



The Continuation of the Transatlantic Relations on the NATO Framework: A Theoretical Perspective

(With approach of the expansion of NATO to the East)

Roya Khezri*¹, Kazem Soltanahmadi²

¹ PhD in International Relations

² M.A in International Law

Received: 19 Oct 2011 ; Accepted: 13 Mar 2012

Abstract: The unity of two Atlantic sides from the birth date up to now passed too many ups and downs and now on it remains as one of the satiable and long life unity. After the 11 SEP, there were many tensions and challenges among the two Atlantic sides which face the future of this unity into the doubts and suspicions. From this point of view the existing and expansion of the NATO could be mention as a virtual challenge to the international relation Theory. After the collapse of the Soviet Union, two ways of thinking and ideology about NATO were raised. Neo - realist perspective , dissolution of NATO, Neo - liberalist perspective, the continuation of NATO and the expansion of it to the East but with some new geographical and topical change. With this regard, this paper tries to look to the cause of this continuation and the existing philosophy of NATO. The two perspective of Neo-realism and Neo- liberalism with the strategy of the NATO expansion to the east will be explained and analyzed.

Keywords: Neo-Liberalism, Neo-realism, Transatlantic, NATO Expansion, Russia.

Introduction

Termination of the cold war was caused huge and wide Transformation in the international scope and it made some changed on the process, structures and organizations. Some of these organizations had already adopted themselves with this new situation. NATO was one of the most successful organizations during the cold war which could reach to its goals and aims because NATO facilitated cooperation among its members and established a security umbrella for its members.

This organization during the 50 years of the cold war was the most important security structure in

the Euro – Atlantic Zone which showed its successions for preventing the Soviet Union and at the same time moved forward to its other goals and aims. NATO was the fruit of transformation and change after the end of the Second World War, creation of the bipolar system and the spreading the US hegemony. The new reality which was raised by changing the Maine player required this kind of new power structure based on this reality and fact. NATO as one of the best and successful unification in the international arena was on the deep concern of many neo-realist and neo - liberalist analyzer. Some other unification neither was able to adopt themselves with the new situation (after the collapse o the Soviet Union),

*Corresponding Author: dr.rkhezri@gmail.com

nor they could challenge with this new situation so they vanished from the international dictionary, par exemple Warsaw pact. But NATO was an exception which we can clearly observe the stability and transformation of unification after the fundamental change on its strategy and termination of its existing philosophy. The continuity and expansion of NATO could be mentioned as a vital challenge for the international relations theories. After the collapse of Soviet Union and termination of the cold war, two thoughts of thinking existed for the NATO pact.

1) Neorealist perspective, dissolution of NATO like its cold war era competitor, Warsaw Pact

2) Neoliberalism perspective, the continuation of NATO and the extension of it to the East but with some new geographical and topical change (such as conversion from a regional pact to global pact) and topical change (hence the pact must extend its activity from sole military issues to economical, military and political activity and create some new function for itself).

On the other hand, the anxiety of the NATO was caused by two totally opposite and contradicted results. The pro Atlantic tries to make understand that the collapse of the Soviet Union and the communist system eventually does not mean that the entire treaty from east Europe is totally gone. This group by replacing Russia federation to the Soviet Union, reasons that if Europe is facing with instability, the previous situation will be repeated. Some others (pro-European) are emphasis to non military role of the NATO and saying that this organization must take political character and become a political assembly (see: Brandon, 1992: 40-60). In this paper we try to express the reasons of the continuation of NATO and the existing philosophy of this organization after the collapse of the Soviet Union which was explained by two approaches of Neorealist and Neoliberalism and after that we will search the extension of NATO to the east and the prospect of the transatlantic to this continuity and deployment.

The Continuation of NATO from Neorealist and Neoliberalist Perspective

• Neorealist Perspective

Realist believes that the obvious deduction of risk or treaty could not weaken it and also it can not collapse that unification. This issue occurs when the integrated forces of the unification become weak and as a result the abnegation moral of all members is gone. Neorealist about the existence of unity believes to the continuation of treaty. Based on this approach, all the unity was forming in order to reply to the foreign treaty and their wide extensions depends on the continuation and intensify of treaty and the main reason of dissolution of these unity is the deduction or removal of the foreign treaty which was started from the first against it.

