

Marcin Szymański

**ENTROPY VERSUS ADAPTIVE DYNAMICS:
CONTEMPORARY CONFLICT AND ITS IMPLICATIONS
FOR THE NATO DOCTRINE EVOLUTION**

Evolution of global environment has accelerated significantly since catalytic outbreak of the twenty first century. Rapid explosion of globalization, fuelled by information technology, gave birth to the new world order. The newly born nature of the world is deeply rooted in conceptual vision of “system of systems” – network built by clusters of numerous actors, connected with each other across clouds of economy, politics, infrastructure, information, social and security domains. Enhanced complexity paradoxically increased the tempo and momentum of “change”. As a result, the events, processes, advances and crises have all maintained vigorous speed since the beginning of the new century. Projecting future global trajectories in turbulent environment is hardly possible, nevertheless some predictive analysis are available for contemporary scholars. US National Intelligence Council study “Global Trends 2030”¹ defines world’s present status as “a critical juncture in human history, which could lead to widely contrasting futures”². The study identifies crisis prone global economy, governance gaps, potential for increased conflict, wider scope of regional instability and impact of new technologies as critical game changers in upcoming decades. Turbulent nature of contemporary environment is further highlighted in numerous publications and analysis. Stewart Patrick in his

¹ *Global Trends 2030 Alternative Worlds*, December 2012, www.globaltrends2030.files.wordpress.com/2012/11/global-trends-2030-november2012.pdf (access: 10.08.2015).

² *Ibidem*, p. 4.

article “The Unruled Worlds” soberly acknowledges: “global disorder is here to stay, so the challenge is to make it work as well as possible”³. Wayne Michael Hall and Gary Citrenbaum underline the unpredictable character of contemporary and future environment. They both agree that global networks “cannot be squeezed or manipulated into mathematical formula or a program evaluation and review technique (PERT) to help people with engineering backgrounds understand their characteristics, purposes and operations”⁴. Complexity, unpredictability, dynamics and rapid cascading effects dominated the perspective in all spheres of human activity. They overshadowed economy, politics, infrastructure, security, information and social domains. As a result an adaptive dynamics became an indispensable capability for any actor operating on global scale.

Critical value of the capability to adapt in constantly fibrillating suprasystem has been widely recognized by actors operating in a security domain. It appears as no surprise since “Global Trends” report attributes security challenges to all four global “mega trends” (individual empowerment, diffusion of power, demographic patterns, growing food, water and energy nexus)⁵. The undeniable truth is that since the beginning of the new century the dynamics of the security has become much more global in scope. North Atlantic Alliance, as still the most robust actor at the security arena, has already been challenged by some of the new realities. Terrorist’ threat and terrorist’ attacks at some of the member states, asymmetric conflicts, counter piracy efforts, humanitarian challenges, hybrid threats, cyber security breaches and numerous other aspects compose new, dynamic landscapes of the Alliance existence. NATO’s survival is anchored in the capability to transform adequately to global security atmospherics. Success of the NATO evolution requires more – it depends on accuracy of far reaching predictive analysis and transformation of its results into doctrines. Such hypothesis stimulates several questions: is the twenty eight nations’ Alliance prone to change or does its current weight produce too much organizational inertia? Has the Alliance identified, analyzed and reacted to current ramifications of global change? How does the Alliance address growing complexity of global “system of systems”? Is the Alliance flexible enough to absorb impact of unpredictable trajectories?

The aim of this article is to investigate the NATO ability to adapt to dynamic changes in global environment. Challenges the NATO faced as a result of changing security environment have fueled high level debate throughout the Alliance summits during the past decade. The theme which dominated the discussions is constantly calibrated around growing complexity of contemporary crisis. Tendencies and trends dominating 21st century crisis call for sophisticated use of instruments of power. Such an approach is sometimes labelled as a “smart power” – a combina-

³ Source: S. Patrick, *The Unruled World*, “Foreign Affairs” January/February 2014.

⁴ W.M. Hall, G. Citrenbaum, *Intelligence Analysis: How to Think in Complex Environments*, 2009, p. 13.

⁵ *Global Trends 2030...*, *op. cit.*, p. 10.

