



<https://asce-uok.edu.pk/journal>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.56384/jes.v41i2.392>

NATO at 75: Evolution, Expansion, and Strategic Implications for Global Security

Wajeeha Najam*

Abstract

This paper explores how NATO has transformed from a Cold-War-type defence alliance to a multipurpose international security organization, adjusting both legal frameworks and strategic doctrine to new challenges such as cyber warfare, counterterrorism action or growing Chinese influence. NATO, in marking its 75th anniversary, is steadfast in its commitment to global security by a combination of traditional defence with new responsibilities. At the center of this shift is NATO's extension to the east (the third wave of enlargement, comprising the Baltic States as well as Finland and Sweden), which has led to a marked deterioration in relations with Russia. Nevertheless, while the expansion of NATO has been summarized as a topic of concern (history and memory in NATO enlargement 2014), the full scale consequences of this enlarged defence reality on European security and a balance power for Eastern Europe has not yet executed fully enlightened. The research aims to addresses central issues on both sides regarding NATO's possible enlargement and its likely implications for European and strategic stability with Russia, as well as important insights into the changing character of the alliance in an increasingly complex global security environment.

Keywords: NATO, cyber warfare, collective defence, cold war, enhanced forward presence, hybrid warfare, European stability

Introduction

On April 4, 1949, NATO was born, signalling the beginning of perhaps the most powerful military alliance of the 20th century. While the alliance was created in December of 1949 after WWII, its primary mission was to prevent any potential Soviet assault on Western nations. NATO in 75 years

* Wajeeha Najam is a Research Officer at the Rabita Forum International, Karachi. Email: ms.wajeehanajam@gmail.com.

has undergone a number of changes — including new member nations, which had been its main purpose, and its relation to the changing world geopolitics.

At first, the objective of the North Atlantic Alliance was to limit the spread of communism in the Cold War. Today, its reach has grown substantially, covering a broad array of worldwide security concerns such as crisis management, counter-terrorism, peace support operations, cybersecurity, and space security. NATO's strategic goals and legal basis have been shaped by historical occurrences, technological progress, China's emergence, and the complicated and sometimes strained interactions with Russia.¹

On its 75th anniversary, NATO is spotlighted for its growth and efforts to address modern security challenges such as cyber warfare and China's rise as a global power. The alliance's dedication to mutual defence, stated in Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty, has served as both a deterrent and a stabilizing influence in Europe. Nevertheless, the expansion of NATO, particularly its movement towards former Soviet regions in the east, has caused considerable tensions with Russia, sparking concerns of a resurgence of a Cold War scenario.²

This article illustrated how NATO has changed over the past 75 years, highlighting the important legal, strategic, and geopolitical changes that have shaped its role in worldwide security. A detailed examination will be conducted on the integration of the Baltic States, Finland, and Sweden into NATO, leading to strained relations with Russia. Additionally, an in-depth analysis will be conducted on how NATO's expansion will impact European stability and the balance of power in Eastern Europe in the long term. It will also seek to add to the current conversation about NATO's future by exploring these issues in a multipolar global environment.³

¹ Lawrence S. Kaplan. *NATO and the United States: The Enduring Alliance* (Twayne Publishers, 1988), 15.

² Mark Webber. "NATO: The United States, Transformation and the War in Afghanistan," *The British Journal of Politics & International Relations* 11, No. 1 (21 January 2009): 120. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-856X.2008.00349.x>.

³ David Reynolds (ed.), *The Origins of the Cold War in Europe*, First Edition (Yale University Press; First Edition, 1994), 35. <https://yalebooks.yale.edu/9780300105629/the-origins-of-the-cold-war-in-europe>.

Formation of NATO (1949)

NATO was created as a direct response to the increasing geopolitical tensions between Western democracies and the Soviet Union during the early Cold War period. Established through the Washington Treaty, also known as the North Atlantic Treaty, NATO was formed with the primary goal of developing a security infrastructure to prevent Soviet expansion in Europe. The establishment of the alliance marked a significant shift in global security dynamics by solidifying a mutual defence pact among its initial 12 member countries: the United States of America, Canada, the United Kingdom, France, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, Luxembourg, Norway, Denmark, Iceland, and Portugal.⁴

Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty forms the foundation of NATO, stipulating that an armed attack against any NATO member is considered an attack against all. The principle of collective defence aimed to deter Soviet aggression and assure smaller European nations of the United States' commitment to their security.⁵ The invocation of Article 5, in line with Article 51 of the UN Charter,⁶ permitted collective self-defence and solidified NATO's position within the broader global legal framework established after World War II. Notably, NATO's legal structure preserved the sovereignty of its member nations, ensuring that the alliance operated through mutual collaboration rather than imposing supranational control.⁷