Mearsheimer (an aggressive realist theorist) short after the collapse of Berlin Wall predicted that NATO after fading of Soviet Union threats will replace with an effective unification. (Mearsheimer, 1990: 52).

Valtz in his presence in front of American foreign relation comity in 1990 said: "NATO is going to disappear the point is how long NATO could stay as an effective organization even it might stay just in its name not function." So for Waltz the most important question is: "How could stay alive a unity in the absences of its valuable and worthy opponent or rival" (Kay, 1998: 6).

On the bases of neorealist theory, changing in power or changing in threat which the unity was formed to combat against it, will put the unity in pressure in order to modify and make possible change in accordance. The first threat which caused the establishment of NATO, (threat from Soviet Union) after the dissolution of the Warsaw pact and collapse of the Soviet Union was gone. Based on this theory, legitimacy of NATO after the collapse of Soviet Union and elimination the primary threat was questioned. In the approach of this theory we should find the dead time of NATO

in 1991 at the same time in which the Soviet Union was collapsed.

On the other hand, all the unity has a huge amount of expediency and cost on the shoulder of the states, a neorealist calculation anticipated that all the members start separation from NATO because the threat which was justified this expends and cost was reduced and also we should look for the reduction of the relation in policy making for the key issues of unity. In first look it seems that, any behavior was predicted and in the neorealist perspective was clearly observed. The NATO member deduct their defend expense as well as the cost of boosting their forces, the debate between the member state in security issues was increased. The leadership of the US in NATO became weak and the member states pay attention to the other security organization. But from an upper approach it shows, beside of the existing debate or miss understanding, NATO stay more powerful and safe. The member states reduced their military expenses and the obligation of their own forces but despite of some limited exceptional case, all this action was done on the framework of negotiation and agreement of the unity. Beside of the internal concern for the nationalist, on the military and defend policy of the member states there was no progress and the common leadership by the US was not questioned and rejected by the other states. even the French was lost its historical objection for the leadership of the US although this country withdrew its participation in united military command in 1966 but after the cold war in 1995 French government for the propose of recovering, improving and stretching its far Atlantic relation and in a attempt to reconstruction of NATO to participate in the core of Decision-making and put its influences for the political and military direction of this organization, returned to the NATO military comity and increased its relation with the military structure of the NATO. The NATO members even at the time that some other was opposed with the policy of this pact on

the other regain agreed that the Continuity on NATO is totally useful. Accordingly Stephan M. Walt is noted that the threat might not be directed, Perceived risks but unidentified like fear of instability and insecurity cold be one of the unifying factor (Mastanduno, 1999:133-137). As a result we should wait for the Loss of coherence, weak Attenuation of the US situation in NATO, deduction of the integrity degree among the members and following its own political orientation.

Given the above discussion, the realistic Theorists believe that no military unity like NATO can continue its life without a threat or a member of common Danger. so the NATO, In the absence of threat from Soviet Union or communism, for its life continuity must reconstruct and revise its structure and make harmony with the new situation and condition after the cold war based on the new identified risks and unpredictable danger such as political instability, preventing from Ethnic strife and civil war in the Euro Zone.

Neorealist for explanation of NATO continuity, shifted from cooperation and unity to domination (hegemony theory). From the neorealist prospective, international order is not achieved by balance but achieved form Superior of power. From this perspective the space between the international structure and states or unites is not logically free or empty. So there in no institutionalized cooperation just some temporary arrangement which comes and goes with the related structure. This temporary arrangement doesn't have any inherent power so they attached themselves to the most powerful country (hegemon state). (Siedschlag, 1997: 7)

