

**Welcome** to the third edition of NATO Watch's bi-monthly *Observatory*. Our focus is on NATO policy-making and operational activities and the clips are drawn from a wide range of subscriptions, feeds and alerts covering a substantial part of the major English language newspapers and other periodicals worldwide. If you are short on time – go straight to the recommended reading, marked ♣♣

## Contents:

Quote – Unquote

Feature Articles:

Bold new claims, no new evidence: NATO's 'avoidance' of civilian harm needs measuring, not re-stating

The NATO Defence Ministerial in Bratislava: more shovels for Afghanistan and missile defences for Europe

News, Commentary & Reports

Afghanistan

Arms Control

Conflict Prevention

Georgia

Missile Defence

NATO Defence Ministers Meeting in Bratislava

NATO Partnerships

Nuclear Weapons

Procurement

Strategic Concept

Transatlantic Cooperation

Upcoming Events

Security News from NATO Member States

Czech Republic

Netherlands

France

Germany

Norway

Slovak Republic

United Kingdom

United States

The Daisy Alliance 2010 Student Scholarship/Essay Contest

IDEAS, FEEDBACK, SUGGESTIONS?

## NATO Watch

conducts independent monitoring and analysis of NATO and aims to increase transparency, stimulate parliamentary engagement and broaden public awareness and participation in a progressive reform agenda within NATO. Coming soon: NATO Watch website [www.natowatch.org](http://www.natowatch.org)

**Have your say:** join in the debate on the future of NATO

NATO's new **Strategic Concept Discussion Forum** is currently soliciting views on "The political dimension of NATO's operations"

Also see and comment on NATO Watch's **Citizens Declaration of Alliance Security**

**Subscription is free of charge**

To start a subscription email: **Start NATO Watch Observatory** in the subject line, to [info@iandavisconsultancy.com](mailto:info@iandavisconsultancy.com)



## Quote – Unquote:

(photo credit: [reway2007](#))

*It costs about 50 times more to support a NATO soldier in Afghanistan than it costs to support an Afghan soldier.*

NATO Secretary General Anders Fogh Rasmussen, during a [press conference](#), following the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Bratislava, 23 October

*If we are going to conduct a population-centric strategy in Afghanistan, and we are perceived as backing thugs, then we are just undermining ourselves.*

Maj. Gen. Michael T. Flynn, the senior American military intelligence official in Afghanistan, on news that the brother of the Afghan president gets regular payments from the CIA, [quoted](#) in *New York Times*, 28 October

*The house that we call NATO may require fresh paint, a new alarm system, and some additional rooms, but there is much in the structure that works, and the foundation is fine.*

[Opening Remarks](#) by Madeleine K. Albright at the First Seminar on NATO's Strategic Concept 'NATO's Fundamental Security Tasks', Luxembourg, 16 October

*We are an alliance of democracies, which means that our people need to know what's going on.*

[Closing Remarks](#) by Madeleine K. Albright at the First Seminar on NATO's Strategic Concept 'NATO's Fundamental Security Tasks', Luxembourg, 16 October

*We will take President Obama at his word and enter talks with our allies so that the last of the nuclear weapons still stationed in Germany, relics of the Cold War, can finally be removed. Germany must be free of nuclear weapons.*

German Foreign Minister-designate Guido Westerwelle, [quoted](#) in *Deutsche Welle*, 25 October

*The new initiatives announced by the US President B.Obama in Prague this April offer a qualitatively new perspective on the issue of a complete nuclear disarmament. It is a very ambitious goal, which can only be accomplished through strong commitment and engagement. We support it.... ...NATO should support all the processes at other forums, which may help this vision come true. We believe that the Alliance, in coordination with other international organisations, can be very helpful in achieving these goals.*

[Address](#) by M. Lajčák, Slovak Minister of Foreign Affairs, at the conference “New Challenges – Better Capabilities” organised in the margins of the NATO defence ministers meeting, 21 October

*Clear proof of the irrational behaviour and irresponsibility of the new generation of politicians is the fact that defence spending by numerous countries, large and small alike, is now greater than during the cold war.*