NATO was established due to legal and strategic requirements. In terms of legality, the alliance signified the ongoing presence of the post-war global system marked by multilateralism and the avoidance of armed disputes. The establishment of NATO happened at the same time as other key post-war organizations like the United Nations, all aiming to avoid another expanded war. From a strategic perspective, NATO was established as a direct reaction to perceived acts of aggression by the Soviet Union in Europe. Incidents like the Berlin Blockade (1948-1949) and the Communist takeover in Czechoslovakia in 1948 highlighted the immediate necessity for

⁴ Stanley R. Sloan. *NATO, the European Union, and the Atlantic Community: The Transatlantic Bargain Challenged* (Rowman & Littlefield, 2005), 60.

⁵ Philip H. Gordon. *NATO's Transformation: The Changing Shape of the Atlantic Alliance* (Rowman & Littlefield, 1997), 36.

⁶ NATO, 'Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations', NATO, accessed 21 October 2024, https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official_texts_16937.htm.

⁷ 'NATO's Response to Russia's Invasion of Ukraine', NATO, 3 October 2024, https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_192648.htm.

a unified Western security structure to limit Soviet power.⁸ Moreover, the United States viewed NATO as a crucial part of its overall plan to support stability in Europe, including programs such as the Marshall Plan aimed at aiding post-war recovery and promoting democratic leadership.⁹

NATO's legal structure and strategic justification also mirrored the growing bipolarity of the post-war era. When the Soviet Union gained control of Eastern Europe, NATO emerged as the official symbol of Western efforts to maintain power balance. NATO created a durable framework for coordinating defence strategies, sharing intelligence, and improving military capabilities to deter Soviet aggression through formalized military cooperation among member states.¹⁰

Evolution during the Cold War

The Cold War period saw the ongoing battle between the Eastern Bloc led by the Soviet Union and the Western one which took shape around the United States and its allies. NATO's creation was meant to thwart Soviet aggression and protect Europe from the spread of communism. As the Cold War prolonged, NATO's legal and strategic structure adapted to the changes in the nature of the conflict as war transformed NATO into a strong military alliance capable of employing both nuclear and conventional warfare.¹¹

During the Cold War's early years, NATO tended to focus on attack-defence models. The significant event of the 1952 Lisbon Conference represented a watershed moment in NATO's development, outlining ambitious goals to enhance member states' military capabilities and strengthen the principle of collective defence.¹²

The accession of West Germany into NATO in 1955 was a significant legal milestone. This stance completely changed the political atmosphere, to the

⁸ Martin A. Smith. *NATO in the First Decade after the Cold War* (Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2000), 45. https://catalog.library.vanderbilt.edu/discovery/fulldisplay/alma991037253869703276/01VAN_INST:vanui.

⁹ Anja Dalgaard-Nielsen et al. (eds.), *The Politics of European Security* (Copenhagen, 2004).

¹⁰ Ashton B. Carter. "America's New Strategic Partner?", *Foreign Affairs*, 1 July 2006, <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/asia/2006-07-01/americas-new-strategic-partner>.

¹¹ Kaplan. *NATO and the United States*, 25.

¹² Sloan. *NATO, the European Union, and the Atlantic Community*, 88.

point where the Soviet Union, in retaliation, established the Warsaw Pact.¹³ Thus, the admission of West Germany in NATO marked the institutionalization of a divided Europe into the two opposing security blocs which only made the situation in the Cold War more exacerbated.

During the Cold War, NATO's strategic posture evolved from an exclusively defensive position to a more flexible, dynamic concept of deterrence. In the 1960s, NATO officially embarked on the strategy of Flexible Response to overcome certain shortcomings in its earlier doctrine of massive retaliation.¹⁴ The new strategy involved NATO promising to respond to Soviet aggression with ever-escalating force, from conventional military to nuclear force as a last resort.¹⁵ It was in this respect that there was an evolution of strategy, given the complex security environment in the Cold War, which essentially required stability; hence, besides the acquisition of military strength, there was indeed a need for prudent management of escalation risk between the nuclear superpowers.

This strategic shift showed that the Cold War security environment was complex, where stability could be maintained with military power, and cautious handling of risks of escalation between superpowers.¹⁶ For extended deterrence, NATO allies were dependent on the nuclear weapons of the United States. It was at this time when great changes in military technologies and intelligence sharing among the NATO members finally provided a better shield from possible Soviet aggression.¹⁷

During the Cold War, NATO focused on military deterrence but also expanded to involve political and economic collaboration among its members. This two-pronged approach enhanced connections between Western Europe and North America, promoting European stability and advancing the US goal of uniting the continent through organizations like the European Economic Community (EEC) and programs such as the Marshall Plan.¹⁸

¹³ Reynolds. *The Origins of the Cold War in Europe*, 102.