In fact, all the power is on the hand of hegemony which formulize the order and structure of the system and the Asymmetric power relation so the unities are one of these structures. From the realistic debate we can come to this conclusion that NATO will exist up to the time in which the big power agree on it. (Haglund, 1995: 665). The establishment of NATO and the continuity of it after

the cold war could be analysis in this frame. Waltz In justifying about the reason for NATO continuity said that : "the ability of this US in continuation of the life of a unity which is nearly to die, shows that how the international unity create by the big power and how they try to keep it in order to serve on behave of their Expected benefits. "He also Conclude that the expansion of NATO on the European Opinions: The European Union country are not eager to the expansion of NATO to the east but still they are staying with the decision which comes from the US The international unity established by the powerful country and they stay alive till the time that they are at the full service of their creator"(Waltz, 1998: 1& 8-9), so from neo-realist prospective, pragmatism calls for that NATO for the continuity of the US hegemony, should continue its life.

- **NeoLiberalism Prospective**

One of the Strength point which the NeoLiberal is saying the ability of this theory in expressing the stability of NATO after the cold war and their right prediction to its continuity up to the time that neo – realism theory was failed to explain a correct explanation and anticipated the fall of NATO. Theorists of NeoLiberal offered that main reason on stability of NATO in theory of Democratic Peas and believes that with this principal that the democracies are not going to war against each other, NATO as tools to expand the Democracy and finally spreading the peace and cooperation finds its suitable and professional character and must continue its existence. We should not consider NATO as security community for achieving its benefits; NATO is a society of common values in which even changing in the security era might not changes its function. (Haglund, 1995: 663)

From Neoliberal structures, one of the Variable features of each regime is Institutional. This feather is Distinguished NATO from the other unity , this organization is located at the middle of an Atlantic -security regime which lay on the US

Commitment to deterrence , Leading Defense in Europe , political co existence with soviet union and (after that) Russia and the huge military obligation of the US. All this factors was decided in acute formwork and guided carefully.

In the view Neoliberalism, NATO is a organization which passed long time from its life and in his life facilities the cooperation and supply vital benefits of its members so the countries which paid the cost of establishment and support this organization to paved its way, don't like to finalizes its function beside they have the Expectation of more positive achievements. This organization is not limited its self to a specific job and in any circumstances defined new function and this reason which NATO could exist after the collapse of the Soviet Union because this organization become enough institutionalized. The verity of functions of NATO after the cold war turns it to a security institute.

Regimes establish either by a dominate power (Hegemonic stability) or by self policy of each country based on the provision of its common attempt, reduce the short time and long time interactive cost of the members. The result is members will understand the Maintaining a regime has less expenses rather than creating a new regime (Keohane, 1998: 101-2).

The country with the expectation of reachable cooperation paid too much amount of money in other to create organization like NATO. They fully aware that the cost of creating a new regime is more than the cost of maintaining an existing regime so it can be predictable that the institution can prolong its existence in a different situation. When a foreign threat which the organization carat to combat against it is gone, if that organization could change its institutionalized behavior in other to put its positive affect. We can see the continuity of that organization (Wallander, 2000: 705-735)

Therefore NATO is helping to the common defend attempt of its members with Appearance of

new common expectations and create a new action mechanism, so the need of replying to the foreign threat by security cooperation is reduced. Hence the situation which cause creating a new regime might be change but that regime could stay longer because the advantages which was provided is important to perpetuate. the neo liberal approach will go to this result that beside of looking for termination of NATO, we should see that NATO is moving toward a new direction and creation of a new institution and at the same time tries to use the existing mechanism in other to increase its previous succession to fight with the future possible problems. The NATO member could anticipate in the time of facing a new problem, refer to the existing mechanism rather than bringing new institution. This possibility is there that maybe some player wants to escape from new economical and political cost so they don't prefer going forward new institution so they refer to the available one.