tion of soft and hard responses, orchestrated within a framework of cohesive campaign. As Richard L. Armitage and Joseph S. Nye described it – such application of power is “neither hard nor soft – it is the skillful combination of both. Smart power means developing an integrated strategy, resource base and tool kit to achieve objectives”⁶. Both theorists and practitioners of international security underline essential meaning of “smartly” orchestrated multi-layered strategies. US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, interviewed by CBS News in 2009 admitted: “We must use what has been called smart power, the full range of tools at our disposal – diplomatic, economic, military, political, legal and cultural – picking the right tool, or combination of tools, for each situation”⁷. NATO leaders initiated series of debates in relation to this topic a decade ago. Intellectual unrest has been inspired by Danish representatives calling for verification of the Alliance strategy. Officially put on the Riga summit agenda (2006), new outlook for operational thinking has been named “comprehensive approach”. The definition, although varying across Alliance, highlights in all of its versions a need for coordinated multidimensional response to a crisis. Moreland and Jasper describe common denominator of all definitions as being anchored in “a congruence of effort, not in unity of command. A working definition of the approach is the manifestation of the idea of mobilizing the resources of an entire society to succeed in complex operations”⁸. Within the scope of the article the author examines the philosophy of the comprehensive approach as the NATO strategic vision channeled along smart power concept. The first section of the study is dedicated to the evolution of the strategic context. Initial attempts to integrate polarity in operational thinking, discussions and Alliance declarations are described and analyzed. Author also outlines some of the political ramifications resulting from the conceptual studies applied within the NATO throughout the past decade. Consecutive section brings more details connected to the nature of the comprehensive approach. The study includes theoretical basis – definitions and terms as well as different national perspectives on multidimensional crisis response methods. As a part of this section author conducts a review of the NATO current doctrinal publications in order to investigate the level of the comprehensive approach operationalization. Throughout this portion of the article author will utilize Allied Command Operations Publication “Comprehensive Operations Planning Directive 1.0”, as primary source of reference. The section also seeks to illustrate theory by several examples of practical application of the comprehensive approach within the Alliance current command structure.

⁶ A Smarter, *More Secure America* [in:] R.L. Armitage, J.S. Nye Jr., *CSIS Commission on Smart Power*, Washington 2007, p. 7.

⁷ C.M. Schnaubelt, *Towards a Comprehensive Approach: Integrating Civilian and Military Concepts of Strategy*, Rome 2011, p. 27.

⁸ *Comprehensive Approach to Operations in Complex Environments*, eds. S. Moreland, S. Jasper, 2014, p. 1.

As a conclusion of the study, the author will attempt to confront the evolution of the NATO doctrine with the main lines of thought defined during 2014 NATO Wales Summit. The fusion will be further used by the author to summarize the article with a few predictive conclusions in regard to the future evolution of the Alliance doctrine. This article is unclassified and it is based on unclassified resources only.

Strategic context

The whole concept of the comprehensive approach (CA) is not a new paradigm. Multidimensional vision of the security with military force involved in non-military tasks is as old as the history of state's instruments of power with professional warfare embedded into it. Adrian Goldsworthy in his study dedicated to Roman Army describes embryonic forms of the comprehensive approach elaborating details of legionnaires' roles in administration, reconstruction, law and order and economy⁹. Studies of contemporary scholars bring some more recent examples: Tanja Miscevic refers to Oliver Cromwell who utilized an orchestrated combination of warfare and diplomacy to influence the decision making of Duke of Savoy in the year of 1655¹⁰. The twentieth century populated the history of warfare with numerous cases, representing multilayered approach to the security. These are especially visible in the post-World War II Europe, where allied armies were facing complex challenge of occupation and restoration of recaptured territories – including vast areas of former Nazi Germany. Weight of the challenge has been widely recognized as too much for the capacity of military apparatus. Christopher M. Schnaubelt admitted in his study of the comprehensive approach, that the military was “doing so despite its reluctance, because there were no realistic alternatives to military control”. Second half of the past century, although relatively clear of the massive scale clashes, provided a fertile ground for hundreds of “small wars”, counter insurgencies, revolutions and terrorist operations. With the end of the cold war these unconventional forms of warfare dominated the scope of global security. NATO heavily engaged outside of its geographic borders, steadily learned new lessons. The Alliance had to transform its force structure and doctrine in order to be able to maintain better peace instead of just winning wars. Such reconstruction appeared to be unavoidable since civil and economic instruments of power increased their importance in global crisis management endeavors. The tendency became the most visible in reference to so called “3 block wars” – complex conflicts in the course of which the responder was involved in the high intensity warfare, humanitarian assistance and reconstruction at the same time. Decades of the struggle with-

⁹ A. Goldsworthy, *The Complete Roman Army*, London 2003.

¹⁰ T. Mišćević, *Philosophy of the Comprehensive Approach to Security*, “The New Century” February 2013, No. 3, p. 2.