¹⁴ Webber. "NATO: The United States, Transformation and the War in Afghanistan", 150.

¹⁵ Gordon. *NATO's Transformation*, 150.

¹⁶ Ashton B. Carter. "The Command and Control of Nuclear War," *Scientific American* 252, No. 1 (January 1985): 32–39. <https://doi.org/10.1038/scientificamerican0185-32>.

¹⁷ Smith. *NATO in the First Decade after the Cold War*, 95.

¹⁸ Sloan. *NATO, the European Union, and the Atlantic Community*, 120.

NATO's legal structures have also developed to strengthen military collaboration, with member countries promising to boost defence expenditures and enhance interoperability within their military forces. This institutional adjustment was crucial to make sure that NATO could effectively address the challenges presented by a constantly changing and sometimes unpredictable global environment.¹⁹

The dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991 signaled the cessation of NATO's original goal of countering Soviet communism, marking the end of the Cold War. With the ideological split that had characterized the alliance now mostly gone, NATO had to redefine its purpose in a post-Soviet world with new security issues. This shift signaled the start of NATO's adjustment after the Cold War, as it aimed to stay significant in a world with multiple powers and ever-changing geopolitics.²⁰

Post-Cold War Expansion and Adaptation

NATO ended the Cold War with a mixed challenge and opportunity to reinvent itself. With the end of the Cold War and the Soviet Union no longer its primary adversary, NATO needed to define new purposes and missions if it were to remain relevant in peace time.²¹ At the same time, the alliance transitioned from stressing collective defence to collective security, expanded its membership and adapted its strategic doctrine for the management of growing global risks.

NATO's eastward expansion after the Cold War was an important landmark in its post-Cold War evolution. In keeping with Article 10 of the North Atlantic Treaty, NATO offered membership to certain ex-Warsaw Pact countries that fulfill sufficient political and military criteria for admission.²² The PfP initiative was established to serve as a framework for NATO cooperation with former-COMECON countries in military matters in the 1990s.²³ It was this effort that eventually led to NATO membership for Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic in 1999. In 2004, the organisation expanded again with the inclusion of Baltic States (Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania) and other Central and Eastern European nations.

¹⁹ Webber. "NATO: The United States, Transformation", 200.

²⁰ Reynolds. *The Origins of the Cold War in Europe*, 180.

²¹ Sloan. *NATO, the European Union, and the Atlantic Community*, 160.

²² Kaplan. *NATO and the United States*, 160.

²³ 'NATO's Response to Russia's Invasion of Ukraine'.

NATO Expansion represented a fundamental turn away from the mission that had originally defined the alliance. Rather than simply focusing on the deterrence of Soviet aggression, NATO expanded in order to stabilize Eastern Europe by incorporating former foes into its security architecture. This process of enlargement was highly controversial, since Russia perceived the NATO encroachment into its traditional sphere of influence as a direct danger to Russian security interests. Yet, this relationship between NATO and Russia has not been without friction, especially as the alliance crept ever closer to Russian borders — notwithstanding assurances NATO officials provided that their expansion was geared toward making Europe more stable rather than coercing Moscow.²⁴ NATO's post-Cold War adaptation was not limited to geographic expansion. The alliance also transformed its mission to address non-traditional security challenges such as peacekeeping, crisis management, and humanitarian intervention.²⁵ NATO's participation in the Balkans during the Yugoslav Wars in the 1990s demonstrated this change. In 1999, NATO initiated its inaugural extensive military involvement in Kosovo by carrying out airstrikes despite lacking a direct authorization from the United Nations.²⁶ This action emphasized NATO's willingness to get involved in crises outside its member states, raising legal discussions about the validity of humanitarian interventions conducted without clear Security Council endorsement.

The 1999 Strategic Concept of NATO formalized these shifts, confirming the alliance's dedication to collective defence while highlighting additional tasks such as crisis management, peace support, and cooperative security.²⁷ This expanded range demonstrated the alliance's acknowledgment of the increasingly intricate global security landscape in the post-Cold War era. NATO had to change from its Cold War strategies to a more flexible and adaptable security approach due to the rise of non-state actors, increased terrorism, and cyber threats.