Expansion of new institution will cost a lot. NATO believes that this cost paid before so the member state beside of making a new institute, must refer to this organization and do their best to make necessary change on it. in this regard, despite of the available imagination (wreaking of organization after dismiss of its foreign threat) NATO converted to new institute which emphasis more on reduction of threat and preventing from any possible tension rather than focusing to combat and fight with the threat. (Nelson /szayna, 1997). Neoliberalism approach suggests that the NATO member should act in this manner:

- 1) Beside of creating new rules and norms, use the existing internal rules and norm of NATO in other to do proper Collision with the new threat.
- 2) NATO amendments such as reduction and minimizing the organization in other to combat with the difficulties in which the existing structure could not solve it.
- 3) Using this regime as a principal of connecting the governmental and non governmental players in

other to follow the regimes common goals and decreasing conflicts among them.

The NATO Expansion and Acceptance of New Members

The negative Processes on internal tension, Growth of threat of fundamental nationalism, racism and Ethnicity and other crises which has the potential of occurring as a security challenge in east Europe, concern the idea of NATO expansion to the east Europe. NATO members believes that the acceptance of new members in on hand will remove all kind of idea logic and political separation of the world war era and will expand democracy and freedom in these countries and on the hand it will Augment the motivation of these country and the other requesting country to enter in this organization to follow up the political, military and military developments. With concentrating to this theory the members of this organization has totally agreed with this geographical expansion. In the 5 DEC 1995 session, NATO foreign ministers meeting suggest acceptance of new member from east and central Europe in order to extend western democratic cooperation and increase the NATO power. In this session the plan of NATO expansion to the east was officially declared.

The common Pointe of all the countries known as NATO member is: trusting to the economical, political and ideological liberal capitalism so the requesting century which following membership of NATO, in case of fulfilling these requirement or Criteria, could be accepting as a new member of this unity.

- 1) Establishment democracy, domination the free economic, nonmilitary control over the military forces, solving minatory problems and border dispute settlement.
- 2) Defend structure amendment, increasing military ability, safety exchange of crucial military and political documents.

3) Sufficient defend budget and possibility of supporting any extra military cost.

4) Coordination of domestic laws with the deposit obligation to the NATO.

In fact after collapse of the Soviet Union and exiting east Europe countries from direct sphere of influence of Moscow, the situation to expansion of comparative capitalism was provided. Be note that comparative capitalism could not run in any country with any situation as a dominated economical, political and cultural system. Hence the requested country to the capital liberalism group must have specific condition, so the country which is requesting the NATO member ship also must have specific condition. These specific conditions must be realized in three economical, political and cultural spheres. Requested country must enjoy from a significant industrial growth with the comparative capitalism Index. And in political sphere that country must put its policy at the same route which the capital liberal counties done and based on ideological and cultural framework, the said country not only must accept the liberalism framework but also must perform it completely. With respect to these factors, 3 countries such as Poland, Hungry and Check republic was recognized as the best nominee for accepting in NATO at the first step. (Taeb, 2002: 511-512) and on the 8TH Jul 1997 NATO invited them to join in this organization.

In 1999, NATO in its 50 anniversary of establishment officially approved their membership and declares the process of NATO expansion to the east will continue. in Prague secession on NOV 2002 leader of NATO countries officially invited from 7 country like Bulgaria , Estonia , Latonia, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia to join to this unity (www.Nato,2204). On 2nd Apr 2004 these seven countries joined in NATO. In 2009 2 other century (Albania, Croatia) joins in NATO. Now NATO has 28 members.

The Russia–NATO Relation about Expansion’ Policy to the East

Russian Authorities at first glance from 1993 with this Reason that expansion of NATO to the east is completely contradict with their national security, express their objection to this plan from 1993. the Maine concern of Russia is creating a new division in the Europe because they believe that the expansion of NATO to the east and membership of Baltic countries is a threat to the Russian security and if the Baltic countries as a member of NATO, this unity will reach to the Russian border so Russia could not tolerated it and stay neutral to this issue. Russia also concern that NATO is moving toward the decreasing Russian role in Europe affairs. NATO tries to convince Russia that its expansion to the east policy is reflecting its interests and benefits as much as the benefits of NATO members. (Farsaei ,2003: 92)