in unpredictable and heavily complex environment pushed military thinkers into the state of justified concern. Studies and exchange of thought resulted in evolution of the ideas. Classic counter insurgency philosophy gave birth to the smart power concepts, which in term have inspired discussions on basis of the comprehensive approach. At the outbreak of the twenty first century, the North Atlantic community finally realized that the military forces “cannot merely focus on defeating or deterring armed opposition; they must do so in a way that supports and reinforces the operations being conducted by the civilian organizations and the host government”¹¹. Complexity of the global security environment has also been recognized as the paradigm extending “well beyond the traditional domain of any single government agency”¹² (including military). Such conclusions provided grounds for the birth of comprehensive approach – the strategic vision, which is currently defined as: “cross-governmental generation and application of security, governance and development services, expertise, structures and resources over time and distance in partnership with host nations, host regions, allied and partner governments and partner institutions, both governmental and non-governmental”¹³. The evolution, however, did not happen overnight and without international, strategic implications. The first conceptual efforts were initiated by Danish military and diplomats early in the first decade of the twenty first century. Danes proposed the verification of the current NATO strategic vision, which dated back to 1999 and had not been adequate to dynamically changing environment. Advocates of the reform advertised their ideas during workshops organized in Copenhagen in 2005. Initial vision quickly resonated throughout the Alliance. Proponents of changes attracted interest and support in Canada, the Czech Republic, the Netherlands, Norway and Slovakia. After successful nesting of the reformatory attitudes in Pentagon, the decision has been made to draft a letter proposing official endorsement of the new approaches during NATO Summit in Riga. So called “Comprehensive Approach Initiative” (CAI) has been embedded in the agenda of the 2006 NATO Summit. During the meeting all Alliance members agreed to rally around the comprehensive approach conceptual vision. The CAI narrative strongly resonated in Riga Summit Declaration as well. The document signed by all Alliance Heads of States included the following statement: “Experience in Afghanistan and Kosovo demonstrates that today’s challenges require a comprehensive approach by the international community involving a wide spectrum of civil and military instruments, while fully respecting mandates and autonomy of decisions of all actors, and provides precedents for this approach. To that end, while recognizing that NATO has no requirement to develop capabili-

¹¹ P.V. Jakobsen, *NATO’S Comprehensive Approach To Crisis Response Operations A Work In Slow Progress. DIIS report 2008:15*, Copenhagen 2008, p. 9.

¹² Secretary Robert Gates speech at Kansas State University, November 26, 2007; quoted at: C.M. Schnaubelt, *Towards a Comprehensive Approach: Integrating Civilian and Military Concepts of Strategy*; Rome 2011.

¹³ J. Lindley-French, *Operationalizing the Comprehensive Approach*, 2010, p. 2,

ties strictly for civilian purposes, we have tasked today the Council in Permanent Session to develop pragmatic proposals in time for the meeting of Foreign Ministers in April 2007 and Defense Ministers in June 2007 to improve coherent application of NATO's own crisis management instruments as well as practical cooperation at all levels with partners, the UN and other relevant international organizations, Non-Governmental Organizations and local actors in the planning and conduct of ongoing and future operations wherever appropriate"¹⁴. As a consequence of such explicit declaration, top level NATO bureaucracy took over the task of drafting action plan for further research and application of the new approach. Time was critical since the consecutive NATO Summit was scheduled for the upcoming year. Concerted efforts of several Alliance agencies and numerous subject matter experts resulted in a document draft, which had been forwarded and subsequently endorsed by the Heads of States during Bucharest meeting. The 2008 Summit declaration included further guidance. The NATO Members expressed their commitment in a form of the following statement: "Many of today's security challenges cannot be successfully met by NATO acting alone. Meeting them can best be achieved through a broad partnership with the wider international community, as a part of a truly comprehensive approach (paragraph 4). Effective implementation of a comprehensive approach requires the cooperation and contribution of all major actors, including Non-Governmental organizations and relevant local bodies. To this end, it is essential for all major international actors to act in a coordinated way, and to apply a wide spectrum of civil and military instruments in a concerted effort that takes into account their respective strengths and mandates. We have endorsed an Action Plan comprising a set of pragmatic proposals to develop and implement NATO's contribution to a comprehensive approach (paragraph 11)"¹⁵. New approach of the NATO to the security issues has been further reaffirmed by a presence of UN Secretary General at Bucharest Summit. Implementation of the Action Plan obligated NATO Secretary General to form up a group of experts in order to identify details of the new strategic concept. Mr. Anders F. Rasmussen elected a group of twelve security experts representing different nations and functional branches. The team was chaired by the former US Secretary of State Madeleine Albright. "The twelve apostles" as the group was labelled in the Alliance jargon, continued its intense research for eight months. The study included briefings by military and non-military security experts, consultations with the NATO and non-NATO states, workshops and conferences. Finally the report has been presented to the Secretary General in May 2010. Among the recommendations and observations, the CA "was regarded as inevitable for an Alliance, that has to cope with today's threats and

¹⁴ Riga Summit Declaration Issued by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Riga on 29 November 2006; paragraph 10.