Mikhail Gorbachev, [article](#) celebrating ‘1989: year of revolutions’, *The Guardian*, 31 October

## NATO Watch Feature Articles:

### **Bold new claims, no new evidence: NATO’s ‘avoidance’ of civilian harm needs measuring, not re-stating**

Rosemary Forest and Hamit Dardagan,  
[Oxford Research Group](#)

On 22 October NATO Secretary General Anders Fogh Rasmussen posted a [video message](#) on his website in response to the question, “For every taliban you kill how many of the civilian population

do you kill or injure? Do you expect those injured will see you as liberators from the taliban tyranny?”. Rasmussen began by noting that “*it is not NATO’s mission simply to kill the Taliban*”, and went on to state:

*We take extra measures to avoid killing or injuring civilians. This approach has already shown results, civilian casualties are significantly down.*

This would be a welcome statement except that (a) NATO always claims to avoid civilian harm so it is unclear that there has been any positive change, (b) civilians continue to be killed and maimed by NATO military actions in Afghanistan and elsewhere, and (c) NATO still has not indicated any objective measure by which its performance on the protection of civilians may be judged, either by NATO itself or the public it serves.

We would argue that claims such as the one above cannot be evaluated, let alone sceptics convinced, until there is full and proper documentation of all casualties in conflicts involving NATO, published on a frequent and regular basis. The Secretary General's answer gives no explicit indication of current casualty numbers associated with NATO's Afghanistan actions, or how these differ from earlier ones; nor are we told how the data upon which this claim is based was obtained. In the absence of such supporting evidence, one may question how Rasmussen knows civilian casualties are down at all, never mind "significantly down".

What is needed to settle otherwise unresolvable arguments over numbers is a verifiable numerical account of civilian deaths in Afghanistan, and a comprehensive, transparent public record of individuals killed. We have neither. Wide disparities in the numbers presented so far relate not only to methodological approaches but to the socio-political priorities of those presenting them. Differing reports contain seemingly arbitrary choices over matters such as the start and end dates of data compilations, categories of casualties and of perpetrators, and the selection of sources for inclusion.

By contrast, had Rasmussen been asked the number of NATO soldiers killed, he would have been able to provide not only their names and date of death, but also their nationality, age, hometown, rank, service branch and place of death. This is of course possible because multiple official and unofficial sources exist for this data, beginning in most instances with the US Department of Defence.

(photo credit: [lafrancevi](#))



For NATO and the West to demonstrate any kind of parity of concern at a bare minimum the names, dates and places of deaths of Afghan victims should be made public in the same way that NATO deaths are. This practice would acknowledge our common humanity and carry the potential to contribute to post-conflict reconciliation, among many other benefits. It would also finally allow NATO to assess and verify, under public scrutiny, that its tactics for reducing civilian casualties are as effective as they are claimed to be.

(photo credit: [angelfire\\_3182](#))



The Secretary General's answer continued along another familiar line:

*The conclusion is NATO is doing everything possible to avoid civilian casualties but in conflicts such like the one in Afghanistan you regrettably cannot avoid the loss of civilian lives. When it happens we try to learn and improve. We will do our utmost to protect the Afghans.*

While NATO may indeed be doing everything possible to minimize civilian casualties, without transparency, people will rightly question whether the statement "We take extra measures to avoid killing or injuring civilians" isn't simply negated by "but in conflicts such like the one in Afghanistan you regrettably cannot avoid the loss of civilian lives".

NATO's credibility in this matter could only be enhanced if it provided concrete examples of what has been learned from mistakes, how operations have improved to better protect civilians and, of course, how NATO measures these outcomes. Such evidence need not reveal specific military tactics – indeed, these are of little interest to most people. The only relevant performance criterion here is one that measures (and records accurately and openly) civilian deaths and injuries in NATO actions. Good intentions, genuine as they might be, cannot be directly measured.

Until such recording is done, and seen to be done, Secretary General Rasmussen's claim will remain just one among many in the political landscape.