During the early 21st century, NATO broadened its focus in reaction to the terrorist attacks in the United States on September 11, 2001. For the first

²⁴ Smith. *NATO in the First Decade after the Cold War*, 190.

²⁵ Gordon. *NATO's Transformation*, 220.

²⁶ Carter. "America's New Strategic Partner?"

²⁷ "NATO's Response to Russia's Invasion of Ukraine".

time ever, NATO used Article 5, showing how the alliance can adjust its legal structure to combat the changing threat of terrorism.²⁸

NATO's subsequent involvement in Afghanistan through the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) showcased its capacity to operate beyond its traditional Euro-Atlantic region, albeit with mixed results. The mission raised questions about NATO's ability to effectively engage in long-term stabilization efforts outside Europe, a challenge that would persist in future operations. As NATO navigated the complexities of the post-Cold War era, it also began addressing new domains of warfare, particularly cybersecurity and space. Recognizing the increasing importance of these domains, NATO declared cyberspace a domain of warfare in 2016,²⁹ marking a significant expansion of its legal and strategic frameworks. Similarly, NATO has taken steps to enhance its preparedness in space security, reflecting the alliance's commitment to adapting to the full spectrum of modern threats.

NATO in the 21st Century: New Challenges and Expansions

The dawn of the 21st century presented NATO with a new set of global security challenges, many of which diverged significantly from the alliance's original Cold War focus. As the world shifted towards an era marked by non-state actors, cyber threats, and emerging powers like China, NATO's strategic objectives and legal frameworks were further adapted to address these evolving threats. The attacks on the United States on September 11, 2001, marked a pivotal moment for NATO, reshaping its role in global security.³⁰

For the first time in NATO's history, Article 5 was invoked following the 9/11 attacks, demonstrating NATO's relevance in countering new security threats. The alliance's collective defence clause, originally designed to deter Soviet aggression, was now applied to a non-state actor—al-Qaeda.³¹ This shift highlighted NATO's adaptability and underscored the importance of its transatlantic partnership in addressing global terrorism. NATO's

²⁸ Lawrence Kaplan. *NATO Divided, NATO United: The Evolution of an Alliance* (Bloomsbury Academic, 2004), 184.

²⁹ 'NATO Recognises Cyberspace as a "Domain of Operations" at Warsaw Summit', accessed 19 October 2024, <https://ccdcoe.org/incyber-articles/nato-recognises-cyberspace-as-a-domain-of-operations-at-warsaw-summit/>.

³⁰ Webber. "NATO: The United States, Transformation and the War in Afghanistan," 200.

³¹ Kaplan. *NATO Divided, NATO United*.

subsequent mission in Afghanistan, through the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF),³² marked its longest and most extensive operation beyond Europe. While the mission aimed to stabilize Afghanistan and dismantle terrorist networks, it also raised questions about NATO's ability to sustain long-term stabilization missions outside of the Euro-Atlantic area.³³ The withdrawal of NATO forces from Afghanistan in 2021 reignited debates about the effectiveness and scope of NATO's interventions in non-European theaters of conflict.

NATO's engagement with the global war on terror prompted further expansions in its strategic and legal frameworks. The emergence of cyber warfare as a significant security concern in the 21st century led to NATO's recognition of cyberspace as a domain of warfare in 2016.³⁴ This formal acknowledgment of the cyber domain reflected the alliance's commitment to addressing non-traditional threats that increasingly define modern warfare. NATO's establishment of the Cooperative Cyber Defence Centre of Excellence in Estonia³⁵ and the creation of the Cyber Operations Centre within its command structure are testaments to the alliance's proactive approach to strengthening cyber defences.³⁶

Beyond cyberspace, NATO has also turned its attention to space security. Recognizing the critical role that space assets play in modern military operations, NATO has moved to enhance its capabilities in this domain. In 2019, NATO declared space as an operational domain, a step that reflects the alliance's ongoing evolution to address a wider range of security challenges.³⁷ This change aims to reinforce the capacity of NATO to advance its qualitative superiority over its opponents in the context of the growing threat to the satellites and space-based assets in the modern global security paradigm.

³² 'ISAF's Mission in Afghanistan (2001-2014)', NATO, 30 May 2022, https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_69366.htm.

³³ Sloan. *NATO, the European Union, and the Atlantic Community*, 160.

³⁴ Dr Tim Stevens and Dr Joe Burton. 'NATO Review - NATO and Strategic Competition in Cyberspace', *NATO Review*, 6 June 2023. <https://www.nato.int/docu/review/articles/2023/06/06/nato-and-strategic-competition-in-cyberspace/index.html>.

