Secretary or General? The influence of the NATO Secretary General on the Alliance's Policy Making

Johan Dekker

_____

Master Thesis Political Science
Leiden University
Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences

Author: W. J. (Johan) Dekker BA
ULCN: 1442619
E-mail: wjdekker86@gmail.com
Date: 14 January 2015
Supervisor: ms. Dr. Maria Spirova
2^{e} reader: mr. Dr. M.J.G. van Willigen

'These bodies made for the government of men, or of traffic, be either perpetual, or for a time prescribed by writing. But there be bodies also whose times are limited, and that only by the nature of their business. …'

Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*, XXII. 25.

Contents

List of Abbreviations

AFRICOM	United States Africa Command
ANSF	Afghan National Security Forces
AU	African Union
AWACS	Airborne Warning and Control System
CFSP	Common Foreign and Security Policy
DPC	Defence Planning Committee
ESDP `	European Security and Defence Policy
EU	European Union
EUFOR	European Union Force
IGO	International Governmental Organization
ISAF	International Security Assistance Force
ISIL	Islamic State of the Iraq and the Levant
LTA	Leadership Trait Analysis
NAC	North Atlantic Council
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NATO HQ	North Atlantic Treaty Organization Headquarters
NPG	Nuclear Planning Group
SACEUR	Supreme Allied Commander Europe
UN	United Nations
UNSC	United Nations Security Council
UNMBiH	United Nations Mission in Bosnia Herzegovina
US	United States

List of Tables

I. Introduction

1.1 Introduction

When the Syrian civil war broke out in 2011, Turkey called for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) to help protect its population and territory against the threat of missile attack by the Assad regime. Two incidents in 2012, namely the shooting down of a Turkish jet by Syrian forces in June and the killing of five Turkish civilians in Turkey by Syrian shelling in October, caused the Turkish Government to invoke Article 4 of the North Atlantic Treaty, calling the alliance for consultations. On 4 December 2012, NATO responded by sending six Patriot Missile batteries, which the new NATO secretary general Jens Stoltenberg visited on the 10th of October, 2014. According to Stoltenberg, his visit sends the message that NATO stands by its allies. These words are of no surprise, since the Turkish security threats have evolved since 2011 with the rise of the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), which has taken advantage of instability in Iraq and Syria to gain territory and impose a brutal regime on civilians, killing and driving people from their homes (NATO, 2014a).

The above is one of multiple world affairs where NATO continues to commit itself to, reaffirming its strong devotion to not only article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty, that states that an armed attack against one or more of them shall be considered an attack against them all, but also to global peace and stability in general (NATO, 1949). Other missions include the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) in Afghanistan and support to the African Union (AU). In sum, the role of NATO in present world affairs proves to be one of importance.

The military alliance' post-Cold War transformation, as well as NATO's decision to use force in certain situations, has been examined from multiple perspectives. Among an array of diplomatic, historical and political approaches, however, analysts have given little attention to the role played by NATO's most important leader in Brussels, the secretary general. More generally, the academic literature on executive leadership of Intergovernmental Organizations (IGO's) has received limited academic scrutiny since the Cold War (Hendrickson, 2004: 508). This may come as a surprise given the width growth of IGO's in recent decades and the increased number of IGO leadership positions. Think of the new position of the president of the European Council as an example. Within scholarly literature, a discussion is taking place on the importance of IGO leaders: are they individuals who operate under serious or even profound political and organizational constraints, or do they play an important role in shaping policies? Although there are exceptions to be found, when it comes to

specific research on the most recent officeholders of the NATO secretary general position, a real dearth of analysis exists.

This thesis provides one of the first analysis of the roles of the two most recent officeholders (who finished their terms) in shaping the alliance policy on two major crisis affairs; Jaap de Hoop Scheffer on the mission in Afghanistan (ISAF) and Anders Fogh Rasmussen on the operation in Libya (Operation Unified Protector). Much has been written on NATO's actions and decisions towards Afghanistan, but no specific research is available on de Hoop Scheffer's leadership during the decisive period for NATO in Afghanistan, since command of the mission was turned over indefinitely to NATO on August 11, 2003. The same can be said for Rasmussen's leadership during ISAF and NATO's operation in Libya.

The research question is: *To what extent do NATO's secretaries general shape alliance policy on crisis situations?* This research question is answered through a case study research method on both de Hoop Scheffer's and Rasmussen's role in shaping NATO policy on two major crises situations during their term in office: Afghanistan and Libya. Both case studies consist of an analysis in three categories: systematic, organizational and personality factors. Throughout the project, there are three ways of data collection: interviews, speeches and secondary literature. The main argument suggests that major differences exist between the leadership tenures of both secretaries general and that both men, each in their own way, have exercised considerable influence on NATO's handling of Afghanistan and the crisis in Libya. De Hoop Scheffer adopted a consultative approach because of the transatlantic schism that existed, together with the goals in Afghanistan he wanted to achieve. Keeping the alliance together was his first priority. Rasmussen operated in a very different way. With more leadership opportunities than de Hoop Scheffer, Rasmussen acted as a policy entrepreneur, and put forward his own views, even if the alliance was not unified on the topic. However, his entrepreneurial style did not contribute to a unified NATO approach regarding Libya.

1.2 Relevance

An important part of a scientific study is the degree of scientific and societal relevance. This study contributes both to specific knowledge on IGO leadership within the field of political science as to a better understanding of leadership and IGO's within society, as will be explained below.

In academic literature, a discussion exists on the importance of IGO Secretaries General. While some researches share the view that the secretary general can be important in promoting

consensus in the alliance, others contend that the secretary general often found his leadership jurisdiction seriously limited by the allies, especially during the Cold War (this debate is explained more thoroughly in the next chapter). The main problem with this discussion is that most of it took place before the end of the Cold War, when the environment of international relations was profoundly different compared to the situation nowadays. This applies in particular to NATO, as the military organization was founded primarily to oppose the threat formed by the Soviet Union, and this threat almost completely disappeared with its collapse. Also, the majority of the research on IGO leadership focuses on the United Nations (UN) secretaries general or on the leaders of European Union (EU) institutions. Thus, a scholarly void exists when it comes to the role of the *NATO secretary general at present day*. This thesis provides new insights on the influence that NATO secretaries general have on alliance policy in crisis situations in the most recent decade, and therefore reasonably enlarges our knowledge in this particular field.

IGO leadership has proven to be an evolving concept. As a result of a growing number of IGO's in international relations, together with the growing size and capabilities of IGO's, and thus influence, the increasingly important role of the also growing number of IGO leaders cannot be neglected. Nations and its citizens have to deal more and more with IGO's and have to take its interests, although mostly established by the nations and citizens themselves, into greater account. This process creates friction and debate. Think, for example, of the French and Dutch referendums on the European Constitution in 2005, when a majority of both populations voted against the proposal (Taggart, 2006: 7-25). Therefore, a deeper understanding of leadership roles and their influence on policy making is no frivolous luxury: the developments mentioned above prove that more scholarly attention is necessary. It will not only improve our understanding of how policies that affect almost everybody are developed, and help us formulate more truth worthy expectations on future IGO directions and developments, but also contributes to a possible increase of civilian and state government comprehension and acceptance of new policies that directly influences them.

1.3 Reading guide

The next chapter continues with a literature review on executive leadership in IGO's, focusing mostly on previous research on NATO's secretaries general. The literature review also explains the leadership assessment model and provides a few expectations. Chapter three is the methodology chapter, where the research method, based on models developed by other author's research on IGO secretaries general, will be explained, together with the choices made on the case selection and the

methodological approach. The fourth chapter contains the actual analysis of the roles of both secretaries general, each of them divided into three categories for examining their roles: systematic conditions, organizational constraints and the personality type of the individual secretary general. Finally, the fifth chapter concludes, answers the research question and suggests further research.

II.   Theory

2.1 Introduction

This chapter consists of two components: 1) a literature review that recapitulates the most important works on IGO leadership in general and studies related to NATO leadership in particular, and explains how this thesis develops the three categories of analysis; 2) a paragraph that transforms the most important findings from the literature review in hypotheses and expectations on the cases studied in this research. In other words, a preliminary prediction of the results, that will either be confirmed or refuted; The main goal of this chapter is to provide a solid theoretical framework on which the analysis can build upon.

2.2 Literature review

2.2.1   Literature on IGO and NATO leadership

From a neorealist perspective, the end of the Cold War was supposed to lead to the end of the transatlantic security effort (Dorman &Kaufman, 2011:27). In realist theory, it is often depicted that alliances need enemies or opposing blocks to hold them together, and that IGO's in general and individuals in particular play marginal roles within the big power systems of international relations. However, constructivist or behavioural approaches acknowledge that 'who leads matters' (Hermann et.al., 2001). From this perspective, social structures are of paramount importance. The difference between these two grand theories constitute the core of the previously mentioned debate: are IGO leaders individuals who operate under profound systematic, political and organizational constraints, or can they play an important role in shaping policies because of personality traits and individual choices that are made? As with many theories, the truth most likely lies somewhere in between.

In 1969, Robert W. Cox conducted a now widely recognized study on leadership in international organizations. Cox noted that by that time, the history of international organization was sufficiently long and varied enough to allow for a comparative approach, in an effort to find elements for theory of leadership. He argues: 'The quality of executive leadership may prove to be the single most critical determinant of the scope and authority of international organization.' (Cox, 1969: 205). Cox maintains that secretaries general can assist IGO's in becoming more independent players in world politics and that they can play a big role in fostering multilateral integration. The amount of

influence of an IGO leader depends on several factors, including the power structure in the international system (for example, bipolar or multipolar), the resources and legal authority available, the leader's independent diplomatic skills and their personal relations with (the most important) member states. Noteworthy is that Cox also contends that an executive head must be conscious of and work within multiple constraints (Cox, 1969: 229). These constraints may include the member states' ongoing protection of their own sovereignty, the lack of supportive (inter)national public opinion, or the inherent institutional limits of the office, among other factors (Kille & Scully, 2003: 175-198). In a wider study on decision-making in IGO's, by examining eight specialized agencies in the UN family, Cox and Jacobson argue that the amount of influence a particular executive head will have is determined by both the characteristics of his position and his individual attributes, but that in general the latter is probably more important. They add that the secretary general's ability to use his unique 'platform', or his privileged leadership position that allow him to communicate and share information with member-states, can be instrumental for his influence on decisions and policies. It is the key task for any executive head to use his strategic location in the IGO communications network to mobilize a consensus in support of the organization's goals (Cox & Jacobson, 1973: 397-399).

Within the field of political psychology, even more emphasis is placed upon specific personality traits leaders have. Kille and Scully (2003) provide an exceptional summary of scholars that have clarified frameworks within which leadership is conceptualized as an important explanatory variable and that have built techniques for measuring personal characteristics that relate to leaders' political behaviour. They note that 'strong support now exists for the argument that leaders have particular and identifiable traits that predispose them to behave in certain ways' and that 'despite these observations, the paucity of systematic research on IGO executive heads is striking' (Kille & Scully, 2003: 175, 177). According to Kille and Scully, one of the causes for this shortage of research on IGO leaders is the stress by scholars on constraints faced by IGO leaders, in such a way that structural determinants of collective outcomes in international society have had the effect of diverting attention from the roles individuals play as leaders (Ibid: 177).

An example of a scholar that focused on structural determinants is Moravcsik, who has argued that the structural dominance of the EU by large member-states renders active leadership by executive heads of the Commission either marginal or futile (Moravcsik, 1998,1999). There are many others that argue that the impact of personality on behaviour is strongly mediated by contextual factors (Hermann, 1980a; Winter, 1992). As with the studies of Cox and Jacobson, Kille and Scully and Moravcsik, the majority of research on IGO leadership focuses on UN secretaries general or on leaders of EU institutions. In most cases those studies maintain that such leaders are capable of

influencing policy making within the IGO, and they often conclude that several political constraints as well as personal factors determine the amount of influence they have.

When it comes to studies on NATO leadership, a substantial shortage exists. Most studies on NATO during the Cold War devote no attention to the secretary general, and if the leader is mentioned, he is often depicted as a secretary general who operated under serious political and organizational constraints (Hendrickson, 2004: 510). There is one exception, and that is Robert Jordan's study *Political Leadership at NATO* (1979), that solely devotes its attention to four NATO's secretaries general. While Jordan acknowledges that the secretaries general analysed, in the period 1952-1971, frequently had serious political constraints placed upon them, he primarily argues that all these men were nonetheless talented and skilled diplomats, who were often able to enhance transatlantic cooperation and to provide independent influence on various aspects of NATO (Jordan, 1979: 249-264). Like Jordan, former US ambassadors to NATO from the Cold War confirm the view that the secretary general can be important in promoting consensus in the alliance (Cleveland, 1970). However, the most common view among scholars is that NATO secretaries general during the Cold War often found their jurisdiction seriously limited by the will of the most important allies, primarily the United States (Kaplan, 2004, 1988; Kay, 1998; Stuart and Tow, 1990; Smith, 1989).

