

Australia and NATO after Afghanistan¹

Lieutenant William Leben, Australian Army

Introduction

In February 2013, Australia and NATO signed the 'Individual Partnership and Cooperation Programme between Australia and NATO'.² Although the agreement followed an unprecedented level of Australian involvement in the NATO-led International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) in Afghanistan, this significant relationship has received little scrutiny. However, given the renewed emphasis on international engagement in the *Defence White Paper 2016*,³ it would seem prudent to seek a nuanced understanding of Australia's relationship with NATO.

Foreign Minister Julie Bishop has characterised the relationship as a 'natural' one.⁴ NATO policy makers have made similar characterisations, with some commentators calling for full Australian membership of NATO.⁵ On the other hand, Stephan Frühling and Benjamin Schreer have challenged the 'natural' characterisation, while Hugh White has gone so far to suggest that:

The speed-dating infatuation between Australia and NATO is just one more sign of ... our strategic distraction, in the face of the perplexing power politics of the Asian century.⁶

This article analyses the future of the relationship between Australia and NATO, exploring it in three sections: political engagement, risks and military consideration. It argues that for Australia, the partnership agreement represents a unique relationship, with attendant opportunities and risks. It contends that the relationship is valuable because it nests within the long-recognised value of international institutions for a middle power such as Australia.⁷ It concludes that while Australia has little or no ability to impact the broad direction of NATO, its partner status provides specific leverage and access relevant to its own strategic priorities.

Political engagement

The agreement signed between Australia and NATO in February 2013 stipulates that:

In pursuit of mutual benefit, Australia and NATO undertake this Partnership to: promote understanding through consultation; stabilise post-conflict situations; support reconstruction and facilitate humanitarian assistance and disaster relief; and, as appropriate, enhance interoperability, create opportunities for technological or scientific exchange and build capacity through personnel exchange, education and training.⁸

The trajectory signalled by the agreement was reinforced by the so-called 'enhanced opportunity partnership' announced at NATO's summit in Wales in September 2014, with the post-summit declaration noting that:

[NATO] Defence Ministers also met with five partners [Australia, Finland, Georgia, Jordan and Sweden] that make particularly significant contributions to NATO operations to discuss further deepening dialogue and practical cooperation as part of the enhanced opportunities within the Partnership Interoperability Initiative.⁹

While the 'enhanced opportunities' were not further articulated, it is clear that this status was not offered to all partner countries (which include, for example, South Korea, Japan and New Zealand), including some who also worked within ISAF. This should be seen as a signal that the gains in interoperability and access developed during ISAF have been consolidated in Australia's case, and are indicative of genuine intent from both parties in strengthening cooperation.

Nevertheless, in an address to the North Atlantic Council in April 2015, Foreign Minister Bishop made clear Australia's interest in the relationship being a 'two-way street', contending that:

An integral aspect of an Enhanced Partnership for Australia will be NATO's willingness to respond similarly to Australia requests, where it is in our shared interest.... This reciprocity has much to offer NATO in return—for instance, by improving member-states' understanding of the vital Indo-Pacific and East Asia region.¹⁰

The place of the Australia-NATO partnership agreement within broader Australian policy has also come under attack from some as a distraction from Australia's real priorities. White has also suggested that Australia-NATO cooperation represents 'the last dying embers of Europe's aspirations for global influence'.¹¹ White is no doubt correct in pointing out that Asian economic growth means that old centres of power are now in relative decline.¹² Such criticisms, however, should be moderated, and predictions of NATO's demise should be regarded sceptically.