Any how NATO is not looking for omitting the Russia from European security system but NATO wants Russia as a counter who is following the process of making a democratic society and implementing political and economical reform. From NATO perspective especially US point of view, isolation of Russia will harm the other members because this issue will run Russia to the military policy so Russia must participated to the European security system. NATO wants to ensure Russia that the expansion of NATO to the east is just for the purpose of increasing the security in Europe and the NATO member states believes that increasing on the level of security in Europe will help the extension of peace and security all over the world so the expansion of NATO not only doesn’t mean the Russian limitation or isolation but also it will defiantly help Europe to reach to the peace and stability, Which Russia also will benefit from it. In this regard Russia had joined in participation program for peace on 22 JUL 1994 and on the DEC of the same year made a bilateral agreement with NATO about participation pro-

gram. After signing this agreement, Russia officially starts cooperating with NATO.

After becoming Russia as a partner of NATO in participation program for peace, NATO tries to give a specific and unique position to Russia. Since Russia is looking to get this position, in 27 MAY 1997 in Paris, the primary document of Interrelationships the cooperation and security between NATO and the Russian federation was signed. Based on this primary document, NATO and Russian federation in the highest level pledged that on the basis of people principal and collective security is trying to establish and keep peace in Euro – Atlantic. The introduction of this document comes "they are not competitors to each other any more and they are going to put backside the bad affects which left from their competition era with a new Strengthen confidence and more cooperation this document shows their eagerness and anxious to establish one stable, peaceful and united Europe. The free and united Europe is showing the highest political elements for starting new fundamental relation for its people"(www.nato,2008/5/22).

For decreasing the background of tensions and understanding the common interest and providing peace and security, following these principal is obligatory:

- 1) Development on the base transparency, power participation with equality and stability and cooperation for Reinforcement security in Euro-Atlantic.

- 2) Political Pluralism, Rule of Law, and respect to human rights and improving free market.

- 3) Respect to sovereignty. Independent and territorial integrity of all states, and their natural rights for choosing the proper tools to provide their own security.

- 4) Bilateral transparency in unity and implementing defend policy and military Teachings.

- 5) Preventing from any conflict and using the peaceful settlement of dispute based on the regulation ruled by UN and ESCO (European security and cooperation organization.)

Full protection of peace keeping operation under the supervision of Security Council of the UN or under the responsibility of (European security and cooperation organization (Yazdanfam, 2002: 14)

Finally due to the article 12 of the NATO–Russia agreement, a permanent Russia–NATO common comity established which a consultative mechanism in order to coordinate and make a common decision will be create. The Main goal of establishing this consultative mechanism is to increase trust of each party on the framework of this council with respect of rules of laws.

The council is the palace of viewing and reviewing any threat against territorial integrity, political independence or member's security in order to inform each other the possibility of any security challenge. The Main document doesn't recognize any VATO system to implement or refusing to implement any decisions or independent action for any side. addition to that NATO has given a special provision to Russia that is: Implied Consent of the United States to join Russia in (WTO) world trade organization as a member and acceptance of this country in Group 7 (after joining Russia to this group, the name shifted to Group 8) was some of the action in order to attract and absorb of Russia.

In Vladimir Putin government, in Russia, a new step in bilateral relation of Russia-NATO was taken. In this filed in ROM session on 28TH MAY 2002, the permanent Russia– NATO common comity was replaced with the Russia–NATO council. In this council all members of NATO and Russia are participated. (NATO document, 2002). After creating this council, Russia officially becomes NATO's security partner.

In Russia–NATO council, members act as equal partner in the common interest and their aims is to create a new level of relation in which Russia enjoys the same rights with the other in different filed like crises managements and Arms Control (Karami, 2003: 134)

The Transatlantic Views about NATO Continuity, Expansion and Change

Transatlantism or General correlation of west Europe and US inspired from historical tradition, common political-cultural Heritage and economical and strategic necessity. It was the result of European Wane in international policy after the World War II and the hegemonic domination to the west part of this ancient continent.