## The NATO Defence Ministerial in Bratislava: More Shovels for Afghanistan and Missile Defences for Europe

Dr. Ian Davis, Director, NATO Watch

NATO Defence Ministers meeting in Bratislava on October 22-23 agreed a revised set of key priorities for Afghanistan over the next 18 months together with a new strategic concept for the transition to an Afghan lead for security “when the conditions are right”. The four key NATO priorities are:

- to place the Afghan population at the core of NATO-ISAF’s collective effort;
- an enhanced effort to build the capacity of the Afghan National Security Forces;
- to work more closely and effectively with international and Afghan partners to promote better governance; and
- to engage effectively with Afghanistan’s neighbours, particularly Pakistan.

The question of how much of the Afghan population should fall under the direct protection of NATO-ISAF will be determined in Washington. President Obama is currently deciding how many more US troops should be sent, but the emerging consensus in the White House appears to be that the insurgency cannot be entirely eradicated in a nation where the Taliban is an indigenous force. Instead, the focus is likely to be on protecting population centres and preventing Al Qaeda from returning in strength while containing and weakening the Taliban long enough to build Afghan security forces to eventually take over the mission.

This accelerated training of Afghan troops and police is presumably at the heart of the ‘Strategic Concept for Transition to Afghan Lead’ approved by Ministers in Bratislava. However, a request to NATO HQ for a copy of the Strategic Concept has so far met with a stony silence. To paraphrase Madeleine Albright (see quote above), our people need to know what’s going on, especially in relation to a ‘train-and-equip’ strategy that is **deeply flawed**. The **exposure** of financial ties and a close working relationship between the CIA and Ahmed Wali Karzai, the brother of the Afghan president, also raise significant questions about US-NATO efforts to promote better governance.

Without greater transparency and openness about US and NATO war aims and strategy, popular support for the ISAF mission is likely to continue to ebb away. In his speech on 22 October, Secretary General Rasmussen did seek to justify the strategy: “Leaving Afghanistan behind would once again turn the country into a training ground for Al Qaeda. The pressure on nuclear-armed

*Pakistan would be tremendous. Instability would spread throughout Central Asia. And it would only be a matter of time until we, here in Europe, would feel the consequences of all of this”.* But after eight years of fighting the security trends in both Afghanistan and Pakistan remain downward, and the **consequences** are already being felt in Europe.

A journalist embedded with the US Army’s 501st Parachute Regiment captures the futility of the counterinsurgency in Afghanistan in **this** recent video report. When one of the US soldiers states that “*Afghans just want to be left alone*” he speaks with far greater wisdom than any of the assembled Ministers in Bratislava, whose key message appears to have been “*when in a hole, keep on digging*”.

(photo credit: sunrise in Afghanistan, [The U.S. Army](#))



Missile defence was the other key issue discussed in Bratislava. And while the digging has now stopped in terms of the third site in Eastern Europe, the doggedness of the missile defence lobby shows little sign of abating. There was one small hiccup, when the Slovak Prime Minister Robert Fico announced during a joint press conference with the NATO Secretary General that he would not allow the stationing of any components of the US missile defence system in Slovakia. But back in the Ministerial debate, following a briefing by the US Secretary of Defence Robert Gates, the assembled Defence Ministers confirmed their readiness to continue working towards a NATO missile defence system in preparation for the Lisbon summit next year.

As the Secretary General later said in his press conference: “*Ministers welcomed the fact the new US approach puts European missile defence more in a NATO context. That is good for the Alliance. It is good for solidarity. And to my mind, it is important for the defence of Europe that we are talking about rolling out a system within a couple of years that can provide European and North American citizens defence against a real and growing missile threat*”.