While serious problems remain, for instance in a lack of burden-sharing in global missions, it is not easy to conclude that NATO is largely irrelevant, soon to pass or set to withdraw back to European boundaries, as some would argue.¹³ Indeed, even if NATO's influence is in decline, Australia's engagement with it offers more benefits than costs.¹⁴

Similarly, there can be no dispute that Australia's strategic priorities reside primarily with her closest neighbours and within the Indo-Pacific region, as asserted in the most recent Defence White Paper.¹⁵ This has been affirmed in various other forums. For example, the Secretary of the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade has clearly identified Australia's relationships with the US, China, Japan, India and Indonesia as its strategic priorities.¹⁶ More broadly, and over the past several years, policy initiatives from both major parties have signalled a consensus that Australia's strategic future lies in Asia, increasingly framed around the concept of the Indo-Pacific, with similar messages about regional priorities and the continuing primacy of the US alliance.¹⁷

However, this set of strategic priorities establishes Australia and NATO's partnership as unique, not necessarily as a distraction. Australia is clearly removed from the European partners that characterised NATO enlargement after the Cold War. The suggestions of a few commentators excepted, serious consideration has never been given to Australian membership of the alliance. With no consideration given by Australia to reciprocal commitment to matters of European defence, European security issues have, understandably, barely featured in discussion between Australia and NATO. Australia's gaze has been and continues to be on the global rather than European face of contemporary NATO, although the MH17 incident, to which this article will return shortly, demonstrated that Australia remains involved in European interests.

More importantly, while the language of the partnership—and the words of both Australian and NATO officials—purportedly situates Australia's relationship within NATO's framework of various partners around the globe, the factors shaping the relationship uniquely position Australia. Of the middle-power partners, Australia is the most geographically distant and enjoys a very strong relationship with the US. The few other partners with a shared history in ISAF, an Indo-Pacific perspective and a relationship with the US, are on different trajectories with NATO.

For example, working with NATO is of lower priority for South Korea than Australia, while New Zealand's future intentions are unclear. Japanese sensitivities on the use of their armed forces impede potential participation in NATO operations, despite Japanese enthusiasm for cooperation.¹⁸ And unlike some other partners, for instance Mongolia, the Australia-NATO relationship is not characterised by a defence capacity-building focus.

In this light, the partnership is most importantly about positioning Australia within the international system. Australian involvement in events in Libya and the Ukraine has provided clear evidence that despite a broad policy priority for Australia in the Indo-Pacific, the rhetoric of global security in Australian defence and security planning will continue to be tested. While Australia did not contribute in military terms to NATO's Libya operation in 2011, Australia was one of the largest aid donors in support of that mission. That some may ascribe this wholly to Australia's involvement with the UN Security Council in this period merely demonstrates that Australian actions as a global security player are likely to continue to bring it into contact with NATO.¹⁹

More recently, Australia's response to Russia's actions in Ukraine occurred in large degree through its NATO connections. Australia's Foreign Affairs and Defence Ministers both attended high-level NATO meetings shortly following the downing of MH17 in July 2014. Australian Federal Police and military elements were involved in investigations on the ground following the disaster. As one interlocutor observed, both the actions and rhetoric of the Australian Government at the time were much more robust than expected. Most recently, NATO has taken a limited role in the ongoing crisis in Iraq, where Australia is also playing a role.

This kind of incidental occurrence, along with potential involvement in NATO-led or NATO-involved missions, seems to be indicative of future interactions. In the continuing context of unpredictable global security issues, the modest leverage provided to Australia by its relationship with NATO would seem to be both useful and important in maintaining Australia's role as a constructive middle power in international affairs.

While critics such as White underplay this perspective, practitioners emphasise the low relative cost of maintaining the relationship, catalysed by Afghanistan, with substantial benefits that nest within regional strategic priorities. For example, during his time as Ambassador to NATO, Duncan Lewis introduced the idea of the 'pilot light setting', with the relationship represented by the partnership at 'low burn' but ready to be 'turned up' if operational requirements demand it.²⁰ And even when the pilot light is turned down, valuable military exchanges, science and technology cooperation, and interoperability efforts continue with little visibility.