In this era, the united state with the expansion of its political, military and economical capability on west Europe and considering this part as a part of its universal foreign policy, tries to get the leadership of the west Europe by forming transatlantic integration. The European countries if fully in need of this strategic connection on order to reconstruct their economy, Encounter with the threat of Soviet Union and Overcoming to the nationalist tendency of European State-nation.

The Atlantic unification was a kind of unequal and unbalances integration it means that US designate its own Geopolitics scope and at the same time tried to decrease the European domination of doing any kind of maneuvering and attempt as a regional unity in the field of economy and trade beside of that , after the attrition empowerment of the European countries in economy in the process of west Europe integration from 60 decade, and conversion of this unity to a successful economic power, west Europe start its attempt to achieve new position at its disposal situation . So these countries made a sort an equal policy toward the US which faces the Atlantic relation with some crises. Termination of cold war and fading of bipolar system caused the existing policy of Athleticism and the necessity of previous strategy on a doubt and suspicious. The European as far as running their European integration policy instead of Atlantic integration and Convergence, had taken some new steps to become the Maine architect of their ancient continent and express different opinion on international relation so the growing in-

fluence of EU after the cold war, explain new definition on the transatlantic relation .

With the Friability of universal political order, lack of common foreign policy, unsuccessfulness of EU to manage the BALKAN crises, The ambiguity about the future of this old continent, had forces the EU to prolong its traditional relation with Washington.

NATO had created different approach on its transatlantic allies based on their perspective which some time has contradiction with the others view. For The US, NATO is a proper place to keep and expand its military appearances in Europe, on the other hand Russia believes that NATO will run its country to the corner and isolated it, most of the east and central European countries look to the NATO as a defend shield in front of future east instability and no acceptance of Russia interface in the regional affairs and seriously following the membership of this unity.

Generally, about the role, continuation and NATO expansion different ideas are existed which could be divided in two Categories:

A: pro-European (Europeanism)

B: pro-Transatlantic (Atlanticism)

Europeanism believes that the Europe share in decision making in NATO must increase and this unification must expand and perform its different ability of performance out of NATO zone. This idea especially the idea of US role in NATO is not common in all NATO members. Some of them requested American active participation in NATO and the others want European security unification. the first group which England is the leader, wants Americans active role in European Security arrangements but the second group which French is leading it, is looking for European more participation and activeness in achieving of new European security plane. This group believes that NATO still is on need but other European institute such as EU must be in priority. French believes that just serious and apparent determinations of Europe and their Defensive capability to defend

themselves, could establish a new relation in Atlantic zone though they try to argue and promote the EU. (Grant, 1997: 62/Asmus, 1993: 33)

In NATO security and defense policy, France doesn't agree to turn NATO as a global organization. French foreign policy goals and its perspective to NATO, is more concentrated on Autonomy. In this regard two main principal of French foreign policy aims are:

- Following European integration to ensure stability and Prosperity of Europe continent
- Encouraging development towards peace, democracy and development inside international community. With respect to the mentioned aims and its background and function, France has fewer tendencies to NATO and generally support the independent European defensive capability from European security and defense policy.

On the other hand, the Atlantic believes that NATO must stay as a major institute to provide European defense policy. Their reasoning based on hegemonic stability in which to continue in international order and regime, a hegemonic power (the US) is needed. The British as well as the Americans believe that the American direct participation for European security still is vital and NATO paved the way of American participation in European security. Based on this theory NATO must prolong and Restructure its structure and act as main column of the new European security structure. After collapse of Soviet Union and reduction of nuclear deterrents, may be it's a proper time to deliver the command of forces and NATO secretariat to Europe but it will be benefit of Europe if the US keep some of its forces in this continent. The Netherlands and Portugal are supporting England's position (Clark, 1998).

Basically England as a close ally of the US from World War II and establishment of NATO, look a founder stone of its defense and security policy. NATO for England is very important and essential because a powerful Atlantic unity such

as a European influential column for its interest is fully needed (Ministry of defense, 1995: 12)

From England's perspective NATO's success as a base for collective security could not be achieved easily so NATO must change because in recent time more threat and is threatening Europe rather than the cold war era.