Post-Cold War studies on NATO similarly spend little time analysing the secretaries general's role in policy making. Most of the scholarly literature focuses on the alliance's remarkable transformation during the 1990s, with little research on NATO's political leader (for example: Sloan, 2003; Moore, 2002; Yost 1998). Fortunately there are some more exceptions than in the Cold War period. The most important researcher to be mentioned is Ryan C. Hendrickson, who wrote multiple books and articles on NATO secretaries general. He devoted an article on Javier Solana's role during NATO's Operation Allied Force in Kosovo in 1999 (Hendrickson, 2002), and another article on the leadership of secretary general Manfred Wörner, who oversaw NATO as it moved towards aggressive military action in the Balkans (Hendrickson, 2004). Hendrickson's second article provides the first assessment of Manfred Wörner's role in shaping alliance policy on the crisis in Bosnia. His findings suggest that both Solana and Wörner were critical leaders in influencing NATO decisions and that their leadership must be recognized as instrumental in moving the alliance towards military action. Hendrickson's more extensive study on the topic, *Diplomacy and War at NATO: the Secretary General and Military Action after the Cold War* (2006), with analyses of Willy Claes and George Robertson in addition to Wörner and Solana, provides similar conclusions. However, also Hendrickson, as his colleagues, puts emphasis on the profound systemic limitations that exist on the ability of any secretary general to lead the alliance (Hendrickson, 2006: 143). But, in broader terms, Hendrickson's

findings suggest that in order to understand NATO's post-Cold War evolution, the possible influence exercised by the secretary general has to be included as a factor for analysis.

By analysing the systematic-political conditions, the organizational environment at NATO and some personality aspects, Hendrickson's study examined the roles played by the four secretaries general preceding Jaap de Hoop Scheffer and Anders Fogh Rasmussen in moving the alliance toward military action: Manfred Wörner, Willy Claes, Javier Solana, and George Robertson. His findings suggest that these four men differed in the kind of impact they had on the alliance, but nonetheless that they all were critical players in shaping how and when NATO used force. 'Their exceptional diplomatic skills, creative uses of NATO's rules, different degrees of backing from NATO's major powers, and their relationship with the SACEUR permitted these secretaries general at times to personally affect NATO and its corresponding military actions.' (Hendrickson, 2006: 4). Although Hendrickson himself recognizes that a host of political factors are relevant for understanding how and when the alliance used force, his argument maintains that these individuals who served as secretary general had substantial effects on NATO policy (Ibid: 5). Each of the four secretaries general investigated by Hendrickson are now addressed shortly, in order to understand his findings more profoundly.

According to the evidence Hendrickson collected, Manfred Wörner proved an aggressive secretary general in all three forums. Despite severe constraints because of disagreements in the alliance, which placed serious obstacles to policy change that Wörner was unable to overcome in the short term, Wörner was among the loudest advocates for NATO military action in the Balkans. He lobbied aggressively for American leadership in NATO on the issue of Bosnia. Although NATO did not engage in a sustained bombing campaign against the Bosnian Serbs before Wörner died of intestinal cancer in August 1994, it did increasingly adopt more warlike policy solutions to the crisis, which culminated in Operation Deliberate Force in 1995. To discount his strong, continued calls for military action would not reflect reality. This is clearly illustrated by Wörner's presence and actions during the 1994 NAC meetings, where he unexcitingly showed up despite suffering from his disease. He made a lasting impression on all participants, and a political difference in moving NATO towards action, as was confirmed by all senior officials Hendrickson interviewed. Additionally, Wörner's close cooperation with the SACEUR also demonstrated his attempts to shape alliance policy independently (Hendrickson, 2004: 509; 2006: 63-65).

Wörner's successor, Willy Claes, took up his duties in September 1994, and inherited the alliance in crisis. NATO still continued to refrain from any sustained combat in the first half of 1995, despite Wörner's efforts to encourage American military leadership on the matter. Much of Claes's

legacy is often overshadowed by his involvement in a bribery scandal over Belgian defence purchases. This scandal eventually forced an early exit from NATO HQ. However, Hendrickson still contents that Claes 'played an instrumental role in Operation Deliberate Force, and, more broadly, he must be recognized as a player in shaping NATO's post-Cold War transformation.' (Hendrickson, 2006: 66, 67). At the systematic level, several international political obstacles prevented Claes from having an independent impact on the alliance's policy. Claes did advocate his own views on the Bosnia matter, but his position corresponded with the general direction of American foreign policy. Also, the earlier mentioned bribery scandal limited his credibility and what he could do to influence the international political debate on Bosnia. Within the NAC, Claes's leadership was much more visible. He exercised much influence in the council with use of his management and diplomatic techniques, and he proved very important in keeping consensus among the allies during Operation Deliberate Force (Ibid: 86-88). Also, he worked closely together with SACEUR Joulwan to move the alliance towards military action. Claes always proved informed on military aspects and showed his views on the civil-military relations at NATO by at times not consulting the NAC on military conduct.

After Willy Claes resigned, former Spanish foreign minister Javier Solana came into the office. Although Solana's selection as secretary general proved very contentious, with the US and France rejecting two other candidates first, he is now regarded as one of the most influential secretaries general NATO has seen. His role in shaping NATO's post-Cold War transition, in particular on the issue of expanding the alliance's membership at the 1997 Madrid Summit, is recognized by past decision makers and analysts as critical (Asmus, 2002: 238-250). Hendrickson contents that his leadership prior and during NATO's military action in Kosovo must also be noted as such (Hendrickson, 2002: 242; 2006: 89). Unlike in the years of his two most recent predecessors, the political environment provided unique leadership opportunities. Much of Solana's ability to lead NATO successfully towards and during Operation Allied Force stemmed from the favorable systematic political conditions in 1998. These conditions include strong support from the Clinton administration, a worldwide recognition that Milosevic's brutal policies could not be tolerated again, and a shift of the diplomatic center of action towards Brussels and away from the UN, due to the UN's poor peacekeeping performance in Bosnia in the early 1990s coupled with the United Nations Security Council's (UNSC) unwillingness to endorse military action in 1998. In sum, the systematic political conditions favored a transatlantic solution to the Kosovo crisis. Within the NAC, Solana adopted a different approach compared to his predecessors. Wörner and especially Claes are remembered for their sometimes assertive leadership style and the insertion of their own policy perspectives. Solana operated far more passively, and is remembered for his congeniality and hands-of approach. This allowed for time and space for the ambassadors to get to their consensus and

helped to keep the alliance unified. Solana's workaholic attitude, his extensive list of political friendships and the personal trust he had cultivated are other factors that contributed to his successful leadership of the NAC (Hendrickson, 2006: 113-116). The final element of Solana's leadership at NATO is his partnership with SACEUR Wesley Clark. They shared a believe that Milosevic had to be stopped and they maintained close coordination during Operation Allied Force. Their relationship certainly helped sustain transatlantic unity over the two and a half month of air strikes (Ibid: 115).

The fourth and final secretary general investigated by Hendrickson is Lord George Robertson, who succeeded Solana in October 1999. Hendrickson focuses on Robertson's leadership when Turkey invoked article 4 of the North Atlantic Treaty in 2003, requesting defensive measures against a potential attack from Iraq. As with the other three secretaries general, Robertson's role is seen as instrumental in managing the crisis. At the systematic level, Robertson faced very deep transatlantic differences over Iraq. Therefore, he chose to focus his energy on the Prague Summit and he did not attempt to engage NATO in the diplomatic discussions surrounding Iraq. Instead, he waited for the US to openly turn to NATO before he began to push the alliance in new policy directions. However, in the NAC Robertson was at the center of the key decisions during the article 4 crisis. He almost independently decided to employ the silent procedure, to activate the Defence Planning Committee (DPC), and he was the central mediator between the US and Belgium, when Belgium suddenly made objections in the last hours of the crisis (Hendrickson, 2006: 140, 141). Just like Solana, Robertson maintained close contact with the SACEUR, Ralston. They shared a philosophical outlook for the alliance and kept working in cooperation despite the fact that American foreign policy had distanced itself from its European allies.

Hendrickson's conclusions are very clear: all four secretaries general often played instrumental roles in shaping alliance policies on use-of-force issues (Hendrickson, 2006: 142-148). He also showed that a methodological approach consisting of three different levels works very well on NATO leadership, while it had previously only been used by scholars to investigate IGO leadership in general (Schechter, 1987; Cox and Jacobson, 1973). Because the fact that these three scholars have contended that systematic, organizational and personality factors determine the amount of influence that leaders have on policy making, all three factors are considered in answering this thesis' research question. The methodological choices made regarding these three categories require some more explanation.

2.2.2 Assessment model

Among the large collection of published case studies of IGO leaders, no single assessment model stands out as the dominantly accepted approach. However, in the literature on secretaries general of IGO's, three different studies consider three important categories of analysis. These include an assessment of systematic-political conditions, of the organizational level, and of the personality of the individual secretary general (Hendrickson, 2004, 2006; Schechter, 1987; Cox & Jacobson, 1973). Therefore, this study uses these three categories of analysis as a starting point. The authors mentioned all used these three categories in somewhat different manners. The method in this research has the most similarities with Hendrickson's assessment model, but also has its own approach on how these three categories of assessment are to be understood (Hendrickson, 2006: 39-45). The main flaw of Hendrickson's model is that he leaves the category of personality underexposed. Because this statement requires clarification, all three categories are now explained in more detail, and the differences with Hendrickson's model are mentioned as well.

The first category is the assessment of systematic-political conditions. This part analyses the secretary general's response to the wider political environment in which he operates. For example, Dirk Stikker, secretary general of NATO from 1961-1964, came to office in a bipolar world environment, while the alliance he was supposed to lead was fundamentally divided and deadlocked because of differences between important member states. Stikker responded in a way he was known for in Dutch politics: as a pragmatic realist, he aimed at 'manageability'. He recognized the deadlock NATO was in, accepted it, and relied on silent diplomacy in order to be able to produce outcomes despite the fundamental division (Hoogenboezem, 2009: 417, 418). De Hoop Scheffer and Rasmussen operated under completely different systematic-political conditions, in a more unipolar environment where the US clearly is the most powerful and influential country in world affairs and in the alliance. Today, the secretary general has much wider discretion in how he chooses to address the international political conditions facing the alliance. While a secretary general is by definition a representative of all the allies, with little formal independent authority, at the same time he may or may not attempt to steer NATO's public political agenda as he desires. He can do little without support from the most important allied countries, but he can still choose to be active, passive, or both when faced by constraints or opportunities (Hendrickson, 2006: 41, 42). This category focuses upon the broader political factors outside of NATO that may have shaped, influenced or constrained both men's leadership role. In doing so, two sources are used: a series of secondary literature that contemplate the overall political situation during each of the secretaries general time in office; and a selection of speeches given by both men, in order to assess to what extent they recognized and

addressed the respective situations of world affairs. In this category, there no real differences with Hendrickson's model.

The second category is an assessment of the organizational level. While since the birth of the office, the secretary general does not have a vote in the North Atlantic Council (NAC), the principal decision-making body of NATO, he *is* charged with overseeing the council through his power to call meetings and set the council's agenda. In this environment, a secretary general thus has the means to actively exercise leadership by using his diplomatic skills, but may also choose to adopt a lower profile. Consequently, the secretary general's leadership of the NAC is a factor for analysis. Furthermore, in the past several secretaries general instituted Tuesday luncheons for off-the-record exchanges between ambassadors, in an effort to develop a consultative environment outside of normal institutional constraints, while others did not (Hendrickson, 2006: 24). Therefore, the efforts of the secretaries general in promoting such informal sessions is another factor that is looked at. A third factor on the organizational level that requires examination is the relationship of the secretary general with the Supreme Allied Commander Europe (SACEUR), the highest military rank within NATO, a position always held by an American general. During the Cold war, the NATO secretary general was sometimes greatly limited by the political influence exercised by the SACEUR (Hendrickson, 2006: 23, 29, 38, 43, 146-148; Jordan, 1987). The presence of the SACEUR is a unique aspect of political leadership at NATO. While the secretary general does not have the mandate to make military decisions (these decisions lie with the SACEUR), the secretary general's leadership in the realm of civil-military relations still is an important aspect in determining the amount of influence the secretary general has in shaping alliance policy. Hendrickson, in contrast, treats the relationship of the secretary general with the SACEUR as a separate category for analysis, one that more or less replaces the category of personality style. It is my believe that the relationship with the SACEUR is a factor that belongs at the organizational level, since the SACEUR is part of the NAC. This category is developed by conducting interviews with former NATO ambassadors and officials, together with the use of secondary literature. Given the fact that the press does not report on the inner-politics of NATO, interviews are the most important way to get the data needed to obtain information of the organizational level.