Moreover, while NATO has taken a limited interest in the Asia-Pacific, relevant Australian representatives remain acutely conscious that this region is the prime concern for the Australian government. Foreign Minister Bishop's remarks quoted above are the most notable public expression that the importance of Australia's regional concerns underwrite its ties with NATO. This does not suggest that Australia envisages an ISAF-type operation in the Indo-Pacific in coming years. Instead, it means the potential for modest contributions of single aircraft or specialist personnel to Australian-led regional efforts, as well as Australian involvement in NATO activities such as Indian Ocean anti-piracy activities.²¹

It also means advocating at the working level, on a day-to-day basis, why European players should take an interest in the economic hub that is the Indian Ocean, in the same way that Australia took an interest in Russian actions in Eastern Europe. The broad rhetoric of shared interests disguises more concrete strategic priorities served by the partnership. In the first instance, this strategic priority is cooperation in the Indo-Pacific. But additionally, as recent events have demonstrated, Australia will be likely to continue to be drawn into global crises, both because of a risk management security outlook and the US alliance. The need to influence decision making in whatever operations eventuate is concrete.

None of this cooperation undermines the primacy of the US alliance in Australian policy. Australia will continue to support American operations, as evidenced by its return to Iraq in 2014-15. But Libya has also demonstrated that American involvement is increasingly likely to be conducted in a so-called 'lead from behind' fashion. That is, while American power might be responsible for much of the policy and key capabilities at play, organisations such as NATO and other states (for example, Britain and France in Libya) will provide the visible 'lead' for the operation.²²

As was pointed out by one senior officer interviewed, the cost of maintaining even a two-star officer and a 'splattering of staff' in Brussels is very small. With such a presence, Australia is more favourably positioned to foresee developments and shape responses to crises in the global commons that are likely, owing to both the US alliance and Australia's interest in a rules-based global order, to raise the prospect of some Australian response.

Further, and counter-intuitively, presence and engagement might actually allow Australia to avoid entanglement in some crises, rather than represent a distraction. Actually having personnel in Brussels, as well as embedded in NATO headquarters, to 'sense and feel' developing crises and the thinking of key players, is hard to quantify but important. These relationships allow access that would otherwise whither against NATO's structural tendency to work simply at the

deliberation of its 28 member states alone, noting that even after ISAF, access within NATO to certain levels of classification and discussion reportedly remains 'very difficult'. An additional benefit of this presence is that it opens other bilateral doors, with high-level multilateral meetings as well as a small permanent presence in the multilateral environment allowing bilateral contacts with constituent countries Australia would otherwise struggle to engage with.²³

At the very least, it is important to remember that NATO remains the world's 'premier' military alliance. While NATO is unlikely to be a major player in Indo-Pacific crises, in an era in which 'self-reliance' is an increasingly outdated concept in Australian defence planning, maintaining a relationship with NATO (as well as, by extension, many NATO member countries) is a modest enabler that positions Australia more favourably to react to global crises.²⁴ Rather than as a temporary expedient, the Australia-NATO relationship can be seen as a broad-based adjunct to Australia's priority focus on the US alliance and the Indo-Pacific region. As articulated by a senior ADF officer interviewed for this article:

It's really about having linkages and networks that provide opportunity. That's the main relationship benefit ... a set of multidimensional security collectives and arrangements, because the US' interests won't always align with ours.

Treading carefully: risks

The unique position represented by the partnership also entails political risks and potential downsides that deserve as much attention as the opportunities. Australia does not want to stumble its way into a diplomatic bind.

First, the priority for the Indo-Pacific that Australia must bring to its relationship with NATO in coming years, conversely reflects a potential blind spot. Australia must tread carefully: given the stated intent of the Foreign Minister, what kind of NATO involvement does Australia want in the Indo-Pacific? Australia must be careful what it becomes a broker for, and remain attentive to the mutual perceptions between Asia and Europe that cut across strategic interest calculations. Colonial memories continue to affect European-Asian political dynamics. For instance, in the examples analysed by Evi Fitriani:

The memory of colonial history could not be detached by either the Asian or European participants.... [T]he Asians tended to perceive that the Europeans approached them usually for 'material' motives, while the Europeans behaved as if they need to teach Asia how the world works.²⁵