¹⁵ Bucharest Summit Declaration Issued by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Bucharest on 3 April 2008; paragraph 4 and 11.

challenges to the security of its members”¹⁶. The concept, outlining wide spectrum of the NATO strategy was titled “NATO 2020 – Assured Security, Dynamic Management, Analysis and Recommendations of the Group of Experts on a New Strategic Concept for NATO”. The content was thoroughly studied and endorsed during the Alliance Summit in Lisbon. The NATO states delegations once again appreciated the role of other than military instruments of power in a contemporary crisis response. This attitude was summarized in the following statement: “our operational experience has taught us that military means, although essential, are not enough on their own to meet the many complex challenges to our security. Both within and outside the Euro-Atlantic area, NATO must work with other actors to contribute to a comprehensive approach that effectively combines political, civilian and military crisis management instruments”¹⁷. Summit delegations also took further steps in order to operationalize the concept of the CA. The following initiative was declared: “to improve NATO’s contribution to a comprehensive approach and its ability to contribute, when required, to stabilization and reconstruction, we have agreed to form an appropriate but modest civilian capability to interface more effectively with other actors and conduct appropriate planning in crisis management, as addressed in the political guidance mentioned above”¹⁸. Structural and conceptual visions, endorsed by the highest Alliance executive, were quickly translated into doctrinal narrative. Allied Joint Publication 01 (AJP01D) drafted in 2010 outlines strategic and operational level doctrine of the Alliance. It dedicates section 2-11 to describe NATO contribution to the Comprehensive Approach. It officially recognizes the fact that “all military planning should be coherent with other non-military and potentially multinational and non-governmental initiatives intended to stabilize and create a self-sustaining secure environment. A NATO military response must therefore be integrated into a wider overall framework of a comprehensive approach”¹⁹. This capstone document provided a base of thoughts for further NATO doctrinal publications outlining details of the operational practice. The study of these documents is a subject of a subsequent section of the article.

Operationalization of the comprehensive approach

Several years of concerted efforts resulted in an adaptation of the new approach to crisis management. The approach was translated into the language of the doctrine, impacting heavily Alliance procedures, training and structures. Transformation of the vision into the practice was initiated relatively early. 2011 update to CA Action

¹⁶ C.M. Schnaubelt, *Towards a Comprehensive Approach...*, *op. cit.*, p. 56.

¹⁷ Lisbon Summit Declaration Issued by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Lisbon; paragraph 8.

¹⁸ Lisbon Summit Declaration Issued by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Lisbon; paragraph 9.

¹⁹ *Allied Joint Doctrine*, „Allied Joint Publication”-01(D), 2010, p. XII.

Plan noted: “good progress has been made since the Lisbon Summit in adapting staff structures, crisis management procedures, training and education, and in improving NATO’s liaison with other bodies and actors. At the same time, working methods are being adapted across the board to meet the requirements of a comprehensive approach”²⁰. The Alliance initially benefited from some progress already done in the field of the CA by its individual members. UK has been involved unilaterally for a substantial period of time in numerous operations requiring multi-layered approach to the security. Consequently, studies similar to CA had been initiated in the British Army before the adaptation of the CAI by the NATO. In 2010 the report to House of Commons Defense Committee articulated principles of the comprehensive approach as: “proactive engagement, shared understanding, outcome based thinking and collaborative working”²¹. They correspond very closely to later issued NATO principles captured in Allied Joint Publication 01, which defines them in paragraph 0230 as: “proactive engagement, shared understanding, collaborative working and common goal”²². NATO did not produce a universal definition of the comprehensive approach, although the British Ministry of Defense classification, despite its slightly generic nature; captures all of the major characteristics as: “commonly understood principles and collaborative processes that enhance the likelihood of favorable and enduring outcomes within a particular situation”²³. Within the NATO command structure the task of formulating details of the new approach was delegated to Allied Command Transformation (ACT). Conceptual research was nested in the approaches defined during experiments facilitating effect-based theories. The ACT was involved in several projects dedicated to new operational approach channeling operational thinking around so called “Effects Based Approach to Operations” (EBAO). Earlier studies were to some degree coherent with the comprehensive approach principles. Fusion of both concepts resonated in several doctrinal publications – most important among them being Allied Joint Publication 01 defining joint doctrine. The publication key themes covered some of the CA essential features. AJP01 recognizes complex nature of a contemporary crisis, it underlines the need of military planning to be “coherent with other non-military and potentially multinational and non-governmental initiatives intended to stabilize and create a self-sustaining secure environment”²⁴. Subsequent reading of the publication indicates that in crisis response domain the Alliance intends to engage in extensive horizontal integration with other than military instruments of power. AJP01 drafters explicitly admitted that a necessary precondition for such integration is

²⁰ Implementation Of The Comprehensive Approach Action Plan And The Lisbon Summit Decisions On The Comprehensive Approach, dated 6 DEC 2011; prepared by the International Staff of the Secretary General, p. 2.

²¹ *The Comprehensive Approach*, Seventh report of joint session 2009-2010, 09 March 2010, p. 11.

²² *Allied Joint Doctrine*..., *op. cit.*, paragraph 0230.