Russia's attitude to NATO is recognizing the value of closer unity to this unification so there was a slight disagreement especially after 11 SEP 2001 was raised by Russia because of its concern to the Balkan countries and NATO's expansion.

From the perspective of Russia the new form of international relation on the format of NATO-Russia council will strengthen the global peace and security. Once we are observing this unification, Russia wants to find more information regarding the purpose of NATO expansion in order to engage itself more positively in the political decisions.

However, there are some opposition areas, Russia does not consider NATO's expansion as an urgent threat to its national security but Russian opposition believes that this aim (expansion of NATO) will weaken the strategic stability system.

Russian desire to see new identity of NATO not in the favor of a big military organization to combat with new threats but toward a political organization in which Russia will play equal role than the other players.

By any means, supporter of NATO continuity, change and expansion, especially American analysis, rise this issue that the threat against European security and capitalism word is not removed but new threats are threatening west security. Editors of American national security strategy believe that in 21 century the global balance key is located in Europe. From Americans perspective the main factor in new peace structure is continuity of NATO pact. This pact formed some sort of Foundation work and cooperation between the transatlantic countries. In this regard, the decision of strengthening NATO and expansion of it in order

to keep and support national independence and sustainable freedom of the east Europe countries to maintain a new peace structure was made. American's attempt to expand NATO to the east could be stabilizing the Easter countries and will help NATO Survival and finally it will cause Americans presence in Europe.

Conclusion

In particular from neo-liberalism prospective, NATO must prolong because in addition to its security function, NATO must act positively and professionally as a security regime and multi functional institution, in order to extend co - existing with Russia, facilitate transatlantic relation and make a kind relaxation between them, expand western values and maintain security and uses the new norms to combat with the new challenges. NATO as a successful organization, after institutional adoption, beside of keeping its previous function, assumed new function. Some of the previous functions are: continuity to play the role of providing security and collective defensive, transparency the relation between the unity members, control some of the unity members, keeping the US in Europe... These mentioned function continued and at the same time this organization accepts some new function like stabilizing in previous east block, humanitarian interference, expansion of democracy.

Though the new definition of security and threat was offered after the cold war, in which threat still exist for the member states of NATO and this definition of threats finds Variety of qualitative and quantitative. In new definition some threat such as terrorism, fundamental nationalism. Political instability, Tribunal dispute, Proliferation of mass destruction weapons was concern as important factors in providing states security. Technical improvements also increase the number of states which potentially threatening international peace and security (Solana, 1999, :13-22)

As it was seen, the definition and Inclusion of threat to NATO members was spreading widely. This point was emphasizes the existence philosophy of NATO as a sole organization who is able to relatively ensure facing and combating with these threats (Hunter, 1999: 129-203)

On the other hand, changing in the quality of these threats, required to establish new structure to fight with it and make proper amendment and reform. These reforms might include in the field of extension on geographical area, NATO forces structural reform, participation among NATO or with other states and also empowering on responsibility and missions of this organization in crises managements and collective security measures.

So NATO on its strategic direction shows continuity and prosperity. Even in the absence of foreign threats, the member states still relay on it as a valuable and worthy organization. Even at some specific time when some members are oppose to its expansion policy in deferent region, they clearly acknowledge that the continuity of NATO is useful and the do their best to extend the special function and goals of this organization. Neo-realistic theory could not anticipate that a unity in order to decrease the amount of threats could do so, establishing NATO and participation of this organization in peace process are some elements that NATO members put value to this organizations activity and they are eagerly required its continuity.

In fact both Europe and America need to cooperate with each other and they won't benefit from disputes and conflicts. So despite of having some disagreement and deferent approach to NATO expansion, continuity and change, we can observe that there is a good and deep cooperation between the two Atlantic side countries.