Sebastian Bersick has examined similar issues of perception between Europe and Asia.²⁶ No-one is suggesting that NATO's interest in the Indo-Pacific in coming years will take the form of an 'ISAF in Asia'. Similarly, no-one is suggesting that NATO will have any relevance comparable to the US or China in carving out the emergent order in the Indo-Pacific. Nonetheless, given such delicate issues of mutual perception, Australia must be careful about the broker it becomes. This is especially true given that the NATO and European positions on already delicate regional issues involving the US and Australia, such as South China Sea territorial claims, are as yet unclear.²⁷

Turning away from the Indo-Pacific, what has been completely absent from the discussion of the Australia-NATO relationship is Australia's position on European security issues and Russia. Official documentation has very much focused on shared interests in global security issues. This risks forgetting that for NATO, although the Cold War may be some years gone, the Russia of Putin in 2016 is the prime security concern.

Australia's unique position needs to grapple with the primacy of concern over Russian actions for many NATO members, despite its relative lack of importance for Australia, as a distant partner lacking collective defence obligations. The tone of former Prime Minister Abbott's remarks about 'shirt fronting' President Putin suggest that the current level of consideration given to Russian actions within Australian policy may be somewhat lean.²⁸ There are at least two aspects to this concern.

First, is Australia part of the problem? Australian strategic planners need to be attentive to NATO's post-Cold War expansion and the vocal warnings that a Russian security dilemma could result. While Australia's partnership with NATO does not add to any perceived or real territorial encirclement of Russia by NATO, Australian rhetoric has positioned it within the broader group of Western states—which are, in the main, US allies—seen as hostile by Putin's Russia.

Former Prime Minister Abbott's remarks and the Foreign Minister's condemnation of Russian actions are key examples in this regard. The symbol of the partnership between Australia and NATO reflects this alignment with European NATO, even though it in no way represents collective defence obligations. Australia's stance in this regard is not, of course, going to exert a decisive impact on the course of developments in Eastern Europe. Thoughtful Australian policymakers should nonetheless be conscious of this issue.

Secondly, what should Australia do if escalation occurs? Paul Dibb has argued that Australian policymakers currently regard Russian actions too dismissively.²⁹ This is not to say that Russia is as important for Australian policymakers as for their European counterparts. As Dibb has argued, however, Australia should give serious consideration to what its response should be if the security environment in Europe continues to deteriorate. While priority might remain with the 'defence of Australia' and regional security, Australian interest in a rules-based global order is genuine.

Additionally, any conventional military action by Russia in Eastern Europe, improbable but not fanciful, would raise the real prospect of an American military response.³⁰ In view of these commitments to both the global order and the US alliance, conflict in Europe could well raise the prospect of some Australian contribution, however small. Australian policymakers should thus think seriously about any Australian response to a potential escalation of conflict in Ukraine and Eastern Europe. This is another small area of confluence between Australia and NATO; not one that should consume Australian planners but one they should not dismiss entirely.

In the incremental development of the Australia-NATO relationship, catalysed by Afghanistan, Australian policymakers did not necessarily grapple with broader questions surrounding a relationship with NATO. With the partnership cementing the relationship into the future, Australian analysts should now turn more seriously to these questions.

Military considerations

The political considerations discussed above should have primacy in deliberations on the future of Australia-NATO ties. Military considerations, however, cannot be ignored. Interoperability is and has always been a key issue for both Australia and NATO within their separate domains, and they have cooperated incidentally in this regard in years past. As such, it is unsurprising that it has been touted as a benefit of cooperation.

What has changed for NATO is the development of interoperability with global rather than European allies, as it has begun to conduct out-of-area missions. As John Deni has argued, Afghanistan provided something of a large-scale, live interoperability workshop for the transatlantic allies.³¹ Even with such a workshop, the difficulty NATO faced in maintaining a truly coherent approach has been documented extensively. Peter Jakobsen, for example, has argued that there were many conflicting understandings of counterinsurgency at play within the ISAF mission, under the rubric of NATO's 'comprehensive approach'.³²

Additionally, some have suggested that NATO headquarters on operations are dynamic, while its functioning in Brussels can be somewhat Byzantine as different parties tug for influence.³³ There are thus a number of reasons why interoperability with NATO is attractive: retaining lessons hard won in Afghanistan, staying abreast of NATO's complexity at the military headquarters level, and simply obtaining broader interoperability for the ADF.