The third category, personality, is the most complicated category of analysis, because at NATO, the secretary general's personality is often difficult to isolate from his leadership role across other platforms. This research will therefore restrict itself to determining the leadership style both de Hoop Scheffer and Rasmussen adopted. It is true that leadership style is deeply intertwined with and reflected by the leadership roles both leaders exercise in the previous two categories. However, by

using the leadership typology of Kent Kille (2006), our understanding of the way and the extent both de Hoop Scheffer and Rasmussen influenced policy-making will deepen. Kille offers a tripartite typology of political leadership: manager, strategist and visionary. Although Kille adopted a literary dominant approach by studying UN secretaries general, his typology can easily be used in helping to discern whether NATO secretaries general can best be regarded as a manager, a strategist or a visionary. Determining the personality style is a major difference with Hendrickson's model, since he replaced the category of personality with the relationship of the secretary general with the SACEUR. I consider this as a shortcoming of his model, since many leading political psychology scholars have shown the impact of personality on policy making (Hermann, 1974, 1980, 1987; Winter: 2003). If one wants to investigate the amount of influence secretaries general have on decision-making in moving NATO towards military action, personality should be included as a factor for analysis. The primary source in determining the leadership style are speeches, but the interviews and available secondary literature are also used. In table 1 the assessment model is summarized schematically. In chapter three, the methodology chapter, the factors for analysis are conceptualized and operationalized further for analytical purposes.

Table 1: Leadership Assessment Model for NATO's Secretary General

Category of assessment	Factors for analysis	Sources
Systematic	Broad political environment outside NATO;	Secondary literature Speeches
Organizational	Leadership of the NAC; Promotion of informal sessions; Relationship with the SACEUR	Interviews Secondary literature
Personality	Leadership style	Speeches Interviews Secondary literature

The analytical framework presented above offers a useful method for assessing the amount of influence NATO secretaries general exercise on alliance policy regarding the use of force. It has been used before, albeit in a different form (Hendrickson 2006), and it allows for comparisons between NATO's most important political leaders, and maybe even for some tentative predictions on the future development of the position. Of course, this approach also has its limitations. First, the case studies considered in this thesis are not comprehensive assessments of the entire leadership tenure of Jaap de Hoop Scheffer and Anders Fogh Rasmussen. Both men also exercised leadership across other issues the alliance faced that are not examined in this thesis. In addition, the cases

presented here are not perfectly analogous. De Hoop Scheffer and Rasmussen each faced different use-of-force considerations. However, the analytical framework presented here allows for these considerations to be addressed to a decent degree.

2.3 Expectations

On the two most recent NATO secretaries general, little specific research exists. However, based on the theory developed by scholar who studied previous NATO secretaries general, some hypotheses and expectations can be formulated. The most important findings out of the literature review can be summarized as follows: although every NATO secretary general is profoundly limited in leading the alliance by systematic political and organizational constraints, he can be very capable in building consensus and guiding the alliance towards a specific policy or decision. Examples of previous post-Cold War secretaries general who proved very instrumental in specific use-of-force decisions are Javier Solana during the Kosovo crisis (Hendrickson, 2002: 240-257; 2006: 113-116) and Manfred Wörner during the crisis in Bosnia (Hendrickson, 2004: 508-527; 2006: 63-65).

Both de Hoop Scheffer and Rasmussen have been part of major policy and decision-making processes during their time in office at NATO regarding Afghanistan and Libya respectively, and therefore both men might have exercised major influence on use-of-force decisions, just like Solana and Wörner did. When looked at the small amount of literature available together with the actual military actions NATO undertook in Afghanistan and Libya, seemingly a paradox exists: while de Hoop Scheffer is regarded as a consulter, and as not instrumental in leading the alliance in new policy directions, under his reign NATO did extent its military capabilities in Afghanistan. On the other hand, Rasmussen is more often depicted as a policy entrepreneur (Hendrickson, 2014), but he never got the allies to make bigger military contributions for the mission on Libya once the bombings started. Another factor also influences the expectations: while de Hoop Scheffer has working experience as NATO ambassador during the Cold War, Rasmussen only has IGO experience during his tenure as Minister of Economic affairs (1990-1992), as Danish negotiator for the Maastricht Treaty. Thus, while de Hoop Scheffer has a NATO past during a time when Europe was divided and the US largely defined NATO's policies, Rasmussen primarily worked on further European integration.

The first expectation is that de Hoop Scheffer operated much more as a diplomatic consulter then Rasmussen: he has a history as a NATO diplomat during a time division was rampant, and therefore he is used to intensive deliberations and lengthy procedures, whereas Rasmussen, on the other hand, has diplomatic experience only in a time when further European integration seemed just

a matter of time. He is thus used to focus more on the aspects that bind the allies together, instead of on factors where they divide.

The second expectation is that de Hoop Scheffer has exercised more influence on the particular use-of-force decisions regarding Afghanistan then Rasmussen did on the use-of-force decisions dealing with Libya. Under de Hoop Scheffer's reign, NATO came to a consensus regarding extended capabilities in Afghanistan, while during the mission in Libya, Rasmussen did not get the allies to make bigger military contributions.

A final expectation is that although both leaders were dealing with different events, there is a big chance that they continued the tradition set by the previous four post-Cold War secretaries general of increasing influence and importance of the office. The expectation is that both played a significant role and had critical influence on the alliance to reach consensus on use-of-force decisions, whether it will prove to be in the NAC, by the use of public diplomacy or by other means. As the alliance keeps evolving in an out-of-area direction, the office of secretary general probably evolves accordingly.

III.   Research method

3.1 Introduction

This chapter is divided in four parts. The first part elaborates on the choice of using a case-study research design and explains the advantages and limitations of case study research. The second part discusses the case selection and specifies what the cases exactly entail. The third part develops the actual research design, while the fourth part discusses the primary and secondary sources that are used in the analysis. The goal of this chapter is to clarify the methodological approach and the research design used in this thesis.

3.2.Case-study research: advantages and limitations

This thesis employs a case study approach, which is the most commonly used method for examining the role of secretaries general in IGO's. Case studies allow for close scrutiny of the influence of individual leaders, and give us a better understanding of the reality we are interested in. Although in the past case-study methods have received a large amount of criticism, many social scientists content that case studies can supply quite decisive evidence for or against political theories (van Evera, 1997: 49-55). Especially when it comes to analysing specific actors, the advantages of case-study methods stand out. Van Evera states:

> 'Case studies allow the test of predictions about the private speech and writings of policy actors. Often these predictions are singular to the theory that makes them: no other theory predicts the same thought or statements. The conformation of such predictions strongly corroborates the test theory. Case studies are the best format for capturing such evidence.' (van Evera, 1997: 54).

In general, large-*n* methods offer the most solid explanations about *whether* hypotheses hold or not. However, case studies tell us more about *why* they hold or not, because they provide a better understanding of causal mechanisms. Testing hypotheses that define how or why the independent variable causes the dependent variable is easier with case-study methods. If case-study evidence supports a hypothesis, the researcher can then explore the case further, detailing the operation of the hypothesis. Thus, case studies methods function best if we want to validate explanatory

hypotheses, or in other words, get a better understanding of causal mechanisms, and that is precisely what this thesis intends to do.

Case studies offer three formats for testing theories: controlled comparison, congruence procedures, and process tracing. While all three formats are also used to create theories and to test antecedent conditions, congruence procedure and process tracing are stronger test methods than controlled comparison, by testing theories using observations within cases (van Evera, 1997: 56). By exploring the chain of events and/or the decision-making process by which initial case conditions are translated into outcomes, the cause-effect link that connects independent variable and outcome is unwrapped and divided into smaller steps.

Like any method, the case-study method has limitations. In testing theories, a thorough "process-trace" of a single case can provide a strong test for a theory. However, the investigator will still be unsure what antecedent conditions the theory may require to operate. Exposing these conditions remain an important task, and they can only be found by examining other cases (van Evera, 1997: 65, 66). This thesis primarily tests previously used methods by analysing observations within two cases, but also generates additional knowledge on the topic of influence of NATO secretary general on the alliance's policy making in use-of-force decisions.

3.3 Case selection

Researching NATO's secretary general is challenging analytically. Since NATO's most important role revolves around the security interests of its member states, press coverage of the alliance's decision-making process, and therefore also of the role of the secretary general, is limited. Most of the NATO's secretaries general leadership is exercised in closed-door sessions of the NAC or in informal discussions in the hallways of NATO's headquarters. Moreover, the documentary evidence on NAC discussions requires the approval of all twenty-eight member states before it can be released to the public, which is usually thirty years after an event occurs (Hendrickson, 2006: 40). With such limitations, the reliance on interviews, speeches and secondary literature is the most useful method for examining the leadership of NATO secretaries general.

The cases to be examined include two events when the secretary general faced questions of use of (more) force. These cases are Jaap de Hoop Scheffer's leadership during NATO in Afghanistan (ISAF) and Anders Fogh Rasmussen's role during the operation in Libya (Operation Unified Protector). Although the leadership of the secretaries general could be tested on other issues as well, the

decision to use force is arguably different form other issues: it entails some of the most difficult political and moral questions for governments and IGO's, and it are these issues where leadership matters most. In addition, these two events are a clear illustration of the development NATO is going through since the Cold War, as these two events are the first ones where NATO used force outside of the Euro-Atlantic area, excluding training and support missions that did not entail the use of force.

The two cases are used to answer the bigger question: *To what extent do NATO's secretaries general shape alliance policy on crisis situations?* Previous literature has shown that analysis of the use-of-force decisions in crisis situations offer a suitable way of answering these type of questions. It is, of course, true that only these two cases alone do not satisfactory answer the bigger question. However, together with the previous research mentioned earlier, scientists can possibly identify certain developments, and comparisons can be made. By doing more and more case studies, the conditions under which NATO secretaries general can play influential roles can be identified. And in the last decade of NATO history, the crisis situations of Afghanistan and Libya provide the most analogous cases available with regard to previous studies, and therefore they are the most relevant cases for this particular research.

As mentioned earlier, the NAC is NATO's principal decision-making body. Strictly speaking, the NAC is not the only body within NATO that carries such a high degree of authority. The Nuclear Planning Group (NPG) has comparable authority for matters within its specific area of competence, and it is also chaired by the secretary general of NATO. However, in practice, the NAC convenes far more frequently than the NPG and covers a broader scope of themes – as broad as the member countries decide it should be (NATO website, 2014). In addition, the NPG did not make any relevant use-of-force decisions in the most recent decade. Therefore, only the use-of-force decisions regarding Afghanistan and Libya made in the NAC remain for the purposes of this study.

3.3.1   Case one: Afghanistan during Jaap de Hoop Scheffer's tenure

The goal of this paragraph is to make clear which use-of-force decisions where taken by NATO regarding Afghanistan during Jaap de Hoop Scheffer's tenure (2004-2009), in order to be able to carry out a focused empirical analysis. Because from the very start of the mission there have been calls for extending the amount of troops in Afghanistan, and allies in many cases individually decided to extend their troop contributions, it is hard to designate to which specific use-of-force decisions de Hoop Scheffer might have exercised influence and to which he did not. The extension of the overall amount of troops in Afghanistan can more appropriately be regarded as an ongoing process then as a

list of carefully planned NATO decisions. However, there are two events that can be regarded as defining moments in this process. These are two major summits, in 2004 in Istanbul, Turkey and in 2008 in Bucharest, Romania.