²³ *The Comprehensive Approach*..., *op. cit.*, p. 11.

²⁴ *Allied Joint Doctrine*..., *op. cit.*, p. XII.

unity of purpose. Information sharing and consultations with external actors may lead to the reciprocal advantage in the spirit of the CA. NATO doctrine presumes that the complexity of contemporary crisis will bring numerous actors to the table. Full agreement on objectives in such densely populated landscape is not likely to be possible. That's why the AJP01 narrative strongly highlights the importance of common purpose as the driver for cohesive delivery of effects. "Political agreement on a desired outcome is necessary for clarity on strategies and objectives; however complete agreement between different actors may be difficult to achieve and, in that case, developing a shared vision or unity of purpose should be pursued"²⁵. Collaborative nature of the crisis response required some adjustments in the NATO operational planning procedures. The vision defined by the ACT inspired other elements of the Alliance command structure to verify their approaches. Allied Command Operations (ACO) responded promptly to new requirements, issuing in 2010 the publication "Allied Command Operations Comprehensive Operations Planning Directive" (COPD). The document was published in 2010, with its updated version being released in 2013. The ACO assumed that successful comprehensive approach to operations is heavily dependent on thorough understanding of a complex crisis environment. The COPD introduces some new terminology to the military lexicon. The appreciation of strategic context, which in accordance with the publication is the first step of the planning process, requires detailed analysis of so called "engagement space". It is defined as "that part of the strategic environment relevant to a particular crisis in which the Alliance may decide, or has decided, to engage"²⁶. The space is further segmented into political, military, economic, social, infrastructure and information domains (PMESII). Introduction of such conceptual framework indicates a clear recognition of other than military domains of a contemporary crisis, where other than military sources of power may be in the lead. Understanding of the nature and scale of the crisis in accordance to COPD is built not only on the basis of PMESII analysis. Planners are also obliged to identify, segment and analyze agendas of all influential actors operating across the theatre. The scope of this activity is also focused on neutral and friendly actors – thorough study of their objectives and agendas is designed to initiate comprehensive, operational planning. As a part of this process NATO planners are supposed to recognize "political goals and objectives, main characteristics, capabilities, strengths, weaknesses and relationships of each actor"²⁷. Identification of non-military institutions operating within the crisis area is conducted during "the Review of the Level and Scope of International Engagement"²⁸. The COPD underlines a critical role of friendly environment understanding, such tendency is confirmed within following

²⁵ *Ibidem*, paragraph 0230.

²⁶ *Allied Command Operations Comprehensive Operations Planning Directive*, version 1.0, p. L-2.

²⁷ *Ibidem*, paragraph 4-18.

²⁸ *Ibidem*, paragraph 4-13.

statement: “the Operational Liaison and Planning Group (OLPG) needs to identify the relevant international actors operating in the area that could contribute to the resolution of the crisis, including those IOs, GOs and NGOs engaged in humanitarian aid, human rights, protection of minorities, refugees and displaced persons, legal assistance, medical care, reconstruction, agriculture, education, and general project funding. It is critical that the OLPG understands the mandate, role, structure, methods and principles of these organizations”²⁹. Once they become clearly outlined, the NATO in accordance to its doctrine, determines its role in the coordinating and enabling mode. Enabling in this case is understood as a security provision and other supporting functions as logistics, transportation, medicine etc. The alliance planners, in accordance with the COPD have to assure that the objectives are understood well enough to build cohesive plan of the response to the crisis. Coordinated planning and execution is best exercised by exchange of liaison with relevant organizations. The ACO publication recommends to take active steps in order to facilitate such arrangement. Paragraph 4-25 describes major contribution of the NATO planners to establish such cooperation networks, it includes identification of:

- Arrangement for in-theatre coordination with cooperating civilian organizations,
- Liaison requirements with local, international, governmental and non-governmental entities³⁰.

The AJP01 and COPD as the two capstone doctrinal documents have shaped the content of numerous NATO manuals, instructions and procedures. The military structures absorbed new trends set by the narrative of the Alliance political leadership. The vision sketched out by the group of experts led by Madeleine Albright and reinforced by a series of post-summit declarations translated into sound doctrine. It still evaluates as the NATO gains more experience throughout operations and exercises. The CA narrative however impacted more areas than just doctrine. Some implications may be also identified in the Alliance structures. Comprehensive approach in accordance with AJP01 is exercised by the NATO at political-strategic, operational and theatre level. Sequentially following functions are related in parallel to these levels: “confidence, planning, cooperation/coordination”³¹. Implementation of the CA guidelines at political levels surprisingly encountered numerous difficulties. NATO identifies UN and EU as its major partners at this level so all the implications resulted from complex relationships between the Alliance and these particular actors. The debates concerning “how” to get NATO closer to the non-military strategic actors were initiated with the discussion on basic model of civil military cooperation. Scholars exploring such relations define three major concepts of civil-military cooperation, it is “civilian advisor model”; “parallel structures” or

²⁹ *Ibidem*, paragraph 4-13.