³⁵ 'NATO Cooperative Cyber Defence Centre of Excellence', Estonian Defence Forces, 8 October 2024. <https://mil.ee/en/landforces/ccdcoe/>.

³⁶ 'NATO Recognises Cyberspace as a "Domain of Operations" at Warsaw Summit'.

³⁷ 'NATO's Approach to Space', NATO's ACT, accessed 19 October 2024. <https://www.act.nato.int/our-work/network-community/natos-approach-to-space/>.

Currently, in addition to counterterrorism and protection from the cyber perimeter, NATO also directs its strategic capabilities towards the conduct of hybrid warfare by both state and non-state actors.³⁸ The evolution of hybrid practices of Russia, especially in the annexation of Crimea in 2014, made NATO re-evaluate the defence strategies it had in Eastern Europe. Hybrid warfare including information warfare, cyber warfare, and the use of non-state actors as proxies created another dimension of threat to NATO's traditional model of collective defence. NATO responded through the EFP initiative which saw the deployment of multinational battalions in Poland and the Baltic States to dissuade further Russian moves, and reassure Eastern European NATO members of NATO's readiness to provide adequate defence.

The 2022 Strategic Concept document of NATO elaborates on the alliance's further developments and strategic reach. It admits that as a competitor and an active player, China needs to be taken into consideration, thus NATO's interest in the Indo-Pacific region is made explicit. It identifies new priorities, including climate change and is viewed in wider security terms because it causes competition over resources and mass migrations. Thus, attending to NATO's further developments, it can be noted that NATO has expanded its traditional mission of collective self-defence and has taken a broader perspective on security, which now also includes cyber, hybrid warfare, and political dynamics conflict due to the rise of China.³⁹

Russia's Reaction on NATO's Eastward Expansion

NATO's eastward expansion, particularly into former Soviet republics and satellite states, has been one of the most contentious issues in post-Cold War geopolitics. Guided by Article 10 of the North Atlantic Treaty, which allows for the admission of new members that meet specific political and military criteria, NATO was positively inclined towards attracting Eastern European countries into its fold in the 1990s.⁴⁰ The alliance's eastward expansion, while legally grounded in NATO's founding treaty, has sparked

³⁸ Guillem Colom Piella. "Nato's Strategies for Responding to Hybrid Conflicts," *CIDOB REPORT* (Barcelona: Centre for International Affairs, 2022). <https://www.cidob.org/en/publications/natos-strategies-responding-hybrid-conflicts>.

³⁹ 'Strategic Concepts', NATO, 18 July 2022. https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_56626.htm.

⁴⁰ Sloan. *NATO, the European Union, and the Atlantic Community*, 120.

significant tensions with Russia, which views NATO's proximity to its borders as a direct threat to its strategic depth and security.

Russia's opposition to NATO expansion is rooted in its perception of the alliance as a vestige of the Cold War, designed to counter Soviet influence. For Moscow, NATO's movement into its former sphere of influence in Eastern Europe is seen as an encroachment on its national security and an effort to contain Russia's resurgence as a global power. Russian officials have cited agreements,⁴¹ such as the 1990 Charter of Paris⁴² and the 1997 NATO-Russia Founding Act,⁴³ as evidence of alleged promises made by Western powers to limit NATO's enlargement. However, no binding international treaty prevents NATO from admitting new members, and NATO's leadership has consistently argued that enlargement strengthens European security by bringing more nations under the umbrella of collective defence.

The inclusion of the Baltic States (Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania) in 2004, along with other former Warsaw Pact countries like Poland and Hungary, marked a turning point in NATO-Russia relations. For Russia, the presence of NATO troops and military infrastructure so close to its borders was seen as a threat to its strategic interests. This concern was further exacerbated by NATO's Enhanced Forward Presence (EFP) in Eastern Europe, which began in 2017⁴⁴ in response to Russia's actions in Ukraine. The deployment of multinational battalions to Poland, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania underscored NATO's commitment to deterring Russian aggression, but it also deepened the rift between NATO and Russia.⁴⁵

The 2008 war between Russia and Georgia and the 2014 annexation of Crimea were key flashpoints in Russia's deteriorating relationship with NATO. Moscow viewed these conflicts as direct responses to NATO's

⁴¹ Richard Sakwa. *Russia Against the Rest: The Post-Cold War Crisis of World Order* (Cambridge University Press, 2017), 88.

⁴² 'Charter of Paris for a New Europe', 21 November 1990. <https://www.osce.org/astana/110410>.

⁴³ 'Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security between NATO and the Russian Federation Signed in Paris, France', NATO, 27 May 1997. https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official_texts_25468.htm.