Against the background of a challenging economic climate and hard budgetary choices, it will be interesting to see if the high-level group of MoD officials appointed by the Secretary General to review the prioritisation of resources within the Alliance – a decision also approved by the Defence Ministers in Bratislava – will reach the same conclusion. In the absence of any independent contribution to the group or peer review of the evidence for the “growing missile threat”, I wouldn’t bet against it. Especially since

these would be the same officials that, in Britain, have overseen a defence equipment programme described as “*an unaffordable fiction*”, and throughout Europe have failed to overhaul Cold War military structures that generate a paucity of deployable troops despite over 1.5 million soldiers under arms. Without root and branch reforms in procurement practice, and security thinking more generally, shovels are likely to remain high on NATO’s future wish list.

---

## News, Commentary and Reports:

### Afghanistan:

(photo credit: [Stitch](#))

#### News

[Barack Obama meets coffins of soldiers killed in Afghanistan](#), *The Guardian*, 29 October

[On a suburban street, a bloody reminder of the cost of Afghan war ...](#) - hundreds welcome most battered battalion home; Commanding officer insists sacrifice not in vain, *The Guardian*, 29 October

[U.S. Quietly Speeds Aid for Pakistani Drives on Taliban](#), *New York Times*, 28 October

[Militants Attack U.N. Guest House in Kabul](#), *New York Times*, 28 October

[Brother of Afghan Leader Is Said to Be on C.I.A. Payroll](#), *New York Times*, 28 October

[Conflict Risk Alert: After Afghanistan's Fraudulent Elections](#), ICG Media Release, 27 October

[Briefing on Progress Made in Civilian Hiring in Afghanistan](#), Jacob J. Lew, Deputy Secretary for Management and Resources, US Department of State, Washington, DC, 26 October

[NATO Ministers Endorse Wider Afghan Effort](#), *New York Times*, 23 October

[Statement by the Secretary General on the Afghan elections](#), NATO Press Release, 20 October

[Afghanistan: anatomy of an election disaster](#) - It was, everybody agrees, a tawdry and inept attempt to rig an election. But are we in the west as much to blame as anyone?, *The Guardian*, 20 October

[Many Sources Feed Taliban's War Chest](#) - Despite efforts by the US and its allies to cripple the Taliban's sophisticated financial network, American officials say they've barely made a dent, *New York Times*, 18 October

[Military Committee Meeting with the Chiefs of Defense of NATO and non-NATO contributing Nations to ISAF](#), NATO Press Release, 17 October

#### Commentary

♣♣ [Too Big to Fail? Why All the President's Afghan Options Are Bad Ones](#), Tom Engelhardt, *TomDispatch.com*, 1 November

[The Afghan election: a five-star debacle](#), Simon Tisdall, *The Guardian*, 1 November

[Afghanistan Déjà vu? Lessons from the Soviet Experience](#), US National Security Archive Electronic Briefing Book No. 292, Edited by Svetlana Savranskaya, 30 October

♣♣ [“A Woman Among Warlords”](#): Afghan Democracy Activist Malalai Joya Defies Threats to Challenge US Occupation, Local Warlords, *Democracy Now*, 28 October

♣♣ [UN Special Rapporteur on Extrajudicial Killings, Philip Alston: Record AfPak Drone Attacks Under Obama May Violate International Law](#), *Democracy Now*, 28 October



♣♣ [Our Faustian Bargains in Afghanistan](#) - Ex-Warlords Continue to Hold Back Democratic Governance, Caroline Wadhams, Colin Cookman and Christina Misunas, Center for American Progress, 28 October

NATO Secretary General Anders Fogh Rasmussen use a [video blog](#) to respond to a question on civilian casualties in Afghanistan, 26 October

♣♣ [Who Are the Taliban?](#) Gilles Dorronsoro, Q&A, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 22 October

[Keep Pushing Effective Governance in Afghanistan](#), Caroline Wadhams, Colin Cookman and Peter Juul, Center for American Progress, 21 October

[An important moment for Afghanistan](#), video blog by NATO Secretary General Anders Fogh Rasmussen, 21 October

[The Slowly Vanishing NATO](#), Anne Applebaum, *The Washington Post*, 20 October

[Strategic Dialogue: Afghanistan](#), Erik Leaver and Ed Corcoran, *Foreign Policy in Focus*, 15 October