³⁰ *Ibidem*, paragraph 4-25.

³¹ *Allied Joint Doctrine...*, *op. cit.*, paragraph 0227.

“integrated civilian military participation”³². NATO found it difficult to pick a comfortable model since the debate stalled due to duality of thought among some Allies. The question of the NATO integrated civilian capability gave birth to a number of controversies. During the Lisbon Summit Allies declared the will “to form an appropriate but modest civilian capability to interface more effectively with other actors and conduct appropriate planning in crisis management”³³. The issue of “civilian capability” divided Allies into those preferring wider, global role and those favoring more regionally focused, purely military nature of the Alliance. From the outset of this debate France vetoed the initiatives leading to robust civilian capability of the NATO. As Viggo Jakobsen captured it: “France defined two red lines: first, that NATO should not develop civilian capabilities or attempt to take the lead and coordinate other actors; and second, that NATO should place its military capacities ‘at the service of the international community’ and nothing else”³⁴. French Allies feared the idea of the NATO growing independence, since their perception was that it might have engaged the Alliance in a heavily US influenced, global policing role. Anglo-Saxon part of the Alliance was purely in favor of enlarged NATO capacity, enabling the Alliance to deal almost independently with non-military spectrum of the crisis. Such conceptual dichotomy produced a compromise solution, which included both – limited integral civilian capability of the NATO and strong liaison relations to the EU. The Union benefited from such compromise – it was granted an access to the NATO collective assets for operations where the Alliance as a whole was not militarily engaged. The compromise solution also included creation of the joint EU – NATO crisis response exercise plan and establishment of the EU–NATO Capability Group with the main purpose to facilitate information exchange. Additionally, both actors exchanged their liaison teams, locating them permanently at the EU Military Staff and in the NATO Supreme Headquarters. Strategic importance of the NATO–EU relationship has been confirmed during Lisbon and Chicago summits. NATO 2010 Strategic Concept underlines the value of this bilateral alliance to the overall vision of the “comprehensive approach”. The Chicago Summit declaration defines common values and joint strategic interest as the base for NATO–EU cooperation. The document also highlights the fact, that “strengthening this strategic partnership is particularly important in the current environment of austerity”³⁵. Less robust but certainly not less vital is the NATO cooperation with the UN. Comprehensive approach to the strategy inspired the idea of the meeting between NATO and UN general secretaries in 2008. Memo-

³² C.M. Schnaubelt, *Towards a Comprehensive Approach...*, *op. cit.*, p. 19.

³³ Lisbon Summit Declaration Issued by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Lisbon; paragraph 9.

³⁴ P.V. Jakobsen, *NATO'S Comprehensive Approach To Crisis Response Operations A Work In Slow Progress. DIIS report 2008:15*, Copenhagen 2008, p. 9.

³⁵ Chicago Summit Declaration Issued by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Chicago; paragraph 20.

randum of Understanding signed at 23 September 2008 included statements reassuring mutual will for cooperation. Consequently NATO, although not having permanent presence in the UN headquarters, engages its partner regularly on all levels. As a result of improved cooperation NATO has supported UN sponsored missions in Darfur, Sudan and Somalia. The Alliance also facilitated UN disaster relief operation in Pakistan. Several NATO operations have been mandated by the UN – such endorsement builds international legitimacy for the Alliance security efforts. The NATO Secretary General briefs UN staff regularly on the progress of these operations. Cooperation with the UN, although not as robust as relations with EU, continues to grow. Experience of the past years dictated the main areas of common interest for the UN and NATO – they are currently defined as: communication and information-sharing, capacity-building, training and exercises, lessons learned, planning and support for contingencies and operational coordination and support³⁶.

Introduction of the CA structural solutions to the NATO organic structures was less complicated. Although the Alliance, as it was mentioned earlier, have not built robust civilian capacity, the number of staff organizations were created in order to facilitate effective delivery of the comprehensive approach. At the highest level of the Alliance command – SHAPE, the comprehensive approach philosophy stimulated the creation of the Comprehensive Crisis and Operations Management Centre (CCOMC). The main task of this organization is to monitor crisis development and to plan options for the response. Creation of the center resulted from a series of experiments conducted under auspices of Allied Command Transformation. The research by ACT was summarized in the document “The Future Comprehensive Civil Military Interaction Concept” which among the other issues recommended creation of the CCOMC. The center currently consists of five groups: Crisis Identification, Current Operations, Estimations and Options, Response Direction and Crisis Review. Such structural solution “represents a fundamentally new approach to the management of modern and future crisis and operations by connecting, enabling and integrating international, private and national organizations – most notably the EU and the UN, nongovernmental organizations, and host governments and institutions”³⁷. Civilian capacity of the Alliance has been additionally reinforced by implementation of civilian advisor offices (CIVAD) at both strategic and operational level of command. Other structural elements, introduced to the Alliance network as a result of Lisbon Summit declaration, include Civil Military Fusion Center and Civil Military Planning and Support Section. NATO civil military coordination elements at operational and tactical levels are theater specific and the solutions are dependent on specific regional and functional requirements. Most relevant elements of such structural delineation can be identified basing on

³⁶ Source: *NATO's relations with the United Nations*, 30.07.2014, www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_50321.htm (access: 10.08.2015).