⁴⁴ 'NATO's Military Presence in the East of the Alliance', NATO, 8 July 2024. https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_136388.htm.

⁴⁵ Webber. 'NATO: The United States, Transformation and the War in Afghanistan', 250.

encroachment into its sphere of influence, particularly after Georgia and Ukraine expressed interest in joining the alliance.⁴⁶ Russia's actions in Ukraine, including its support for separatist forces in the Donbas region, demonstrated Moscow's willingness to use military force to counter NATO's expansion. The Russia-Ukraine war, which erupted in 2022, further strained NATO-Russia relations, with NATO providing military and non-military assistance to Ukraine under the framework of the NATO-Ukraine Distinctive Partnership.⁴⁷

From NATO's perspective, eastward expansion serves as a means of consolidating peace and stability in Europe by integrating former Communist states into its collective defence framework. The enlargement process has brought new democracies into the fold, extending the security benefits of NATO membership to nations historically caught between East and West. However, Russia sees NATO's expansion as a violation of its strategic interests and has repeatedly used this as justification for aggressive military actions in its near abroad.

As NATO continues to expand, with Finland and Sweden pursuing membership in the wake of the Russia-Ukraine war, the strategic implications for European stability and the balance of power in Eastern Europe remain a subject of intense debate.⁴⁸ While NATO maintains that enlargement enhances collective security, Russia's reaction suggests that the alliance's eastward push has contributed to renewed tensions reminiscent of Cold War dynamics.

According to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), Russia's defence expenditure grew from approximately \$41.1 billion in 2010 to \$84.5 billion in 2014, reflecting heightened security concerns following NATO's expansion and the Ukraine crisis. Public sentiment in Russia has also mirrored these strategic anxieties. Surveys by the Levada

⁴⁶ Svante E. Cornell. *Russia's War in Georgia: Causes and Implications for Georgia and the World* (Nacka: Silk Road Studies Program, Central Asia-Caucasus Institute, 2008); Bushra Batool, "The Russo-Chechen Problem: A Historical Perspective," 72 (6 July 2024): 69–96. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/384924649_THE_RUSSO-CHECHEN_PROBLEM_A_HISTORICAL_PERSPECTIVE.

⁴⁷ 'NATO's Response to Russia's Invasion of Ukraine'.

⁴⁸ Kristin Archick, Paul Belkin, and Andrew S Bowen. 'NATO Enlargement to Sweden and Finland', 22 March 2024.

Center^{49*} in 2015 revealed that only 5% of Russians viewed NATO positively, while over 70% perceived the alliance as a threat to Russian sovereignty.

Russia has consistently cited the presence of NATO infrastructure near its borders—including US missile defence systems in Poland and Romania—as justification for military modernization and regional assertiveness. These figures and perceptions underline the strategic depth of Russian opposition to NATO's enlargement, challenging the alliance's efforts to promote European stability through expansion.

NATO's Response to the Russia-Ukraine War

The Russia-Ukraine war, which began in 2014 with the annexation of Crimea and escalated dramatically in 2022 with Russia's full-scale invasion of Ukraine, has profoundly impacted NATO's strategic posture. This conflict has reinforced NATO's role as the principal security guarantor in Europe and brought the alliance back to its original mission of defending Europe from Russian aggression. The war has also highlighted the complexities of NATO's relationship with non-member states like Ukraine and the legal and strategic challenges that come with providing support without direct intervention.⁵⁰

Ukraine, while not a NATO member, has long had a cooperative relationship with the alliance through frameworks such as the NATO-Ukraine Distinctive Partnership and the Enhanced Opportunities Partnership (EOP). These partnerships have facilitated military cooperation and defence reforms in Ukraine since the early 2000s.⁵¹ However, NATO's involvement in the Russia-Ukraine conflict has remained indirect, primarily through military aid, training, and intelligence-sharing rather than direct military engagement. This approach reflects NATO's careful balancing act: providing robust support to Ukraine while avoiding actions that could escalate the conflict into a broader war between NATO and Russia.

⁴⁹ This organization is a Russian independent, nongovernmental polling and sociological research institute.

⁵⁰ 'NATO's Response to Russia's Invasion of Ukraine'.

⁵¹ 'NATO - Topic: Relations with Ukraine', 3 October 2024. https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_37750.htm.