[Five Facts About Afghanistan](#), Ivan Eland, The Independent Institute, 14 October

♣♣ [How to get out of Afghanistan](#), Hugh Gusterson, *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, 12 October 2009

## Arms Control:

[Dangerous Ambiguities: Regulation of Riot Control Agents and Incapacitants under the Chemical Weapons Convention](#), Michael Crowley, University of Bradford, UK, October 2009. This report by the Bradford Non-Lethal Weapons Research Project highlights the inability of the international control regime established under the Chemical Weapons Convention to regulate incapacitants effectively. It warns of the potentially devastating consequences for human rights, international peace and security if this situation is not urgently addressed. In addition to Russia, the report identifies incapacitant research activities of concern in China, the Czech Republic and the United States, as well as interest shown in such agents by France, the UK, NATO and the European Defence Agency.



(photo credit: riot control marines, [nukeit1](#))

## Conflict Prevention:

[States of Conflict: A case study on statebuilding in Kosovo](#), Dominik Zaum, Institute for Public Policy Research, 23 October. Focuses on the period since the declaration of independence and identifies three key challenges to a successful and lasting transition from conflict to self-sustaining peace in Kosovo.

[States of Conflict: A case study on conflict prevention in Macedonia](#), Katie Paintin, Institute for Public Policy Research, 14 October. The report details how Macedonia was largely spared the bloody conflict that afflicted much of the Balkans due to the focused and sustained attention of the international community.

## Georgia:



[NATO Week in Georgia](#), NATO Press Release, 16 October. A week-long programme of events aimed at raising public awareness of NATO policies and structures and reaching out to civil society, 5 -10 October.

(photo credit: NATO)

[Dialogue on security guarantees in the context of the Georgian-Abkhaz conflict](#), International Alert, September 2009. This paper presents the separate analyses of both Georgian and Abkhaz civil society experts on the need for security guarantees, the reasons why the sides have been unable to agree on them as well as barriers and opportunities for future agreements.

## Missile defence:

[Slovakia Will Not Host Missile Defense System While Current Prime Minister In Office](#), *Radio Slovakia International*, 27 October

Defense Ministers Meeting in Bratislava – US Ambassador Daalder's [Speech](#), 'New Nuclear Disarmament Proposals: Implications for NATO', 23 October

[NATO Welcomes Obama's Missile Defense Plans](#), *Associated Press*, 23 October

[U.S. Missile Shield Won't Expand to Non-NATO Countries](#), Samantha Shields, *Wall Street Journal*, 21 October

[Poland to Accept U.S. Offer on Shield](#), Judy Dempsey, *New York Times*, 20 October

[Missile Defence: A View from Turkey](#), Piotr Zalewski, *CEPS Commentary*, 8 October



## NATO Defence Ministers Meeting in Bratislava:

[Adm. James Stavridis, Commander, U.S. European Command, blog on the Defence Ministerial](#), 26 October

[NATO Ministers agree on key priorities for Afghanistan](#), NATO Press Release, 23 October

[NATO Ministers address defence transformation and missile defence](#), NATO Press Release, 23 October

[Opening remarks](#) by NATO Secretary General Anders Fogh Rasmussen at Informal Meeting of NATO Defence Ministers in Bratislava and subsequent [press conference](#), 23 October

'New Challenges - Better Capabilities', [Speech](#) by NATO Secretary General Anders Fogh Rasmussen at the Bratislava Security Conference, 22 October

[Press briefing](#) by NATO Spokesman James Appathurai, 22 October

[NATO Defence Ministers to gather in Bratislava](#), NATO Press Release, 22 October

[NATO to Meet on Afghanistan, Missile Defense](#), *Associated Press*, 21 October

[Statement by the NATO Secretary General on the Bratislava Ministerials](#), press reception, 19 October

## NATO Partnerships:

[Keynote Address by NATO Secretary General Anders Fogh Rasmussen](#) at the conference 'NATO-UAE Relations and the Way Forward in the Istanbul Cooperation Initiative', Abu Dhabi, UAE, 29 October

[NATO and Russia: Partnership or Peril?](#) Dmitri Trenin, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, October 2009

Secretary General Anders Fogh Rasmussen [video blog](#) about his trip to the UAE, 26 October

[NATO week in Armenia](#), NATO Press Release, 21 October. The third NATO week in Armenia took place from 12-16 October, with the aim to provide a better understanding of the Armenia-NATO cooperation.