The military interoperability aspect of the relationship should, however, be kept in careful perspective. The prime interoperability concern for Australia has been and continues to lie with the US. While the prospect of seamless integration with potential partner militaries around the

world is an attractive one, hard choices have to be made: interoperability with one partner likely means incompatibility with some others.³⁴

As such, the ADF is best off keeping its interoperability priority in alignment with prime Australian strategic priorities—the US and the region. Additionally, achieving a good level of interoperability with the US does represent a certain level of commonality with NATO, as many NATO partners also buy American capabilities, and this provides some mitigation against divergence from NATO standards.

This overlap is reinforced by Australia's participation in other interoperability agreements. The ABCA Armies program is a longstanding arrangement designed to allow the sharing of technical and operating information between the US, Australia, the UK, Canada, and most recently New Zealand.³⁵ There are also extant arrangements that facilitate the sharing of classified information among key Australian partners, most importantly the so-called 'five eyes' arrangement. Specific areas in which gains can be obtained, for instance in leveraging NATO's leadership in cyber security issues, should be the focus of tightly-limited interoperability efforts.³⁶

In this light, and keeping military interoperability in line with broader strategic priorities for Australia, it is useful to recall one interviewed officer's contention that 'the question is really how Australia can best influence NATO'. The relationships established at the military level are a part of establishing and maintaining this influence in close complement to the political and diplomatic relationships already discussed.

The presence of Australians in Brussels and within operational headquarters as seen in Afghanistan provides the opportunity to build relationships with key allies and, thereby, the potential to generate significant influence with them.³⁷ Embedded roles in a multinational context also provide professional development opportunities in the planning and conduct of larger and more complex operations rarely available within the smaller ADF context. These roles are complemented by shorter-term exercises and training exchanges that continue periodically.

This area—defence diplomacy—complements the higher levels of political engagement that have punctuated Australia-NATO relations. Time and again, interviews conducted during this research demonstrated that during the tensest periods for Australia-NATO relations during Afghanistan, the defence diplomacy aspect of the relationship acted as a more stable mechanism than political engagement. The defence diplomacy level of engagement was also key in building the relationship from 2007-08 until the partnership agreement in 2013, and into the present.

This mirrors observations about the complementary value of defence diplomacy to traditional diplomacy made by others. In light of Nicholas Floyd's observation that the ADF's defence diplomacy contribution is all the more important against the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade's often resource-strapped reality,³⁸ the small Australian presence in Brussels is good value given the 'sense and feel' functionality it provides to both NATO and multiple bilateral partners. Defence diplomacy, while based on the strategic interests of the partners in question, might eventually allow Australia to move beyond 'narrow *realpolitik* calculations to advance diplomacy and towards an emphasis on co-option and fostering reciprocal relationships, expectations and linkages between nations'.³⁹

Conclusion

Rather than representing a distraction from Australian strategic priorities, as suggested by White, the Australia-NATO relationship is a sensible investment for Australia as a middle power: there is a future for the Australia-NATO partnership that reflects 'clearly formulated national interests'.⁴⁰ The relationship between Australia and NATO, even relative to other global partners to NATO, can be seen as a unique quantity: its prime benefit lies in how it improves Australian leverage through both multilateral and bilateral connections.

In this respect, the partnership is also a useful adjunct to the US alliance that will continue to hold primacy in Australian policy, and can be nested within, rather than outside of, Australia's strategic priority for the Indo-Pacific. The idea of the 'pilot light setting' is also useful because, as

one official observed, we need to be wary of any push for more deliverables as the relationship between Australia and NATO further develops. As the Afghanistan mission that catalysed the Australia-NATO relationship slowly draws down, the relationship should continue at 'low burn', with limited visibility but significant benefit.