NATO has based its legal and strategic reaction to the conflict on international humanitarian law and focused on offering defensive assistance to Ukraine. The alliance has continuously criticized Russia's behavior as breaches of international law, specifically the principles of state sovereignty and territorial integrity outlined in the United Nations Charter. Simultaneously, NATO has provided aid to Ukraine within legal limits for non-member state assistance in conflict, ensuring adherence to international law.⁵²

NATO's deterrence and defence capabilities have been put to the test by the conflict, especially on its Eastern Flank, where countries like Poland and the Baltic States are closely monitoring for possible Russian aggression. In reaction, NATO has greatly increased its military force in Eastern Europe, by sending more soldiers and strengthening its Enhanced Forward Presence (EFP) to reassure member countries and discourage more Russian invasions.⁵³ These missions show NATO's dedication to collective defence, as stated in Article 5, and its preparedness to protect member countries from attacks.

The conflict in Russia and Ukraine has also sped up Finland and Sweden's efforts to join NATO. For many years, both nations stayed neutral in terms of military but have now changed their security strategies due to Russia's aggressive behavior.⁵⁴ Their accession to NATO would not only expand the alliance's geographic reach but also enhance its strategic depth in Northern Europe, further complicating Russia's security calculations. Russia has reacted sharply to these developments, viewing NATO's potential expansion into Finland and Sweden as another example of the alliance encroaching on its sphere of influence.

NATO's strategic response to the Russia-Ukraine war underscores the alliance's enduring relevance in European security. The conflict has reinvigorated NATO's traditional deterrence role while also highlighting the complexities of supporting non-member states like Ukraine. As the war

⁵² Michael Wood and Kofi Annan. "International Law and the Use of Force: What Happens in Practice?", *Indian Journal of International Law* 53 (2013): 130.

⁵³ 'Enhanced Forward Presence (EFP)', [lc.nato.int](https://lc.nato.int/operations/enhanced-forward-presence-efp.aspx), accessed 19 October 2024. <https://lc.nato.int/operations/enhanced-forward-presence-efp.aspx>.

⁵⁴ Louisa Brooke-Holland. "NATO Enlargement: Sweden and Finland," 19 October 2024. <http://commonslibrary.parliament.uk/research-briefings/cbp-9574/>.

continues, NATO's challenge will be to maintain unity among its members, ensure effective deterrence, and support Ukraine's sovereignty without crossing the line into direct conflict with Russia.⁵⁵

The Role of the United States in NATO

The United States has been central to NATO since its inception in 1949, contributing most of its military power and influencing its strategic path. The North Atlantic Treaty formalizes this role, specifically through Article 5's dedication to collective defence, which was activated for the first time following the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001. This significant event highlighted the US's impactful position in NATO's security goals.⁵⁶

In the past, the US aimed to avoid one European power taking control of the continent, which originated from its early 20th-century focus on preserving a divided balance of power in Europe. This goal influenced NATO's formation in the Cold War era, initially prioritizing to counter Soviet impact and incorporate West Germany into Western defence systems. Currently, given Russia's limited economic and military strength, there is a chance to reevaluate the United States' position in Europe. Despite showing a readiness to use military power, Russia's ability to present a threat to the entire continent is restricted. Some analysts propose that NATO should adjust its focus to allow for more European leadership in defence issues and promote a security approach centered around Europe.⁵⁷

An ongoing issue in NATO has been the division over burden-sharing, as the US pushes European allies to reach the 2% of GDP defence spending goal established during the 2014 Wales Summit. During the Trump administration, this position became more firm, with language implying that American backing could decrease if allies did not provide their "fair share." The Biden administration has once again confirmed its strong dedication to NATO, commending the alliance's growth to incorporate Finland and Sweden. Nevertheless, shifting additional responsibilities to

⁵⁵ 'NATO's Response to Russia's Invasion of Ukraine'.

⁵⁶ Sloan. *NATO, the European Union, and the Atlantic Community*, 75.

⁵⁷ Zoltan Barany. *The Future of NATO Expansion: Four Case Studies*, 1st ed. (Cambridge University Press, 2003), <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511509957>.

European allies could potentially cut billions from the US military budget each year, which would help address the country's current fiscal issues.⁵⁸

One possible strategic change may include the US giving European allies more operational duties, urging them to enhance their defence-industrial capabilities and reducing their usual dependence on American military gear. This shift would involve backing European defence capabilities without relying too heavily on American input, in line with efforts such as Germany's recent boost in defence expenditures as part of its *Zeitenwende* strategy.⁵⁹ In the future, the US may shift from leading defence in NATO to offering strategic support, possibly allowing a European Commander to have a more important role within the organization.

Even though the US continues to be crucial to NATO's existing structure, there might be a need to adjust American obligations in order to tackle new global challenges, such as those in the Indo-Pacific region. A well-balanced transition would enable NATO to stay strong in protecting Europe while also providing the US with more freedom to handle its worldwide interests and resources.