NATO took control of the US-led ISAF mission on August 11, 2003. From the outset, NATO planned that ISAF operations in Afghanistan would have five phases. The first phase was "assessment and preparation", including initial operations only in Kabul. The second phase was ISAF's geographic expansion throughout Afghanistan, completed in 2006. The final three phases would involve stabilization; transition; and redeployment. At the start of 2009, ISAF was operating in Phase III, "stabilization", and NATO officials were reportedly discussing when to announce commencement of Phase IV, the "transition" of lead security responsibility to the Afghan National Security Forces (ANSF) (Morelli & Belkin, 2009: 9).

During the 2004 Istanbul summit, NATO decided to expand its presence in Afghanistan, in order to be able to successfully implement stages two and three of the ISAF mission. More troops were needed than initially expected and greater calls were done upon the allies. By late 2006 as ISAF extended its responsibilities to cover all of Afghanistan, the allies began to realize that ISAF would require an even greater combat capability than originally believed, and the mission would have to change: the realisation of stage three needed more troops to succeed. This would be a central issue when NATO Defence Ministers met in Budapest in 2008. Much of the talks were around force transformation within NATO; certainly a topic directly related to the Afghanistan mission. Much of the talks also centered directly on the Afghanistan mission and the requirements for increased troop levels. Important combat contingents wanted to convince other governments to send more troops (Saltasuk, 2012: 10). In sum, these two summits were central events in NATO's troop-extension process, and therefore the decision-making processes towards these two summits is where de Hoop Scheffer likely exercised most influence.

3.3.2   Case two: Libya during Anders Fogh Rasmussen's tenure

To clarify the use-of-force decisions made regarding Libya is easier than it is for Afghanistan. Operation Unified Protector started on March 23, 2011, and enforced UNSC resolutions 1970 and 1973, concerning the arms embargo and a no-fly zone. A few days later, NATO decided to implement all military aspects of the UN resolution, taking command of the airstrikes on ground targets that were under national control before. The analysis focuses on these two related decisions: the implementation of Operation Unified Protector and the subsequent take-over of the bombings.

3.4 Research design and source selection

Paragraph 2.2.2 of the theory chapter developed the following leadership assessment model for researching the influence of the NATO secretary general:

Table 1: Leadership Assessment Model for NATO's Secretary General

Category of assessment	Factors for analysis	Sources
Systematic	Broad political environment outside NATO	Secondary literature Speeches
Organizational	Leadership of the NAC; Promotion of informal sessions; Relationship with the SACEUR	Interviews Secondary literature
Personality	Leadership style	Speeches Interviews Secondary literature

This paragraph conceptualizes and operationalizes this assessment model further to make it useful for the actual analysis. Table 2 makes clear what each factor for analysis actually entails. In other words, the table shows what exactly is looked for in the analysis of the secondary literature, the speeches and the interviews. These are the factors that combined determine the influence the secretaries general had on NATO policy-making regarding use-of-force decisions. In the results chapter, each of the three categories are handled in the order presented in this table, first for de Hoop Scheffer during Afghanistan followed by Rasmussen during Libya.

Table 2: Operationalized Leadership Assessment Model for NATO's Secretary General

Category	Factors for analysis	
Systematic	Broad political environment outside NATO	- Power distribution - Relationship with the US - Relationship with the UN and EU
Organizational	Leadership of the NAC	- Formal powers: meetings, agenda setting - Modus Operandi
	Promotion of informal sessions	- Tuesday luncheons - Other informal meetings.
	Relationship with the SACEUR:	- Dominance by either one - Degree of cooperation
Personality	Leadership style	- Manager, strategist or visionary?

Each of the three categories analysed makes use of a combination of these three different sources: secondary literature, speeches given by Jaap de Hoop Scheffer and Anders Fogh Rasmussen and interviews with former NATO ambassadors and political assistants that work or have worked at NATO HQ. The importance of each source differs per category. The category of the systematic level uses secondary literature as primary source, but also a few speeches and any information that proves useful out of the interviews. At the organizational level, interviews are the most important source, followed by secondary literature. The analysis of the personality style is performed by a study of a selection of speeches, with the use of a method developed by Kent Kille (2006). The use of this method requires explanation.

Kille provides a tripartite leadership typology that is used in this thesis to determine the leadership style of de Hoop Scheffer and Rasmussen. He formulates his research question as follows: 'How does the leadership style of a secretary general affect the way that he or she attempts to influence the manner in which treats to international peace and security are addressed?' (Kille, 2006: 2). It is important to note that Kille answers this question in three steps: He first establishes the leadership style of seven UN secretaries general with use of a Leadership Trait Analysis (LTA) developed by Margaret Hermann. He then constructs a behavioural framework, in order to be able to explore the proposed link between leadership style and political behaviour. Finally, he selects the three UN secretaries general that best represent each leadership style for behavioural analysis, and carries out three extensive case studies. This thesis only conducts the first step of Kille's method: determining the leadership style. This knowledge is then compared to the findings of the other two categories of analysis, and will hopefully deepen our understanding of the roles de Hoop Scheffer and Rasmussen played in the use-of-force decisions. But firstly, an explanation follows of how their leadership style is determined.

Kille uses the long-running debate over secretary general leadership that revolves around two contrasting styles, the bureaucratic manager and the visionary activist, and adds a third, more balanced, leadership style that lies between these two extremes: the strategist (Kille 2006: 17). Furthermore, after a survey of literature on the topic, Kille distinguishes a set of six personal characteristics that analysts claim are important for an office-holder to possess (Ibid: 17. See also p.259, note 1. for a list of these analysts). In his discussion, Kille draws this material together in a more concise presentation of the personal characteristics that interrelate to create a secretary general's leadership style. The six characteristics are: responsivity, belief that can influence, need for relationships, need for recognition, supranationalism, and problem-solving emphasis. Kille thus argues that each of the three leadership styles represents the interrelation of a particular set of

personal characteristics, or in other words, the personality style that is displayed depends upon a secretary general's personal qualities. All three leadership styles can be captured by looking at variation on the same characteristics (Ibid: 20). Table 3 sets out the degree to which each personal characteristic should be displayed in the ideal situation.

Table 3: Secretary General Leadership Style Ideal Types

Characteristic	Managerial	Strategic	Visionary
Responsivity	High	High	Low
Belief That Can Influence	Low	High	High
Need for Recognition	Low	Low	High
Need for Relationships	High	High	Low
Supranationalism	Low	High	High
Problem-Solving Emphasis	Low	Medium	High

To express this table in words: a secretary general that displays a managerial style has a limited believe in this ability to have influence, is very responsive to conditions, and is motivated by need for relationships, but is not motivated by need for recognition. Managers also emphasize the need of others above task completion and do not possess a strong sense of supranationalism. By contrast, a secretary general with a visionary style shows these characteristics in the opposite way (Kille, 2006: 21). The variation between these three styles is measured with use of the well-established method of Margaret Hermann (1974, 1980, 1987, 1999): the Leadership Traits Analysis (LTA). Although generally designed for the study of national leaders, these schemes can be adapted to for the analysis of leaders of IGO's (Kille and Scully, 2003). In order to determine the scores for each personal characteristic, a content analysis is carried out on a few speeches the office-holders delivered. The choice to use speeches has two disadvantages, but also two advantages: According to Hermann, interviews provide more spontaneous responses from the leaders investigated than speeches, in which more care in thought have gone into what is said and how it is said. Also, speeches are not always written entirely by the leader him or herself (Hermann, 1999: 2). However, speeches are far more accessible and findable on the internet than interviews, which is a clear practical advantage. In addition, a wide range of speeches exist and allow the researcher to choose specific speeches related to summits or specific use-of-force decisions that expresses the thoughts of the secretary general on that specific topic. The specific coding rules for each characteristic are summarized in table 4. They are directly taken from the method developed by Kille (2006: 26-28), who based the coding rules on Hermann (1987, 1999). See the works of these authors for a more

detailed explanation. The characteristics 'conceptual complexity' and 'self-confidence' are used to calculate responsivity, as the table shows.

Table 4: Summary of Personal Characteristic Coding Rules

Personal Characteristic	Coding Instructions	Score used
Responsivity	Relative relation of conceptual complexity to self-confidence	Subtract self-confidence from conceptual complexity, divide by 2 and add 50
Conceptual Complexity	Focus on particular words that indicate acceptance of ambiguity and flexibility, as opposed to words reflecting a low degree of differentiation and tendency to react unvaryingly.	Percentage of words that indicate high complexity
Self-Confidence	Focus on personal pronouns I, me, mine, my, myself: coded for self-confidence if speaker perceives self as instigator of activity, an authority figure, or a recipient of positive reward.	Percentage of self-references meeting criteria
Belief That Can Influence	Focus on verbs: coded for characteristic in situations where speaker is initiating or planning the action, even if it is a decision not to do action: 'feeling', 'thinking', 'sensory' and 'being' verbs not included.	Percentage of verbs meeting criteria
Need for Recognition	Focus on verbs: conditions for coding for recognition are (1) strong, forceful action; (2) giving help or advice when not requested; (3) attempts to control through regulating behaviour or seeking information which affects others; (4) attempt to modify others' opinions; (5) attempt to impress trough public display; (6) concern for reputation or position	Percentage of verbs meeting criteria
Need for Relationships	Focus on verbs: conditions coded for relationship are (1) positive feeling for another, desire to be accepted or liked; (2) reaction to disruption of relationship, desire to reach agreement; (3) com-panionate activities; (4) nurturing acts	Percentage of verbs meeting criteria
Supranationalism	Focus on noun/noun phrases referring to speaker's or other political units: they are coded supranationalism if NATO is identified in a favorable or strong manner or if there is a need to maintain honor and identity for NATO; also if other units are viewed unfavorable or as meddlesome	Percentage of references to political units meeting the criteria
Problem-Solving Emphasis	Focus on particular words which stress completing a task or interpersonal concerns.	Percentage of task or interpersonal words that are task words

To be clear, the analysis is based on a calculation whether a secretary general uses a particular word (verb, noun) or phrase that illustrates a particular characteristic. On this level of analysis, the focus is not on the overall message the secretary general tries to deliver. The objective is to infer their personal characteristics from what they say in the speeches, with the underlying assumption that the more often a certain expression is used, the more that the characteristic related to that expression is representative of the secretary general in question (Kille, 2006: 30).

With use of the Profiler Plus 5.8.4 software, a percentage score for each personal characteristic is tallied for each speech.[i] The average result of all the speeches provides an overall raw score for each characteristic. These raw scores are converted into a standardized score based upon comparison to a base group's score and standard deviation, with a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 10. As base group, the average scores of the seven UN secretaries general analysed by Kille are used. The standardized scores can now combined be used to determine the overall leadership style based on the weighing of characteristics as indicated in table 3. A standardized score of 50 represents the mid-range for a characteristic, while a score above 60 or below 40 is considered high and low respectively (Kille, 2006: 31). While Kille also focuses on the differences between the personal characteristic coding, this research only wants to establish the personality type. In order to do so, two more steps are required.

Kille uses a the a formula to calculate the leadership style results out of the raw characteristic scores: high characteristics are doubled, medium characteristics added once and low characteristics negatively weighed, according to table three ideal types. Thus, for the managerial style, the formula is 2 x (responsivity + need for relationships) + (100 − believe that can influence) + (100 − need for recognition) + (100 − supranationalism) + (100- problem solving emphasis) (Kille, 2006: 34, 261). As with the personal traits, for comparability these scores are standardized in relation to the base group around a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 10, which is the final step.

Information of the speeches analysed, the personal raw and standardized scores, and the interpretation of these scores are all presented in chapter IV in the personality style subchapters of both de Hoop Scheffer and Rasmussen respectively. These chapter contain tables that will help improve the understanding of the text above.

IV.   Results

4.1 Introduction

The results chapter is divided in two major parts: Jaap de Hoop Scheffer and Afghanistan and Anders Fogh Rasmussen and Libya. Each of those parts consists of five paragraphs: the first one provides some background information, followed by three paragraphs that handle each category of analysis: systematic conditions, organizational leadership and personality style. The fifth and final paragraph concludes. The final conclusions are summarized in chapter five.

4.2 Jaap de Hoop Scheffer and Afghanistan

4.2.1   Background information

Jakob Gijsbert (Jaap) de Hoop Scheffer was born in Amsterdam on 3 April 1948. After studying law at Leiden University and performing his military service, he began his political career at the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Following a function in the spokesmen's service, serving at the Embassy in Accra (Ghana) and working at the permanent delegation to NATO in Brussels, he became member of parliament in June 1986. After multiple roles in different committees and assemblies, he was appointed Minister of Foreign Affairs in July 2002. He left this office on 3 December 2003, and took up his duties as NATO secretary general on 5 January 2004.