Finally with concern to the Evolution and change in international system, improving NATO–Russia relation not only required western investment in Russian economy but also it need to recognize role and importance of Russia as a vital

player in Euro–Atlantic security filed. The reality is that not only NATO is going to expand toward west but also the process of participation of common wealth countries in central Asia in western security and political structure is irreversible.

References

- Agreements of NATO and Russia , 1997, political expiration monthly, 2 year, number 21.
- Asgarkhani, Abomohammad (2004) "international regimes", Tehran, Abrar Moaser Tehran publication.
- Asmus, Ronald and Kugler, R (1993), "Building a New NATO", *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 72, No. 4, Oct/Sep.
- Brandon, Henry. ed. (1992), *In Search of a New World Order: The Future of US–European Relations*, the Brookings Institution, Washington D. C.
- Clark, Micheal.(1998), "Britain", in Brenner, M.(ed.),*NATO and Collective Security*, London: Macmillan Press Ltd .
- Farsaei , shahram (2003) "the European Union new change in security and politic ". Tehran, office of international and political studies ministry of foreign affairs
- Grant , Robert.(1997), "France's New Relationship With NATO",in Gordon,Ph.(ed.) *Nato's Transformation: The Changing Shape of the Atlantic Alliance* , New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Haglund, David. (1995),"Must Nato Fail?" International Journal, Winter.
- Hunter,Robert.(1999), "Maximizing NATO, A Relevant Alliance Knows How to Retrench", *Foreign Affairs*,vol.78,No.3,May-June.
- karami , jahangir (2004) "Russian security policy and NATO issues" journal of defend guidance, 2 year, number 2, number 3, spring.
- Kay, Sean. (1998), *Nato and the Future of European Security*, New York: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.
- Keohan , R.(1989),*International Institutions and State Power: Essays in International Relations Theory*, Boulder, Col: Westview.
- Mastanduno, Michael .ed, (1999), *Unipolar Politics: Realism and State Strategies after the Cold War*, Columbia: Columbia University Press.
- Mearsheimer, J. (1990), "Back to the Future: Instability after the Cold War", *International Security*, 15 (1).
- Ministry of Defense, "Defense White Paper 1999", CM 4446,December 1999.
- Nato. (2002), Prague Summit Declaration, November 21, in: <http://www.expandnato.Org/decpraha.htm> 1.
- Nato. (2008/5/22), http://www.nato.int/docu/basicxt/findact_a.htm. (Accessed on 2008/5/22).
- Nato Document. (2002, May 28), Declaration by Heads of State and Government of NATO Member States and the Russian Federation, NATO-Russia Relations: A New Quality, Rome.in: <http://www.nato.int/docu/basicxt/b020528e.htm>.
- Nelson, Daniel and Szayna , Thamas. (1997), "The Politics of Nato Enlargement", in *Nato Enlargment: The National Debates over Ratifications*, A Conference, 7 Oct.
- Palmer,John.(1987),*Europe Without America? The Crisis in the Atlantic Relation*,Oxford:Oxford University Press.
- Siedschlag, Alexander. (1997), *The System-changing Europe: Theoretical and Political Consequences for the future Role of Nato*, Berlin: Humboldt University Press.
- Solana, Javier. (1999),"NATO in the Twenty First Century", *perception*,Vol. IV, No.1, March-May.
- Taeb, saeid (2002) "expansion of NATO to the east and the possible scenario" journal of foreign policy, 16 year, number 2 Summer 2002.
- Terevercon,Gregory.(1990), *Europe and America Beyond 2000*,New York: Council on Foreign Relation Press.

Wallander , C.(2000) ,"International Asserts and Adaptability: Nato After the Cold war ", *International organization*, Autumn.

Waltz, k.(1998),"The Balance of Power and Ex-pantion", University of California *Working Paper* .October.

Yazdanfam , mahmoud (2002) "NATO and Russian from conflict to unity" *Neghah* monthly number 21.

Roya Khezri

Is an official in foreign affairs ministry and received PhD in International Relations from Islamic Azad University, Sciences and Researches Branch, 2008.



Kazem Soltanahmadi

Has M.A in International Law From Islamic Azad University.