Military considerations, such as interoperability, are themselves a matter of second-order importance. This analysis has, however, highlighted the blurring of the military and political. The mundane, day-to-day cooperation entailed in interoperability efforts, personnel exchanges and so on underwrites higher-level engagement. In the military space, defence diplomacy is the most significant aspect of Australia-NATO ties. Importantly, Australia needs to beware of the risks attendant in the partnership. Australia must be wary of becoming too embroiled in European security issues and concerns associated with NATO expansion; it must remain conscious of its position on global security issues; and it must be sensitive to the broker it becomes in the Indo-Pacific region.

Lieutenant William Leben is a tank Troop Leader in the 2nd Cavalry Regiment. He graduated from the Royal Military College, Duntroon in 2014 and completed an Honours degree in politics at the University of NSW in 2015.

Notes

- 1 This article is based on a thesis completed by the author at the University of NSW in 2015. Some 25 interviews were conducted in Canberra and Brussels as part of this research, including with Australian and NATO uniformed and civilian defence personnel, as well as a small number of foreign affairs officials.
- 2 Australian Government and NATO, 'Individual Partnership and Cooperation Programme between Australia and NATO', *Department of Defence* [website], 21 February 2013, available at <<http://www.defence.gov.au/publications/Australia-NATO-Individual-Partnership-Cooperation-Program.pdf>> accessed 25 March 2015.
- 3 Department of Defence, *Defence White Paper 2016*, Commonwealth of Australia: Canberra, 2016, pp. 117-21.
- 4 Julie Bishop, 'Address to the North Atlantic Council', [*Australian*] *Foreign Minister* [website], 24 April 2015, available at <http://foreignminister.gov.au/speeches/Pages/2015/jb_sp_150424.aspx?ministerid=4> accessed 12 August 2015.
- 5 Sverre Myrli, 'Contributions of non-NATO members to NATO operations', *NATO* [website], 2008, available at <<http://www.nato-pa.int/Default.asp?SHORTCUT=1475>> accessed 8 September 2015; also Ivo Daalder and James Goldgeier, 'Global NATO', *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 85, No. 5, 2006, pp. 105-13.
- 6 Stephan Frühling and Benjamin Schreer, 'Australia and NATO: a deeper relationship?', *Lowy Institute* [website], 11 October 2010, available at <<http://www.lowyinterpreter.org/post/2010/10/11/Australia-and-NATO-A-deepening-relationship.aspx>> accessed 4 July 2016; also Hugh White, 'Our affair with NATO based on insecurity', *The Age*, 26 June 2012, p. 11.
- 7 Michael Fullilove, 'A three-dimensional foreign policy', 2015 Boyer Lectures, *Australian Broadcasting Corporation (ABC)* [website], 2015, available at <<http://www.abc.net.au/radio/programitem/pew9Q227pQ?play=true>> accessed 5 October 2015.
- 8 Australia and NATO, 'Individual Partnership and Cooperation Programme between Australia and NATO', p. 1.
- 9 NATO, 'Wales Summit Declaration', *NATO* [website], 2014, paragraph 88, available at <http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official_texts_112964.htm> accessed 4 July 2016.
- 10 Bishop, 'Address to the North Atlantic Council'. The 'two-way street' terminology has replaced 'reciprocity' since Bishop's address. It became apparent that the latter term was undesirable due to its Article 5 (collective self defence) implications for NATO allies.
- 11 White, 'Our affair with NATO based on insecurity'.
- 12 White has written extensively on this subject. For example, see Hugh White, *The China Choice: Why America should share power*, Black Inc.: Collingwood, 2012.
- 13 Ellen Hallams and Benjamin Schreer, 'Towards a "post-American" alliance? NATO burden-sharing after Libya', *International Affairs*, Vol. 88, No. 2, 2012, pp. 313-27.
- 14 Rynning provides a summary of this school of thought: see Sten Rynning, *NATO in Afghanistan: The liberal disconnect*, Stanford University Press: Stanford, 2012, pp. 12-4.
- 15 *White Paper 2016*, pp. 14-16.
- 16 Peter Varghese, 'Australia's foreign policy priorities', lecture held at the Australian Institute of International Affairs, 4 February 2015, Canberra: notes held by author.
- 17 Australian Government, *Australia in the Asian Century: White Paper 2012*, Commonwealth of Australia: Canberra, October 2012 available at <http://www.defence.gov.au/whitepaper/2013/docs/australia_in_the_asian_century_white_paper.pdf> accessed 6 July 2016; also Kevin Andrews, 'Address to the American Chamber of Commerce in Australia', [*Australian*] *Minister for Defence* [website], 27 August 2015, available at <<http://www.minister.defence.gov.au/2015/08/27/minister-for-defence-address-to-the-american-chamber-of-commerce-in-australia-qt-hotel-canberra/>> accessed 31 August 2015.
- 18 Japan recently made legislative changes allowing it to deploy troops overseas, which means that potential NATO deployments are now an issue of political sensitivity rather than legal impediment. It is notable that this change has been welcomed by Foreign Minister Julie Bishop: see 'Bishop