When de Hoop Scheffer became secretary general, the alliance experienced profound intra-alliance divisions stemming from the American war in Iraq. It was clear that de Hoop Scheffer inherited a climate of intense political differences between much of Europe and the US (Andrews, 2005: 224-231). His very first press conference, on the first day in his new position, might be regarded indicative of how he chose to approach this situation: de Hoop Scheffer spoke both English and French, showing that he understood the symbolic importance of appealing to both sides of the Atlantic (NATO, 2004a). According to Hendrickson (2014), de Hoop Scheffer proceeded cautiously for the rest of his tenure. He thinks of him as a consulter or a 'healer', who made sure he was widely accessible to NATO ambassadors and fostered extensive intra-Alliance discussions (Hendrickson, 2014: 130).

The NATO-led mission in Afghanistan had already started half a year before de Hoop Scheffer took up his duties. Fighting for relevancy in a post-Cold War world, NATO has undertaken radical

transformation over the past two decades. It has shifted to operating in area's outside of its traditional area of operations, working in crisis management with other international organizations, and forging partnerships with countries around the globe. The Afghanistan mission is in many ways a decision point where the alliance had to decide on whether to evolve and move past its collective defence trappings, or cling to a security system that is stable but inflexible. NATO has already created new ways to generate war fighting capabilities, created new institutions to deal with emerging threats, and is working with countries in regions far removed from the waters of the Atlantic Ocean. The 2004 Istanbul Summit and the 2008 Bucharest Summit are the most important moments for this research, but since the extension of the overall amount of troops in Afghanistan is considered a process, the chapter considers de Hoop Scheffer's tenure in general with some focus on the two summits.

4.2.2 Systematic conditions

To understand the systematic conditions in which any secretary general operated, there is one most important nation to consider: the United States. Closely related to this point is the general power distribution in world affairs. Additionally, the relationship of NATO with the United Nations and the European Union is the third systematic factor discussed.

As said, the alliance was heavily divided because of the American war in Iraq. To understand the implications the Iraqi war had on the leadership options of de Hoop Scheffer, we have to take a step back in time. After the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, the Cold War ended and the bipolar distribution of power disappeared. Arguably, the world of international relations now found herself in a unipolar power system, with the United States as the sole superpower that exercises most of the cultural, economic and military influence. For neorealists, unipolarity is the least stable of all structures because any great concentration of power threatens other states and causes them to take action to restore a balance (Waltz, 1997: 915-916). However, other scholars argue that a large concentration of power can work for peace but doubt that US pre-eminence will endure (Huntington, 1993: 68-83). Underlying most of these views is the belief that US preponderance is fragile and can possibly be negated by the actions of other states. As a result, most scholars agree that unipolarity is temporarily and will not last long. Indeed, these scholars argue that the unipolar power structure is already giving way to multipolarity, and some of them question whether the system is unipolar at all (Wohlforth, 1999: 5-7). Huntington, for example, in a later article, describes the power structure as 'uni-multipolar' (Huntington, 1999: 36).

Whatever the case, the 9/11 terrorist attacks on American soil challenged the hegemonic status and caused the Bush administration to shift its priorities to the 'War on Terror' as the highest national security interest. It is important to note that the NATO nations were unified in their support for the US immediately after the attacks, although that unity did not last long. On September 12, 2001, NATO invoked article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty for the first time in history. By early October, under the framework of article 5, NATO had started to deploy the Airborne Warning and Control System (AWACS) to help the United States. However, this turned out to be the only act NATO undertook in support of the United States, not because NATO did not want to do more, but because the Bush administration preferred to work independently of NATO or any other formal ally or alliance (Kaufman, 2011: 60-63). It is striking how quickly the NATO allies became divided after the US chose its own course of action irrespective of them, after such a strong and unified beginning.

The US decision to invade Iraq had a devastating effect on the relationship between the US and several major European allies. NATO became deeply divided, with Great Britain remaining the only close US ally that still gave support. Especially the fact that the US invaded Iraq without a UNSC resolution made some of the closest allies, like Germany and France, vehemently oppose the US decision. The decision of the US to invade Iraq over the objections of these and other allies and without full NATO and UNSC support is the main cause of the transatlantic schism that was still present when decisions had to be made regarding Afghanistan (Kaufman, 2011: 63). At the same time, the actions the US undertook can be seen as a direct translation of the unipolar power structure, but also as the point when US leadership internationally started to erode. This strengthens the argument that the unipolar power system is unstable, temporarily, and gives way to a more multipolar power system.

Nonetheless, NATO's policies were heavily influenced by the course the US chose. The American 'War on Terror' dramatically changed NATO's view on its security principle. During the Washington Summit in 1999, 'the alliance gave terrorism relatively little collective attention' because most allies considered it an internal security problem with no clear role for NATO defined (Bennett, 2003: 1). After 9/11, terrorism takes on a central, even defining position in NATO's security discourse (Behnke, 2013: 164). The 2002 Prague Summit clearly illustrates this new outlook, when NATO established and conceptually consolidated its global policies in response to terrorism.

At first, NATO was effectively sidelined and limited to a supportive role with regard to the US-led military campaign, Operation Enduring Freedom. This changed in august 2003, when NATO assumed command and control of the UN mandated ISAF in Kabul. From that moment on, NATO turned out to be one of the biggest proponents for expansion of the mission (Behnke, 2013: 166-

170). The role of Jaap de Hoop Scheffer in this regard might have been an important one, but it is very important to realise that the events and decisions described above significantly shaped the leadership options de Hoop Scheffer had. The United States in many ways determined the course of action, and it was not NATO that set the direction: it was the US that started with Operation Enduring Freedom in October 2001, and although the European allies really wanted to help, they were only allowed a minor role in it. The US simply rebuffed them (Pond, 2005: 33). From the beginning of 2002, the transatlantic relations really deteriorated. Many scholars describe this period as the 'transatlantic crisis of 2002-3' (Kaufman, 2011: 62-66; Lundestad, 2005: 9; Pond, 2005: 33-49). Nonetheless, NATO in the end took control of the ISAF mission by the end of 2003. One of the largest challenges facing NATO countries was the ability to generate the necessary troops to sustain their presence in Afghanistan. Smaller countries such as Canada and the Netherlands took very large roles in the mission, which strained their capabilities. Larger NATO countries such as the United States and Britain were also strained to generate forces for the Afghanistan mission due to their involvement in Iraq. In fact, force generation proved a constant struggle ever since NATO took control of ISAF. In 2004, secretary general de Hoop Scheffer used the Istanbul Summit as a platform from which to try and improve the alliances' force generation procedures, which made some small progress. It did not however, make a fundamental change in two major problems facing force generation which ISAF demonstrated (Saltasuk, 2012: 31). The first problem is the alleged deficiency of the actual 'sharp end' of most countries' militaries, which proved a problem especially for many of the smaller allies. The second problem is that force generation depends on the political will of individual states. Surely, the lack of this political will was a direct consequence of the deteriorated transatlantic relationship. The antipathy of the European public towards the US had only increased since the end of the Iraqi war. After all, no prove was found that Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction, or of his supposed links with Al Qaeda. Also, the report of the Red Cross in April 2004 that showed the torture and humiliation by American soldiers of Iraqi prisoners did not help. By then, many Europeans felt vindicated in their 2002 and early 2003 opposition to the war (Pond, 2005: 54, 55).

A final factor that requires consideration is the role played by other IGO's, namely the UN and the EU. The US war in Iraq deeply divided NATO, but this was much less the case with the start of the war in Afghanistan, one and half year earlier. One of the most important differences between these two military operations is that ISAF security mission was established with UN mandate, by the UNSC in December 2001. Moreover, in October 2003, the UNSC voted unanimously to expand the ISAF mission beyond Kabul in Resolution 1510 (UNSC, 2003). The UN thus set the stage for the start and the expansion of the mission in Afghanistan. This can be considered as a political condition that enlarged de Hoop Scheffer's opportunities in extending the amount of troop in Afghanistan in the

years that followed. During the 2008 Bucharest Summit, the ties between NATO and the UN had been greatly strengthened, with de Hoop Scheffer pronouncing on more coordination with the UN (Kille & Hendrickson, 2010: 508).

NATO still is the primary security provider for Europe, despite the security developments of the European Union, like the evolving Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP), the European Security Strategy and the European Defence Agency (Saltasuk, 2012: 15). However, Geir Lundestad argues that the gradual development of the EU on the area of security will dramatically change the transatlantic relationship between the US and the EU in the future. There has been a clear shift from emphasis on what the Americans can do for the EU towards what the Europeans can and must do for themselves (Lundestad, 20-23). However, at the start of de Hoop Scheffer's tenure as secretary general, it is the deepening relationship between NATO and the EU that attracts most attention. In January 2001, NATO and the EU recognized their shared strategic interests through an exchange of letters between the NATO secretary general and the EU presidency (Dorman & Kaufman, 2011: 13). In December 2002, both organizations signed the NATO-EU Declaration on European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP), which strengthened their relationship and included the basis for further cooperation in security matters, like crisis management and combating terrorism. After all, since the 2004 round of enlargement of the EU and NATO, 19 countries are members of both organizations. This evolving rapprochement is a clear political factor that could work in favour of the increasingly needed extent of the amount of troops in Afghanistan. It must also be noted, however, that in the subsequent years, the Afghanistan mission showed, once again, the big capabilities gap between the European states and the US. Membership expansion does not necessarily mean an increased force generation ability. The capabilities gap proved to be the one of the major concerns for de Hoop Scheffer during the 2008 Bucharest Summit, although it was overshadowed by the politically more sensitive issue of Ukraine and Georgia joining NATO. The increased cooperation of NATO with the EU did not make this problem disappear. The lack of countries willing to contribute more troops made de Hoop Scheffer look beyond the transatlantic border and towards other possible allies on the globe. In his efforts to generate new partnerships to fight terrorism and to contribute to NATO's peacekeeping missions, de Hoop Scheffer made trips to Asia, the Middle East and Australia, which was unprecedented until then (Hendrickson, 2009: 3).

In sum, two major systematic conditions existed that limited de Hoop Scheffer's ability to shape and influence NATO policy on Afghanistan. These factors are the United States general distancing from NATO during the first term of the Bush presidency and the consequence of the profound policy differences between the Bush administration and most of the European Allies over

the war in Iraq: a transatlantic schism. On the other hand, the unanimity within the UNSC on expanding the Afghanistan mission and the deepening of the ties between NATO and the EU in the field of security were factors that, at least initially, provided de Hoop Scheffer with extended leadership opportunities. The capabilities gap between the US and its European allies was not solved with the rapprochement of NATO and the EU, however, and was of significant concern at the 2008 Bucharest Summit, when NATO discussed yet another troop surge for ISAF.

4.2.3 Organizational leadership

According to the NATO website, the secretary general is responsible for steering the process of consultation and decision-making in the Alliance and ensuring that decisions are implemented. The secretary general is the alliance's top international civil servant and has three principal responsibilities. First and foremost, the secretary general chairs the North Atlantic Council - the Alliance's principal political decision-making body - as well as other senior decision-making committees. Second, he is the principal spokesman of the alliance and represent the alliance in public on behalf of the member countries while reflecting their common positions on political issues. Third, the secretary general is the senior executive officer of the NATO International Staff, responsible for staff appointments and overseeing its work (NATO, 2014c).

Formally, the secretary general is charged with overseeing the North Atlantic Council through his power to call meetings and set the council's agenda. Although the officeholder has no vote of his own, the council still provides the primary organizational forum for him to exercise formal leadership. In some cases, the diplomatic skills and the personal network of the secretary general allow him access to heads of government of member states. Another interesting aspect of his organizational power is the silent procedure. If invoked, the silent procedure stipulates that a resolution will automatically be passed by the NAC after a stated time period set by the secretary general, unless a member state objects (Hendrickson, 2006: 107, 108, 133-135).