³⁷ L. Odgaard, *Strategy in NATO Preparing for an Imperfect World*, New York 2014.

the Alliance experience gained in Afghanistan. Early initiatives in this particular mission have been started as early as 2003 – the Alliance then deployed Senior Civilian Representative to represent political spectrum of the NATO leadership. In the course of ensuing years development advisors were deployed to the Afghan theatre. The most visible CA instrument became operational with opening of the Post- Operations Humanitarian Relief Fund – the agency responsible for coordination of financial aid.

In 2007 the CA related reforms were in full speed, as a result the Alliance established a Comprehensive Approach Team (CAT) collocated with ISAF headquarters. Deployment of this cell was supposed to energize and orchestrate all efforts dedicated to the comprehensive nature of Afghan campaign. The CAT was designed as a planning team within ISAF including a fusion of “ISAF forces, the United Nations Assistance Mission in Afghanistan (UNAMA), other UN agencies and NGOs”³⁸. At the same year the NATO and UN came with the conclusion that it might be useful to “double hat” the position of the Alliance and UN senior civilian representative. Although this idea has never materialized, it represents a proof of the CA inspired reapproachment of the two organizations. The comprehensive approach at the lowest tactical level was instrumentalized in form of the 26 Provincial Reconstruction Teams. These units were joint military-civilian entities with the task to enable reconstruction at local levels. Working in the field, the PRTs although criticized as a concept by numerous publicists, contributed a lot to the NATO experience in comprehensive operations at the lowest levels of command. The main reason for the criticism is in most cases anchored in low output of the concept. There are numerous reasons for low statistics, although the most important ones seem to be lack of country-wide coordination, underdevelopment and pathologic corruption of the host nation administrative and economic structures and – most of all, low security.

The Joint International – Afghan Board was supposed to orchestrate efforts of the PRTs – after a failure of this organization the PRT Steering Committee took over. Despite all efforts the overall level of coordination for development endeavors remained far from perfect throughout the whole campaign³⁹. Despite the difficulties and harsh realities of unpredictable environment “the PRTs to an extent became symbols of the NATO adaptability: after all, what was foreign to NATO soon became an operational centerpiece”⁴⁰. The PRTs also remain a symbol of the NATO evolution towards comprehensive nature of operational activity.

³⁸ P.V. Jakobsen, *NATO'S Comprehensive Approach To Crisis Response Operations A Work In Slow Progress. DIIS report 2008:15*, Copenhagen 2008, p. 22.

³⁹ For more details see: S. Rynning, *Of Sirens and Deceptive Virtue: A Critical Look at NATO's Comprehensive Approach*, Boston 2011.

⁴⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 5.

Conclusion

The year of 2014 exposed the Alliance to several unexpected events. Nothing captures it better than one of the paragraphs of the Wales Summit declaration: “Russia’s aggressive actions against Ukraine have fundamentally challenged our vision of a Europe whole, free, and at peace. Growing instability in our southern neighborhood, from the Middle East to North Africa, as well as transnational and multi-dimensional threats, are also challenging our security. These all can have long-term consequences for peace and security in the Euro-Atlantic region and stability across the globe”⁴¹. With the events in Ukraine and Middle East, NATO faced a fully blown complexity of the contemporary security environment. The crisis is not novel in nature, however its intensity, global implications and proximity to the Alliance geographic border bring entirely new strategic context. During the summit in Wales the NATO leaders addressed global issues with new declarations. The official statement signed by the heads of 28 member states reconfirms the Alliance commitment to the comprehensive crisis response philosophy. Operational experience and analysis of the current situation maintain allies convinced that “the comprehensive political, civilian, and military approach is essential in crisis management and cooperative security”⁴². Multi-layered vision of the security fuels a robust relations between the Alliance and EU. In Wales NATO also underlined the importance of the OSCE as a partner organization in comprehensive security efforts. Cooperation between these entities becomes vital especially in confrontation with the crisis in Ukraine. NATO clearly recognizes Russian politics as an “aggressive action” – the need to react to such behavior was identified during the summit. The comprehensive nature of current response to the crisis in Eastern Europe bases on a variety of measures taken in different areas. The Alliance cooperates closely with the EU as a prime non-military responder. Some steps in the military domain have also been taken as a part of the reassurance measures covered in Readiness Action Plan. NATO also monitors closely the crisis with its stand-off intelligence capabilities. The results of these efforts are consequently shaping the international opinion concerning the crisis. Comprehensive approach is further materialized in the form of the Alliance aid for Ukraine – this includes assistance to injured veterans, cyber defense, logistic support and communications. To underline the nature of the program the Secretary General Anders Fogh Rasmussen defined it as “a comprehensive and tailored package of measures”⁴³. Outside Europe the Alliance still remains committed in Afghanistan, Mediterranean Sea, to some extent in Libya and Iraq. Scope and intensity of the contemporary crisis grows beyond past predictions. There is no “one type for all” solution for the security on the globe. The