-
- welcomes Japan's military reforms', *The Australian*, 19 September 2015, available at <<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/latest-news/bishop-welcomes-japans-defence-reforms/story-fn3dxiwe-1227534680317>> accessed 20 October 2015.
- 19 Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT), 'Multilateral organisations – United Nations Security Council bid', *DFAT* [website], 2012, available at <<https://dfat.gov.au/about-us/corporate/freedom-of-information/Documents/120213-doc1-un-security-council-bid.pdf>> accessed 7 October 2015.
- 20 The Australian Military Representative to NATO, interviewed 10 August 2015; also an ADF officer, interviewed 10 August 2015; and a DFAT official, interviewed 10 August 2015.
- 21 NATO, 'Maritime Command factsheet: Operation Ocean Shield', *NATO* [website], 2015, available at <<http://www.mc.nato.int/about/Pages/Operation%20Ocean%20Shield.aspx>> accessed 3 September 2015.
- 22 Alan J. Kuperman, 'A model humanitarian intervention? Reassessing NATO's Libya campaign', *International Security*, Vol. 38, No. 1, 2013, pp. 105-36; also Carl C. Hodge, 'Full circle: two decades of NATO intervention', *Journal of Transatlantic Studies*, Vol. 11, No. 4, 2013, pp. 350-67.
- 23 To provide one example, the Australian Military Representative to NATO was in a position to engage face-to-face, off-duty with his Dutch counterpart during the MH17 incident very shortly after it occurred: the Australian Military Representative to NATO, interviewed 10 August 2015.
- 24 Dan Fortune, 'Self-reliance: an outdated and unaffordable concept for the ADF', *Australian Defence Force Journal*, No. 193, 2014, p. 5.
- 25 Evi Fitriani, 'Asian perceptions about the EU in the Asia-Europe Meeting (ASEM)', *Asia Europe Journal*, Vol. 9, No. 43, 2011, p. 54.
- 26 Sebastian Bersick, 'Perceptions of Asia in Europe', *Asia Europe Journal*, Vol. 8, No. 2, 2010, pp. 245-55.
- 27 James Glenday, 'China lashes Australia and US for "adding fuel to the flames" on South China Sea', *ABC News* [website], 14 October 2015, available at <<http://www.abc.net.au/news/2015-10-14/australia-us-announce-naval-cooperation-deal/6853400>> accessed 17 October 2015.
- 28 Gabrielle Chan and Gay Alcorn, 'Tony Abbott says he will "shirtfront" Vladimir Putin over downing of MH17', *The Guardian* [website], 13 October 2014, available at <<http://www.theguardian.com/world/2014/oct/13/tony-abbott-says-he-will-shirtfront-vladimir-putin-over-downing-of-mh17>> accessed 3 September 2015.
- 29 Paul Dibb, 'Why is Russia a threat to world peace?', public lecture held at the Strategic and Defence Studies Centre, Australian National University, Canberra, 22 July 2015, available at <<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=puZzoKkv2Nk>> accessed 16 October 2015.
- 30 For example, see Ivo Daalder *et al.*, *Preserving Ukraine's Independence, Resisting Russian Aggression: What the United States and NATO must do*, The Atlantic Council: Washington DC, February 2015, available at <http://www.atlanticcouncil.org/images/files/UkraineReport_February2015.pdf> accessed 25 July 2015.
- 31 John R. Deni, 'Maintaining transatlantic strategic, operational and tactical interoperability in an era of austerity', *International Affairs*, Vol. 90, No. 3, 2014, p. 583.
- 32 Peter V. Jakobsen, 'Right strategy, wrong place—why NATO's comprehensive approach will fail in Afghanistan', UNISCI Discussion Papers, No. 22, 2010, pp. 78-90, available at <<http://www.redalyc.org/pdf/767/76712438006.pdf>> accessed 4 July 2016.
- 33 Hans Mouritzen, 'In spite of reform: NATO HQ still in the grips of nations', *Defense and Security Analysis*, Vol. 29, No. 4, 2013, pp. 342-55; Christiaan Davids *et al.*, 'Command and control in the Afghan desert: a field study at a NATO headquarters', *International Journal of Intelligent Defence Support Systems*, Vol. 4, No. 2, 2011, pp. 111-27; and Charles Barry, 'NATO's combined joint task forces in theory and practice', *Survival: Global Politics and Strategy*, Vol. 38, No. 1, 1996, pp. 81-97.
- 34 Terry Moon, Suzanne Fewell and Hayley Reynolds, 'The what, why, when and how of interoperability', *Defense and Security Analysis*, Vol. 24, No. 1, 2008, pp. 6-7.
- 35 The ABCA Armies program is perceived to be of low cost and disproportionate value, with minimal bureaucracy and high level of access for participants: see ABCA Armies Project Office, 'History', ABCA Armies' Program Office: Arlington, 2015, available at <<http://www.abca-armies.org/History.aspx>> accessed 14 May 2015; see also M.W. Burdick, 'ABCA Standardization Program', *Air Defense Artillery*,