Next to these formal powers, the secretary general also has avenues of influence in the informal setting. The use of these possible avenues of influence greatly depend on the secretary general in office. As de Hoop Scheffer describes it himself, in an interview with FiatJustitia: 'As secretary general, you must establish and sustain your own international political contacts. As with normal life, the personal relationship is really important, because you primarily have to act as a mediator' (Zadeh, 2009). In regard to use-of-force decisions on Afghanistan, Jaap de Hoop Scheffer produced his own legacy as NATO's political leader. Just like his predecessor Lord Robertson's mantra for more "capabilities, capabilities, capabilities", de Hoop Scheffer often stressed the need for

additional and more cooperative defence spending efforts across all member of the alliance. But his clearest priority was NATO's engagement in Afghanistan (Hendrickson, 2009: 2, 3). From his first day in office, de Hoop Scheffer did everything he could to increase NATO's chances for success in Afghanistan. He often called for more resources to promote democracy and peace in Afghanistan. With the considerable political constraints during most of the duration of his leadership, his focus was to find consensus were possible (Interview of author with Herman Schaper, former Dutch Ambassador to NATO). Hendrickson describes de Hoop Scheffer's most important leadership role within NATO as a consulter and arguably 'healer', who was widely accessible to the NATO ambassadors and fostered extensive intra-alliance discussion (Hendrickson, 2014: 130; Confirmed by Schaper). An example of this approach was the way he dealt with the increased membership, by instituting 'Tuesday Breakfasts'. These breakfasts preceded the longstanding Tuesday luncheons, which had been used for a long time off-the-record exchanges between permanent representatives. This effort helped develop the consultative environment outside of the normal institutional setting. Not surprisingly, at NAC meetings, de Hoop Scheffer covered a wide range of topics and permitted extensive discussion among the Ambassadors (Ibid, 130; interview with Schaper).

According to Herman Schaper, de Hoop Scheffer spoke very frequently with the SACEUR of that time. Both men really made efforts to keep their respective offices, in Mons and Brussels, figuratively together. De Hoop Scheffer thus worked in close cooperation with the SACEUR in order to be able to effectively implement political decisions made regarding Afghanistan.

Although de Hoop Scheffer presided over the alliance when NATO accepted a much wider presence in Afghanistan, it remains difficult to identify a particular policy or action taken by NATO that was the result of de Hoop Scheffer's organizational leadership. There was no 'Solana-like' moment when he proved crucial in steering the alliance in a particular direction. In addition, de Hoop Scheffer proposed major organizational and budgetary reforms. These reforms, that would have furthered the internationalization of the allied security politics faced fierce resistance from a number of members and were not implemented (Kriendler, 2006: 6). In sum, de Hoop Scheffer's influence was significant in the NAC and through his extensive communication approach among the allies. He most probably chose not to force the allies into decisions that would again threaten alliance cohesion, just like he exercised a limited public leadership role regarding NATO's engagement in Iraq and Sudan (Hendrickson, 2005: 23). In doing so, de Hoop Scheffer managed to effectively 'heal' the alliance from is internal division stemming from Iraq.

4.2.4 Personality style

With the method used for establishing the personality type already explained in chapter 3.4, just the execution of the Leadership Traits Analysis remains. Of course, the established personality type is interpreted afterwards. Firstly, however, the selection of the speeches need some clarification.

Two of Jaap de Hoop Scheffer's speeches have been subjected to the LTA: the first speech was delivered at the Royal United Services Institute on 18 June, 2004, on the topic 'NATO's Istanbul Summit: New Mission, New Means'. This took place just ten days before the start of the 2004 Istanbul Summit. The second speech was delivered in Warsaw, Poland, on the topic of 'NATO's Bucharest Summit - transformation of the Alliance and Polish and regional perspectives'. This speech took place about three weeks before the 2008 Bucharest Summit. Both speeches contain a little more than 2000 words, and offer a clear outlook of the on the expectations of de Hoop Scheffer of both summits. Moreover, while selecting these speeches, the required focus on spontaneous material is considered (Hermann, 1999:2). When it comes to speeches, one can never be sure of the amount of preparation time that has gone into it. However, in these two cases, de Hoop Scheffer addresses a public that consists of interested academics and politicians on the topic of an important upcoming summit, and not a group of colleagues he has to negotiate with. In addition, this happened in a close setting. Therefore, these two speeches most likely represent de Hoop Scheffer's personal expectations of the summits, and therefore the words he chose hopefully reflect his personality in a relatively accurate way. Now let us take a look at the results that are summarized in table 5.

Table 5: Personal Characteristic Results: Jaap de Hoop Scheffer

Characteristic	Raw	Standardized	Relative
Responsivity	47.97	57.24	Medium-High
Belief that can influence	43.01	51.29	Medium
Need for recognition	37.50	41.30	Medium-Low
Need for relationships	33.83	63.11	High
Supranationalism	48.98	39.04	Low
Problem-solving emphasis	70.06	49.59	Medium

As explained in chapter 3.4, the average result of both speeches provides an overall raw score for each characteristic. These score are listed in the second column, 'raw'. These raw scores

are converted into a standardized score based upon comparison the base group's mean score and standard deviation. The standardized score is listed in the third column. This table does not tell as much as of yet, but with the final two steps, presented in table 6, the appropriate personality type becomes clear.

Table 6: Leadership Style Results: Jaap de Hoop Scheffer

Characteristic	Managerial	Strategic	Visionary
Raw score	459.48	530.47	442.09
Standardized score	**63.61**	57.29	38.25

According to the LTA, Jaap de Hoop Scheffer quite clearly comes out a secretary general with a managerial personality type. Kille refers to leaders with the managerial personality type as cautious, one that stays on the background in his strategic political position and that does not usually make public pronouncements with personal view in it (Kille, 2006: 59-62). This coincides well with the role de Hoop Scheffer had in the NAC. For the most part, de Hoop Scheffer was a harbinger of consensus and did everything to get the allies to extent the amount of troops in Afghanistan. Besides, he did not use public diplomacy to extent his views on the matter of Iraq and Sudan (Hendrickson, 2005: 23-25).

4.3 Anders Fogh Rasmussen and Libya

4.3.1 Background information

Anders Fogh Rasmussen was born in Ginnerup, Jutland, on 26 January 1953. He studied economics at the University of Aarhus, and graduated in 1978, the same year when he became member of the Danish parliament representing the Liberal Party. Rasmussen held numerous positions in government and opposition throughout his political career. Among these positions are Minister for Taxation from 1987 to 1992, and from 1990-1992 also Minister for Economic Affairs. As Minister for Economic Affairs and member of the EU's ECOFIN-council 1990-1992, Rasmussen was the Danish negotiator of and signatory to the Maastricht Treaty, which eventually led to the introduction of the single European currency, the Euro. He finally became Danish Prime Minister after the parliamentary elections in 2001. Because of two re-elections in 2005 and 2007, he held his position as Prime Minister until he was elected as future NATO secretary general at the Strasbourg-Kehl Summit in April 2009.

With ISAF in Afghanistan well underway, Rasmussen found the alliance in a much less divided shape than de Hoop Scheffer. At the 2010 Lisbon Summit, the NATO allies showed a unanimous determination to remain committed to a continues effort in Afghanistan until the country is self-sustainable. The 2012 Chicago Summit only reinforced this message. However, this does not mean that the allies did not have differences to overcome. Although Rasmussen also spoke both English and French during his first press conference, there are notable differences between the two speeches. Where de Hoop Scheffer spoke way more broadly and in general terms, Rasmussen's speech was significantly longer and addressed multiple issues separately and independently. Rasmussen made clear what he thought NATO's future should be like, and even stated that NATO needed a new strategic concept (NATO 2009). According to Hendrickson, these observations of Rasmussen's first speech can easily be projected on his entire tenure: he describes him as a policy entrepreneur, who independently introduced new policy initiatives and used new media forums to promote his ideas and office (Hendrickson, 2014: 132-135).

On 31 March 2011, NATO launched Operation Unified Protector, taking over the military lead from the US Africa Command (AFRICOM) of air and naval operations targeting the forces under command of Libyan leader Muammar Qadhafi. Officially the mission started off as a defensive one to protect rebel-held areas, but unofficially emphasis was placed on regime change, and the mission quickly became offensive (Michaels, 2011: 56).

4.3.2 Systematic conditions

Arguably, Rasmussen experienced far less difficult systematic political conditions during his time in office compared to de Hoop Scheffer. The overall commitment of most NATO countries to Afghanistan seemed resolute and stable. Rasmussen faced a completely different question of use-of-force with the bombing campaign in Libya. Still, Rasmussen also faced the problem of allies unwilling to contribute as much as others would have liked. Similar as with de Hoop Scheffer, there are certain systematic conditions in which Rasmussen operated that have to be discussed, in order to be able to assess the amount of influence he exercised on the use-of-force decisions. Again, the role of the United States proves meaningful, together with the general power distribution in world affairs. Moreover, the relationship of NATO with the United Nations and the European Union is discussed.

Firstly, the Atlantic schism that manifested itself so profoundly before and after the Iraqi war in 2003 had disappeared for the most part. Noticeable, one could say that exactly the opposite now happened. In complete contrast with the war in Afghanistan, the US was reluctant to participate in the Libyan mission, and the Obama administration considered Libya as a primarily European problem (Michaels, 2011: 56, 57). Libya represents the first case of major out-of-area NATO commitment in which the US 'led from behind'. Despite the fact that the US military did place A-10 tank buster aircraft and AC-130 gunships on standby, its official role was for the most part limited to assisting with command and control, refuelling, intelligence support and ammunition supply (Ibid, 57). According to Michaels, the US might just shift its focus towards new alliances in Asia and lose interest in Europe (Ibid, 59).

Arguably, the US reluctance to meddle in European affairs and a possible focus towards Asia can be seen as aspects of a translation of the slow but gradual shift from a unipolar towards a multipolar power system. For neorealists, the rise of the number of terrorist attacks together with the emergence of violent protests and trouble spots all over the world clearly signal that the unstable and temporary unipolar power system is logically giving way to multipolarity (Wohlforth, 1999: 5-7). Samual Huntington argues that in the multipolar world of the 21st century, the major powers will inevitably compete, clash or coalesce with each other in various exchanges and combinations. Such a world, he argues, will lack the tension and conflict between the superpower and the major regional power distinctive of a uni-multipolar power system. Therefore, the US will most likely find life as a major power in a multipolar world less demanding and more rewarding than it was as the world's only superpower (Huntington, 1999: 49).

The multipolar world environment thus offers an explanation of the relative backing down of the US. Of course, the ongoing military commitment of the US to Afghanistan also constitutes a part of the US reluctance in taking the lead in another operation in yet another continent. The stance the Obama administration took however clashed with the longstanding assumption that if NATO were ever to launce another air war, the US would not only be a central player in it, but would also be in the lead rather than in support. Given the transatlantic capabilities gap, that also surfaced in Afghanistan in the years before the bombing in Libya, there was never any expectation that European air forces would be able to wage a strategic air campaign on their own (Michaels, 2011: 57). The American reluctance to take the lead in Libya suddenly raised alternative options, such as a British and French-led operation, or running the operation through the mechanism of the EU's CSDP. The most important implication of this systematic political condition is that Rasmussen suddenly had much of a choice: this time, it was clear that operation would continue without American military leadership, after the initial lead from the US Africa Command.

Before turning to the NATO-UN and the NATO-EU relationship, there is one other notable factor that requires some attention. Even if not all of NATO's twenty-eight member states participated in the Libyan campaign, there was a unanimous political consensus on the validity of the mission, despite possible institutional overstretch because of the ongoing Afghanistan mission. No country proved obstructive in the discussions or threatened to withdraw political support for the air campaign, even when the mission became far more offensive than initially intended. Countries such as Germany, Poland and Turkey had no desire for a repeat of a debate that so divided the alliance in the wake of the Iraq war. Indeed, 'the alliance's perceived need to preserve internal solidarity triumphed over domestic political considerations' (Michaels, 2011: 57). The split over the Iraq war thus had a contrasting effect in the long term.

The United Nations played a supportive role in the process towards the NATO decision to use military power in Libya. In previous years, there had been a lack of institutional coordination between NATO and the UN, and the referencing thereof in NATO major summit declarations. For example, the 2004 Istanbul Summit barely mentions the UN's institutional role in fostering international peace and security (NATO, 2004b). In more recent statements, NATO promoted a greater institutional connection with the UN, suggesting a stronger connection between the two institutions' shared security objectives (Kille & Hendrickson, 2010: 507). The organizational relationship was further solidified through the "Joint Declaration on UN/NATO Secretariat Cooperation" that was signed by both secretaries general in New York in September 2008.