As of 2023, NATO reported that only 11 of its 31 member states had met the defence spending benchmark of 2% of GDP, a goal set at the 2014 Wales Summit. The United States remains the largest contributor, accounting for nearly 70% of the alliance's total defence spending. In contrast, many European allies, including Germany and Italy, have historically lagged behind this target.

This disproportionate spending has been a persistent source of friction within the alliance. The Trump administration vocally criticized this imbalance, while the Biden administration has adopted a more diplomatic stance, continuing to encourage increased European defence investment. Recent efforts, such as Germany's *"Zeitenwende"* defence strategy and the European Defence Fund, represent steps toward rebalancing the transatlantic burden. Nevertheless, a strategic shift that entrusts European

⁵⁸ Michael E. O'Hanlon. "Unpacked: What Trump Gets Right and Wrong about Defense Burden Sharing," *Brookings*, 1 August 2018. <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/unpacked-what-trump-gets-right-and-wrong-about-defense-burden-sharing/>.

⁵⁹ Pia Fuhrhop. 'Germany's *Zeitenwende* and the Future of European Security', (2023). <https://www.esteri.it/wp-content/uploads/2023/08/IAI-Guerra-In-Ucraina.pdf>.

members with greater operational roles could potentially reduce US expenditures while preserving NATO's collective deterrence capability.

Conclusion

As NATO reaches its anniversary of more than seventy years of security in the Atlantic region, consideration should be taken into what the future of the alliance is, and its expansion in view of stability in Europe and around the world. The recent enlargements to the east significantly influenced NATO's strategic priorities and capabilities, with the respective consequences it entails in its relation with Russia and the wider regional security setting. In the early days of NATO, its open-door policy was dual-purposed: to strengthen European unity and keep the Soviets at bay. Now, it serves as reassurance for would-be members but a source of irritation with Russia. This places NATO in a critical dilemma in its mandate—to strike a proper balance between its core values of collective defence and open membership—set against the rapidly changing security environment in Eastern Europe and traditionally tense NATO-Russia relations.

The possibility of further expansion, much more around regions near Russia's sphere of influence, is quite touchy. For Russia, the mass expansion of NATO has been viewed as one of the biggest threats to its survival, with heightened tensions and security complications. It has responded to the fact that NATO is moving eastward by reinforcing its military capabilities on its western border and employing hybrid-warfare methods in its vicinity, as a way of demonstrating, from the Russian perspective, the destabilizing effect of continuous NATO enlargement. Consolidation of collective security through NATO enlargement is considered one way, but this demands a shift in the defence strategy toward more investment in deterrence and resilience, especially in NATO's eastern side. This strategic shift also forms part of NATO's commitment to stability, gesturing at the same time that advances into areas which Russia believes are strategic will not be tolerated.

The expansion goes beyond security and has wide-ranging implications for political and economic stability throughout Europe. NATO enables countries seeking membership to have a way to achieve security while at the same time strengthening democracy. Throughout accessions, very profound changes in internal affairs and a reordering of foreign policy involve sacrifice in most cases, incurring burdens on local resources,

exacerbating internal clashes, as seen in Ukraine and Georgia. This NATO expansion also entails increased levels of military expenditure and logistical cooperation among member states. All this has been a little problematic for countries that have less money to spend. While the burden-sharing mechanism stimulates collective resilience, it also demands of the countries an amount of internal cohesion which had sometimes been hard to achieve among the diversity that comprised NATO's membership.

It now falls upon NATO to stand against the challenge of relevance and cohesion in a security environment evolving with the changing world order. Clearly, such complexities of scenarios may even obligate NATO to ponder over more flexible partnership models with non-members, extending security assurances sans membership formalities. This approach would allow NATO to achieve a greater stabilizing effect without the significant geopolitical backlash attached to full membership. It also centers diplomatic relations with Russia - essential but vexing - for the prevention of further division within Europe and for restraint on the risk of accidental escalations. Strong deterrence, blended with diplomacy, is perhaps the road to lasting stability in which the Alliance can protect its core values while being responsive to contemporary security challenges.

In conclusion, NATO's expansion and reaction to Russia's concerns about security will continue to play a decisive role in shaping the European security landscape for the coming years. First and foremost, NATO needs to continue to act as a balancing force through prudent behavior, remembering alliance expansion and diplomatic steps. After all, the secret of NATO's future lies in adapting to new challenges without playing with European stability or its relationship with Russia. The success, thus, of the alliance would depend on its capability for growth in membership and the creation of an environment which can foster collective security and strategic stability.