⁴¹ Wales Summit Declaration Issued by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Wales; paragraph 1.

⁴² *Ibidem*, paragraph 99.

⁴³ *NATO Wales Summit LibGuide*, www.natolibguides.info/summit (access: 10.08.2015).

NATO is criticized for its operational effectiveness in Afghanistan and Libya, low involvement in countering Islamic threat also stimulates some critical narrative. Nothing indicates that the level of instability around the world will decrease in the nearest future. As the Secretary General concluded: "In these turbulent times NATO must be prepared to undertake the full range of missions and to defend Allies against the full range of threats"⁴⁴. The comprehensive approach, initiated a decade ago does not offer universal solution for the peace and security in the NATO area of interest. Growing complexity of the contemporary crisis guarantees its relevance in upcoming decades, though. Experiences gained in the post-Cold War military engagements of the Alliance represent the best proof of the necessity for multi-dimensional cooperation in the security domain. Lessons learned seem to be captured and utilized not only by the Alliance, but also by other key global actors: EU and UN chief amongst them. Such tendency confirms the purpose and importance of the comprehensive approach which most likely will dominate the Alliance doctrine in upcoming decades.

Dynamika adaptacji – wpływ współczesnych konfliktów na ewolucję doktryny NATO

Ostatnia dekada historii Sojuszu Północnoatlantyckiego wypełniona była wyzwaniem o niespotykanej dotąd skali różnorodności, co stało się przyczyną strategicznej debaty zainicjowanej na szczeblach polityczno-wojskowych struktur dowodzenia i kierowania NATO. Dyskusje oscylowały wokół złożoności natury współczesnych konfliktów oraz wpływu tego stanu rzeczy na doktryny sojuszu. Reagowanie kryzysowe w dobie XXI stulecia, zgodnie ze zidentyfikowanymi trendami, wymaga wirtuozerii w dziedzinie posługiwania się instrumentami siły. Kombinacja tak zwanej *hard power* i *soft power* w narracji teoretyków doktryn zyskała miano *smart power*. Termin odnoszący się do pojęcia wielowymiarowych kampanii reagowania kryzysowego wywołał liczne refleksje, których skutkiem stały się konsultacje oraz studia współczesnych strategii NATO. Reformatorskie tendencje po raz pierwszy zostały formalnie zdefiniowane na szczycie Sojuszu w Rydze w 2006 r. Inspirowane naturą współczesnych konfliktów badania zaowocowały powstaniem nurtu strategicznego zwanego *comprehensive approach* (CA). Jego geneza sięga korzeni teorii *smart power* oraz *effects based operations*, natura natomiast jest mocno osadzona w skoordynowanym aplikowaniu militarnych, cywilnych i ekonomicznych instrumentów siły. Autor poddaje analizie genezę oraz okoliczności powstania filozofii CA; ukazuje strategiczny kontekst budowy nowego nurtu w dziedzinie reagowania kryzysowego i naturę CA, przytaczając różne perspektywy narodowe. Analizie poddano aparat pojęciowy funkcjonujący obecnie w Sojuszu. W celu ukazania stopnia implementacji strategii na grunt doktryn operacyjnych różnych szczebli NATO. Autor przytacza przykłady rozwiązań strukturalnych w systemie dowodzenia Sojuszu, wynikających z konieczności dostosowania kształtu instytucji do nowej filozofii działania. Opracowanie ilustruje również praktyczne zastosowanie CA na podstawie wybranych przykładów koncepcji wdrażanych w ramach operacji NATO w Afganistanie. Podsumowanie to refleksja dotycząca adekwatności *comprehensive approach* do wyzwań, które zdefiniowano na szczycie Sojuszu w Walii.

Słowa kluczowe: kompleksowe podejście, reagowanie kryzysowe, NATO, bezpieczeństwo międzynarodowe, bezpieczeństwo globalne, bezpieczeństwo europejskie, doktryna, strategia.

⁴⁴ *NATO leaders take decisions to ensure robust Alliance*, 5.09.2014, www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/news_112460.htm (access: 10.08.2015).