The security cooperation of NATO with the European Union, that developed along such promising lines during de Hoop Scheffer's time in office, somehow got missing during the Libyan crisis. The EU, as a bloc, was totally absent during the crisis, which led analysts to pose tough questions about the future of Europe as a collective security actor (Howorth, 2013: 30). In the most serious crisis on the EU's borders since the birth of the CSDP, the Union proved totally incapable of action, due to the absence of a unified strategy (Ibid, 31, 32). If the EU is ever to develop an effective security identity, it will require several key developments. For example, member states must implement a much greater pooling of sovereignty, and the CSDP must acquire greater operational autonomy through and within NATO, while the Americans must learn to take a genuine back-seat (Ibid, 38). The crisis in Libya could have been an excellent opportunity, with the US reluctance' to take the lead. However, Libya came way too early for the CSDP, that somehow has to be reinvented if it wants to have a future at all.

The systematic political conditions facing Rasmussen were very different from the ones facing de Hoop Scheffer. The Atlantic schism over Iraq had disappeared, and even worked in favour of internal solidarity during Libya. In addition, arguably because of shift in the world environment from unipolarity to multipolarity, the United States opted for a supportive instead of a leading role for the crisis in Libya. These two conditions gave Rasmussen a great amount of leadership opportunities for a possible European lead in the mission. However, the failure of the EU's CSDP accounted for a limiting systematic factor Rasmussen faced. The increased institutional security coordination of NATO with the UN could not make up for this European deficit: as the operation dragged on into the summer and public criticism intensified, several NATO member states started to reduce their military contributions (Michaels, 2011: 56).

4.3.3 Organizational leadership

By the time Rasmussen took up his duties, the official responsibilities of the office of secretary general remained the same as when de Hoop Scheffer started his tenure. The top international civil servant still had three main responsibilities, with chairing the NAC as the most important one. The way a secretary general choses to interpret his role can differ, though, and Anders Fogh Rasmussen sure brought significant change to the office.

If an author mentions Rasmussen in his or her scholarly work, in many cases he is described as a secretary general that brought unprecedented change with the way he run NATO. His proactive diplomacy in world politics with proposals of his own, not necessarily approved in advance by member states, in itself represent a minor revolution in the conduct of the secretary general

(Mouritzen, 2013: 345, 346). Hendrickson describes him as a *policy entrepreneur* and also mentions the break with convention (Hendrickson, 2010: 24). Rasmussen was trying to make NATO an independent actor in world politics, with questionable prospects of success. As an efficient communicator, Rasmussen used PR measures like blog, Twitter and Facebook, and acted like a prime minister, often dealing directly with his former colleagues in the European Capitals (Mouritzen, 2013: 346). Herman Schaper, who was served by Rasmussen in his last two months at NATO HQ, also contents that if someone proved too uncooperative, Rasmussen would simply call his or her Prime-Minister and settle the issue that way.

Within NAC discussions, Rasmussen also operated different than his predecessor. He continued Lord Robertson's initiative for more active chairing, to get rid of leisurely practice and towards obtaining a more strategic focus in NAC discussions. Working further in that direction, Rasmussen focused only on two or three themes at most at each meeting (Mouritzen, 2013: 346, 347). An additional remark on Rasmussen's role in the NAC must be made: on occasion, he would not attend meetings of the NAC. Moreover, many ambassadors expressed the feeling the 'NATO family' had largely disappeared, due to Rasmussen's lack of accessibility (Hendrickson, 2010: 27).

Furthermore, Rasmussen brought change in the informal world at NATO HQ. He usually did not attend the Tuesday luncheons and thus clearly broke with this longstanding tradition. On the other hand, Rasmussen did set up ad hoc consultation meetings on separate important issues. Herman Schaper called these meetings 'brainstorm sessions', and they not so much replaced the informal lunch sessions, but provided for a new avenue within the informal level (Author interview with NATO official).

Rasmussen's relationship with the SACEUR was a little less intensive than the one de Hoop Scheffer had. He had already limited a weekly military briefing to NATO ambassadors to a monthly period, but did keep the SACEUR close enough to not alienate the military and the political sphere away from each other.

Hendrickson describes the overall course of action Rasmussen chose as *policy entrepreneurship,* because of his distinctive internal management of the alliance combined with his repeated willingness to advance policy proposals that best reflect his personal perspectives on the security affairs present (Hendrickson, 2010: 28). Also, the degree of personalised information Rasmussen shared with the world through social media is also unique within NATO leadership. His overall leadership as policy entrepreneur is unprecedented, but also entailed a number of possible risks. For example, to pass NATO ambassadors on a regular basis would surely lead to protests and

less cohesion within the NAC. On the other hand, such activism might just be what the alliance needs.

The question if Rasmussen's break with convention made his influence on the decision to bomb the Qaddafi regime bigger, is difficult to answer. In the week leading up to the UNSC vote that approved of military enforcement of a no-fly zone over Libya, Rasmussen repeatedly emphasized that 'NATO was ready to act' and that 'NATO stands prepared for any eventuality' through his facebook page (Hendrickson, 2014: 134). He thus openly offered NATO as an option to deal with the issue. However, once the bombings started and the US turned to NATO to gain NATO endorsement and oversight, the alliance proved divided. Even when NATO agree to take the lead in the operation, it was still clear that there was no unified NATO viewpoint but rather widely varying perspectives on how and if members would contribute military to the operation (Bell & Hendrickson, 2012: 159-161). In the following months, Rasmussen was not able to convince other allies to join in the bombing campaign despite considerable lobbying. It thus appears that Rasmussen had overstated the degree of unanimity in the alliance prior to the campaign. Be that as it may, Rasmussen four year term did get extended with another year, which might draw upon the conclusion that his proactiveness is generally appreciated.

4.3.4 Personality style

As with de Hoop Scheffer, just the execution of Rasmussen's Leadership Traits Analysis remains. The established personality type is interpreted afterwards. Firstly, the selection of the speeches need some clarification.

Two of Rasmussen's speeches have been subjected to the LTA: the first speech was delivered at the 11th Herzliya Conference in Israel on 9 February 2011, when Rasmussen spoke of the developments in the Arabic world. The second speech was delivered Munich during the conference on 5 February 2011. The speech was titled 'Building security in an age of austerity'. Again, both speeches contain a little more than 2000 words, and offer a clear outlook of the view Rasmussen had on the developing problems in the Arab world and the strategic outlook of the alliance. Admittedly, it was hard to find speeches that Rasmussen delivered before the mission in Libya with the required focus on spontaneous material. However, as Rasmussen always took the liberty to share his own views on matters he felt were pressing, we can assume he has done the same in these speeches. Therefore, these two speeches most likely represent Rasmussen personal views on the matters he discusses, and most probably the words he chose reflect his personality in a relatively accurate way. Table 7 contains the personal characteristic results of Rasmussen, as shown below.

Table 7: Personal Characteristic Results: Anders Fogh Rasmussen

Characteristic	Raw	Standardized	Relative
Responsivity	44.22	44.96	Medium-Low
Belief that can influence	48.39	58.49	Medium-High
Need for recognition	41.85	46.76	Medium
Need for relationships	12.06	43.01	Medium-Low
Supranationalism	58.31	66.89	High
Problem-solving emphasis	75.70	58.56	Medium-High

The average result of both speeches provides an overall raw score for each characteristic. These score are listed in the second column, while the converted raw scores are shown in the third one, as standardized scores. As with de Hoop Scheffer, we need the next table to find the appropriate personality type (table 8).

Table 8: Leadership Style Results: Anders Fogh Rasmussen

Characteristic	Managerial	Strategic	Visionary
Raw score	335.24	538.64	563.43
Standardized score	33.56	60.23	**62.69**

The final scores of Rasmussen are a little less distinct than de Hoop Scheffer's. Of course, it is very clear that Rasmussen does not fit in the managerial personality type, according to this scheme. But the other two personality types lie quite close together. Nonetheless, Rasmussen clearly belongs in the Visionary category. According to Kille, secretaries general with a visionary style will take every advantage to press their opinion on others, they will seek as much exposure as they can and make full use of public pronouncements (Kille, 2006: 59-62). In light of what we already know, these remarks fit perfectly well with the entrepreneurial classification Hendrickson made.

V.   Conclusion

This research has shown that both Jaap de Hoop Scheffer and Anders Fogh Rasmussen both have exercised major influence on certain aspects of the alliance, each in a completely different way. The chapters of systematic political conditions highlighted a few constraints, but also some favorable conditions on the secretaries general opportunities to exercise their leadership. The research question states: *To what extent do NATO's secretaries general shape alliance policy on crisis situations?*

Jaap de Hoop Scheffer came into office when the alliance was still heavily divided because of the war in Iraq. In other words, to overcome this transatlantic schism and still be able to produce policy outcomes de Hoop Scheffer very much wanted to see (namely, expanding the capabilities in Afghanistan), he adopted an approach as a consulter. This was primarily shown in the way he addressed the NAC. However, it still remains difficult to point to certain policy outcomes de Hoop Scheffer had clear influence on. The personality type de Hoop Scheffer was linked to by the Leadership Trait Analysis was of no surprise: the manager type. This clearly reinforces the image that was already apparent after the first two categories of analysis.

Successful independent policy entrepreneurship is not the legacy of NATO's former political leaders. The only previous policy secretary general who attempted to lead from the front Paul-Henri Spaak, was isolated politically when he attempted to steer the alliance in new directions (Hendrickson, 2006: 52). Anders Fogh Rasmussen is in this regard the first 'successful' policy entrepreneur NATO has seen. However, it is debatable if one can speak of success. Rasmussen never got the allies to make bigger contributions once the Libya bombings started. He might even be regarded as one of the causes why the allies were not unified. Of course, the systematic condition of a failing CSDP also contributed to the reluctance of the European allies to step in with more military capabilities. As with de Hoop Scheffer, Rasmussen's personality type coincides with the image of policy entrepreneur. There is no question about Rasmussen's perception on the office, but there is on the amount of influence he has had in NATO's decision to bomb Libya.

VI.   Literature

Andrews, David M. (2005) *The Atlantic Alliance Under Stress. US-European Relations after Iraq.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Asmus, Ronald D. (2002) *Opening NATO's door: How the Alliance Remade itself for a New Era.* New York, Colombia University Press.

Behnke, Andreas (2013) *NATO's Security Discourse after the Cold War: Representing the West.* New York, Routledge.

Bell, Joseph P. & Hendrickson, Ryan C. (2012) 'NATO's Visegrad Allies and the Bombing of Qaddafi: The Consequence of Alliance Free-Riders', *Journal of Slavic Military Studies,* 25:1, 149-161.

Bennett, Christopher (2003) 'Combating Terrorism', *NATO Review,* Web edition. http://www.nato.int/docu/review/2003/Interpreting-Prague/Combating-terrorism/EN/index.htm (Accessed 10 December 2014)

Cleveland, Harlan (1970) *NATO: The Transatlantic Bargain*. New York, Harper & Row Publishers.

Cox, Robert W. (1969) 'The Executive Head: An Essay on Leadership in International Organization', *International Organization* 23:2, 205-230

Cox, Robert W. & Jacobson, Harold K. (1973) *The Anatomy of Influence. Decision making in International Organization.* Yale University Press, New Haven and London.

Dorman, Andrew M. & Kaufman, Joyce P. (2011) 'Introduction', in Dorman, Andrew M. & Kaufman, Joyce P. *The Future of Transatlantic Relations: Perceptions, Policy and Practice.* Stanford University Press, Stanford.

Evera, Stephen van (1997) *Guide to Methods for Students of Political Science.* New York, Cornell University Press.

Hendrickson, Ryan C. (2002) 'Secretary General Javier Solana and the Crisis in Kosovo', *Journal of International Relations and Development*, 5:3, 240-257

Hendrickson, Ryan C. (2004) 'Leadership at NATO: Secretary General Manfred Wörner and the Crisis in Bosnia', *Journal of Strategic Studies*, 27:3, 508-527

Hendrickson, Ryan C. (2004) 'NATO's Secretary General and the Use of Force: Willy Claes and Operation Deliberate Force', *Armed Forces & Society,* 31:1, 95-117

Hendrickson, Ryan C. (2005) 'Public Diplomacy at NATO: an Assessment of Jaap de Hoop Scheffer's Leadership of the Alliance', *Journal of Military and Strategic Studies* 8:2, 1-28.

Hendrickson, Ryan C. (2006) *Diplomacy and War at NATO. The Secretary General and Military Action after the Cold War*. University of Missouri Press, Columbia and London.

Hendrickson, Ryan C. (2009) *NATO Secretary General: a Changing Job Description?* Eastern Illinois University, at http://www.nato.int/docu/review/2009/0902/090202/en/index.htm (accessed on 28 December 2014)

Hendrickson, Ryan C. (2010) NATO'S First Prime Minister, The RUSI Journal, 155:5, 24-30.