Vol. 44, No. 4, 1997, p. 34; Richard A. Cody and Robert L. Maginnis, 'Coalition interoperability: ABCA's new focus', *Military Review*, Vol. 86, No. 6, 2006, pp. 65-8.

- 36 Australia might also leverage capability lessons from specific NATO members, for instance the French employment of Army's Tiger helicopters: see Andrew Davies, 'The path ahead for Army Aviation', *Australian Strategic Policy Institute* [website], 26 June 2015, available at <<http://www.aspistrategist.org.au/the-path-ahead-for-army-aviation/>> accessed 17 October 2015.
- 37 Marcus Thompson, 'An embedded staff officer in Afghanistan: observations from "the Engine Room"', *Australian Defence Force Journal*, No. 196, 2015, p. 42.
- 38 Nicholas Floyd, 'Dropping the autopilot: improving Australia's defence diplomacy', *Lowy Institute* [website], 25 November 2010, available at <<http://www.lowyinstitute.org/publications/dropping-autopilot-improving-australias-defence-diplomacy>> accessed 6 July 2016; also Evan A. Laksmana, 'Regional order by other means? Examining the rise of defence diplomacy in Southeast Asia', *Asian Security*, Vol. 8, No. 3, 2012, pp. 251-70.
- 39 Andrew Carr and Daniel Baldino, 'An Indo-Pacific norm entrepreneur? Australia and defence diplomacy', *Journal of the Indian Ocean Region*, Vol. 11, No. 1, 2015, p. 31. Fullilove also discusses the significant role Australia has and could continue to play: see Michael Fullilove, 'The birthplace of the fortunate', 2015 Boyer Lectures, *ABC* [website], available at <<https://radio.abc.net.au/programitem/pea4L75ao3?play=true>> accessed 19 October 2015.
- 40 Håkan Edström *et al.*, 'Utility for NATO – utility of NATO?', in Håkan Edström, Janne Haaland Matlary and Magnus Petersson (eds.), *NATO: The power of partnerships*, Palgrave Macmillan: New York, 2011, p. 15.