Hendrickson, Ryan C. (2014) "The Changing Role of NATO's Secretary General", in Mayer, S. ed. *NATO's Post-Cold War Politics: The Changing Provision of Security.* New York, Palgrave Macmillan.

Hermann, Margaret. G. (1974) "Leader Personality and Foreign Policy Behaviour", in Rosenau, James N. ed. *Comparing Foreign Policies: Theories, Findings and Methods.* New York, Halsted.

Hermann, Margaret. G. (1980) 'Explaining foreign policy behaviour using personal characteristics of political leaders.' *International Studies Quarterly,* 24, 7-46.

Hermann, Margaret G. (1987) *Handbook for Assessing Personal Characteristics and Foreign Policy Orientations of Political Leaders.* Mershon Occasional Paper, Mershon Center for International Security Studies. Columbus, Ohio State University.

Hermann, Margaret G. (1999) *Assessing Leadership Style: A Trait Analyses.* Hilliard, OH, Social Science Automation, Inc.

Hermann, Margaret. G., Preston, Thomas, Korany, Baghat & Shaw, Timothy, M. (2001) 'Who Leads Matters: The Effects of Powerful Individuals', *International Studies Review* 3:2, 83–131.

Hoogenboezem, Jaap, A. (2009) 'Hidden Success: A Case Study of Secretary-General Dirk Stikker's leadership at NATO', *Leadership journal* 5:4, 403-421.

Howorth, Jolyon (2013) 'The EU and NATO after Libya and Afghanistan: The Future of Euro-U.S. Security Cooperation', *Yale Journal of International Affairs,* 8:1, 30-39.

Huntington, Samuel P. (1993) 'Why International Primacy Matters', *International Security* 17:4, 68-83.

Huntington, Samuel P. (1999) 'The Lonely Superpower', *Foreign Affairs,* 78:2, 35-49

Jordan, Robert S. (1979) *Political Leadership in NATO: a study in multinational diplomacy.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Jordan, Robert S. ed. (1987) *NATO's Supreme Allied Commander, Europe.* Lexington, University Press of Kentucky.

Kaplan, Lawrence S. (2004) *NATO Divided, NATO United: The Evolution of an Alliance.* Westport, CT: Praeger.

Kaplan, Lawrence S. (1988) *NATO and the United States: the Enduring Alliance.* Boston: Twayne.

Kaufman, Joyce P. (2011) "The United States and the Transatlantic Relationship: A Test for US Foreign and National Security Policy", in Dorman, Andrew M. & Kaufman, Joyce P. *The Future*

of Transatlantic Relations: Perceptions, Policy and Practice. Stanford University Press, Stanford.

Kay, Sean (1998) *NATO and the Future of European Security.* Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Kille, Kent J. & Hendrickson, Ryan C. (2010) 'Secretary-General Leadership Across the United Nations and NATO: Kofi Annan, Javier Solana, and Operation Allied Force' *Global Governance* 16:4, 505-518.

Kille, Kent J. & Scully, Roger M. (2003) 'Executive Heads and the Role of Intergovernmental Organizations: Expansionist Leadership in the United Nations and the European Union', *Political Psychology* 24:1, 175-198.

Kille, Kent J. (2006) *From Manager to Visionary. The Secretary-General of the United Nations.* New York, Palgrave Macmillan.

Kriendler, John (2006) Transforming NATO HQ: The Latest Hurrah. Watchfield, Swindon, Defence Academy of the United Kingdom.

Lundestad, Geir (2005) 'Toward Transatlantic Drift?', in Andrews, David, M. ed. *The Atlantic Alliance Under Stress. US-European Relations after Iraq.* Cambridge, University Press.

Mayer, Sebastian (2011) 'Embedded Politics, Growing Informalization? How NATO and the EU Transform Provision of External Security', *Contemporary Security Policy* 32:2, 308-333.

Michaels, Jeffrey H. (2011) 'NATO After Libya: Alliance Adrift?', *RUSI Journal* 156:6, 56-61.

Moore, Rebecca M. (2002) "NATO's Mission for a New Millenium: A Value-Based Approach to Building Security", *Contemporary Security Policy* 23: 1, 1-34.

Moravcsik, Andrew (1998) *The choice for Europe: Social purpose and state power from Messina to Maastricht.* Ithaca, New York, Cornell University Press.

Moravcsik, Andrew (1999) 'A new statecraft? Supranational entrepreneurs and international cooperation', *International Organization*, 53, 267-306.

Morelli, Vincent & Belkin, Paul (2009) *NATO in Afghanistan: A Test of the Transatlantic Alliance.* Washington D.C., Congressional Research Service.

Mouritzen, Hans (2013) 'In Spite of Reform: NATO HQ Still in the Grip of Nations', in *Defense & Security Analysis* 29:4, 342-355.

NATO (1949) *The North Atlantic Treaty*, Article 5. Washington D.C. http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official_texts_17120.htm?selectedLocale=en (Accessed 10 January 2014)

NATO (2004a) *Press Statement by NATO Secretary General Jaap de Hoop Scheffer* (5 January 2004) at http://www.nato.int/docu/speech/2004/s040105a.htm (accessed 2 December 2014)

NATO (2004b) *Istanbul Summit Declaration. Our Security in a New Era* (28 June 2004) at http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/2004/p04-097e.htm (accessed 08 January 2015)

NATO (2009) *First NATO Press conference by Secretary General Anders Fogh Rasmussen* (20 August 2009) at http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/opinions_56776.htm?selectedLocale=en (accessed 2 December 2014)

NATO (2014a) *NATO Secretary General thanks Patriot crews protecting Turkey* (10 October 2014) at http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/news_113858.htm?selectedLocale=en (accessed 1 November 2014)

NATO (2014b) *The North Atlantic Council* (11 November 2014) at http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_49763.htm?selectedLocale=en (accessed 29 December 2014)

NATO (2014c) *The NATO Secretary General* (11 November 2014) at http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics_50094.htm (accessed on 08-01-2014)

Pond, Elizabeth (2005) 'The Dynamics of the Feud over Iraq', in Andrews, David, M. ed. *The Atlantic Alliance Under Stress. US-European Relations after Iraq.* Cambridge, University Press.

Saltasuk, Johnathon (2012) *NATO and the Afghanistan Mission: Lessons for the Alliance.* Winnipeg, MB, University of Manitoba.

Schechter, Michael G. (1987) 'Leadership in international organizations: systemic, organizational and personality factors', r*eview of International Studies*, 13:3, 197-220.

Sloan, Stanley R. (2003) *NATO, the European Union, and the Atlantic Community: The Transatlantic Bargain Reconsidered.* Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Smith, Dan (1989) *Pressure: How America Runs NATO.* London: Bloomsbury.

Stuart, Douglas & Tow, William (1990) *The Limits of Alliance: NATO Out-of-Area Problems since 1949.* Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

Taggart, Paul (2006) 'Keynote Article: Questions of Europe – The Domestic Politics of the 2005 French and Dutch Referendums and their Challenge for the Study of European Integration', *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 44, 7–25.

UNSC (2003) *Resolution 1510* http://www.nato.int/isaf/topics/mandate/unscr/resolution_1510.pdf (accessed on 10 December 2014)

Waltz, Kenneth (1997) 'Evaluating Theories', *American Political Science Review,* 91: 4, 913-917.

Winter, David G. (2003). Personality and political behaviour. In D. O. Sears, L. Huddy, & R. Jervis (Eds.),
Handbook of political psychology (pp. 110–145). New York: Oxford University Press.

Wohlforth, William C. (1999) 'The Stability of a Unipolar World', *International Security*, 24: 1, 5–41.

Yost, David S. (1998) *NATO Transformed: The Alliance's New Roles in International Security.* Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press.

VII.   Appendix and notes

1.   The North Atlantic Treaty

*The Parties to this Treaty reaffirm their faith in the purposes and principles
of the Charter of the United Nations and their desire to live in peace with all
peoples and all governments.*
*They are determined to safeguard the freedom, common heritage and
civilisation of their peoples, founded on the principles of democracy,
individual liberty and the rule of law. They seek to promote stability and
well-being in the North Atlantic area.*
*They are resolved to unite their efforts for collective defence and for the
preservation of peace and security. They therefore agree to this North
Atlantic Treaty :*

Article 1

The Parties undertake, as set forth in the Charter of the United Nations, to
settle any international dispute in which they may be involved by peaceful
means in such a manner that international peace and security and justice
are not endangered, and to refrain in their international relations from the
threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the
United Nations.

Article 2

The Parties will contribute toward the further development of peaceful and
friendly international relations by strengthening their free institutions, by
bringing about a better understanding of the principles upon which these
institutions are founded, and by promoting conditions of stability and well-
being. They will seek to eliminate conflict in their international economic
policies and will encourage economic collaboration between any or all of
them.

Article 3

In order more effectively to achieve the objectives of this Treaty, the
Parties, separately and jointly, by means of continuous and effective self-
help and mutual aid, will maintain and develop their individual and collective
capacity to resist armed attack.

Article 4

The Parties will consult together whenever, in the opinion of any of them, the territorial integrity, political independence or security of any of the Parties is threatened.

Article 5

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

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

Article 6 (1)

For the purpose of Article 5, an armed attack on one or more of the Parties is deemed to include an armed attack:

- on the territory of any of the Parties in Europe or North America, on the Algerian Departments of France (2), on the territory of or on the Islands under the jurisdiction of any of the Parties in the North Atlantic area north of the Tropic of Cancer;
- on the forces, vessels, or aircraft of any of the Parties, when in or over these territories or any other area in Europe in which occupation forces of any of the Parties were stationed on the date when the Treaty entered into force or the Mediterranean Sea or the North Atlantic area north of the Tropic of Cancer.

Article 7

This Treaty does not affect, and shall not be interpreted as affecting in any way the rights and obligations under the Charter of the Parties which are members of the United Nations, or the primary responsibility of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security.

Article 8

Each Party declares that none of the international engagements now in force between it and any other of the Parties or any third State is in conflict with the provisions of this Treaty, and undertakes not to enter into any international engagement in conflict with this Treaty.

Article 9

The Parties hereby establish a Council, on which each of them shall be represented, to consider matters concerning the implementation of this Treaty. The Council shall be so organised as to be able to meet promptly at any time. The Council shall set up such subsidiary bodies as may be necessary; in particular it shall establish immediately a defence committee which shall recommend measures for the implementation of Articles 3 and 5.

Article 10

The Parties may, by unanimous agreement, invite any other European State in a position to further the principles of this Treaty and to contribute to the security of the North Atlantic area to accede to this Treaty. Any State so invited may become a Party to the Treaty by depositing its instrument of accession with the Government of the United States of America. The Government of the United States of America will inform each of the Parties of the deposit of each such instrument of accession.

Article 11

This Treaty shall be ratified and its provisions carried out by the Parties in accordance with their respective constitutional processes. The instruments of ratification shall be deposited as soon as possible with the Government of the United States of America, which will notify all the other signatories of each deposit. The Treaty shall enter into force between the States which have ratified it as soon as the ratifications of the majority of the signatories, including the ratifications of Belgium, Canada, France, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and the United States, have been deposited and shall come into effect with respect to other States on the date of the deposit of their ratifications. (³)

Article 12

After the Treaty has been in force for ten years, or at any time thereafter, the Parties shall, if any of them so requests, consult together for the purpose of reviewing the Treaty, having regard for the factors then affecting

peace and security in the North Atlantic area, including the development of universal as well as regional arrangements under the Charter of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security.

Article 13

After the Treaty has been in force for twenty years, any Party may cease to be a Party one year after its notice of denunciation has been given to the Government of the United States of America, which will inform the Governments of the other Parties of the deposit of each notice of denunciation.

Article 14

This Treaty, of which the English and French texts are equally authentic, shall be deposited in the archives of the Government of the United States of America. Duly certified copies will be transmitted by that Government to the Governments of other signatories.

1. The definition of the territories to which Article 5 applies was revised by Article 2 of the Protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty on the accession of Greece and Turkey signed on 22 October 1951.
2. On January 16, 1963, the North Atlantic Council noted that insofar as the former Algerian Departments of France were concerned, the relevant clauses of this Treaty had become inapplicable as from July 3, 1962.
3. The Treaty came into force on 24 August 1949, after the deposition of the ratifications of all signatory states.

---

[i] The coding software is downloaded from http://www.socialscienceautomation.com. All the instructions explained in one of the supporting documents are followed while conducting the actual coding.