[Book: European Security and Defence Policy: The first 10 years \(1999-2009\)](#), edited by Giovanni Grevi, Damien Helly and Daniel Keohane, European Union Institute for Security Studies, October 2009. See chapter on 'ESDP and NATO' by Daniel Keohane, pp127-138.

## Nuclear weapons:

[NATO should listen to Germany on removing US nuclear weapons from Europe](#), BASIC Press Release, 2 November

[Benelux Countries to Discuss Nuclear Withdrawal](#), *The NATO Monitor*, 31 October

[Ridding Germany of U.S. Nuclear Weapons](#), Judy Dempsey, *New York Times*, 28 October

[Turkish PM exposes nuclear rift in Nato](#), *The Guardian*, 26 October

[Editorial: Nuclear Weapons Free Germany?](#) *Global Perspectives*, 26 October

[Germany Will Press for Nuclear Withdrawal - Will Not Act Unilaterally](#), *The NATO Monitor*, 26 October

[New German government to seek removal of US nuclear weapons](#), *Deutsche Welle*, 25 October

[Germany to U.S.: Take Away Your Nukes!](#) Peter Gumbel, *TIME*, 24 October

[Report on UK Parliamentary Visit to Washington, DC to discuss prospects for multilateral nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation](#), BASIC October 2009. [Summary](#) also available - posted 22 October. See video of associated [event](#) held with the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 9 September 2009.

## Procurement:

[Rosoboronexport confirms sale of special purpose weaponry to NATO](#), *defpro.news*, 28 October

[Allies sign declaration of intent for HIP helicopter initiative](#), NATO Press Release, 23 October

## Strategic Concept:

Hearing before the US Committee on Foreign Relations (US Senate) on 'NATO: a strategic concept for transatlantic security', Washington DC, 22 October:

[Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.Senator Kerry's Opening Statement](#)

[Senator Lugar's Opening Statement](#)

Witness Statements:

[The Honorable Madeleine K. Albright](#), Former Secretary of State, Principal Albright Stonebridge Group, Washington, DC

[General John Craddock, U.S. Army \(Ret.\)](#), Former Supreme Allied Commander-Europe, US Army Myrtle Beach, SC

[The Honorable Kurt Volker](#), Former Permanent Representative to NATO, Senior Fellow and Managing Director Center on Transatlantic Relations, Johns Hopkins University, Washington, DC

[Dr. Charles A. Kupchan](#), Professor of International Affairs, Georgetown University, Adjunct Senior Fellow Council on Foreign Relations, Washington, DC



[NATO's new Strategic Concept discussed at Luxembourg seminar](#), NATO Press Release, 16 October. This was the first of four main seminars that will guide the development of NATO's new Strategic Concept and work towards defining the Alliance's fundamental security tasks. See: the [Agenda](#), and [Opening Remarks](#) and [Closing Remarks](#) from the Chair of the Group of Experts, Madeleine Albright

(photo credit: NATO)

## Transatlantic cooperation:

[Rasmussen set to Reinvigorate NATO](#), Sebastian Bruns, Atlantic-Community.org, 23 October

[Towards a Post-American Europe: a power audit of EU-US Relations](#), Jeremy Shapiro and Nick Witney, European Council on Foreign Relations, October 2009. Based on extensive interviews and on structured input from all the EU's 27 member states, this report reveals that Europeans have so far failed to shake off the attitudes, behaviours, and strategies they acquired over decades of American hegemony. The authors call for EU leaders to enter a new stage of EU-US relations.

[In spite of Europe's Obama mania, the transatlantic relationship remains tricky](#), Werner Weidenfeld, *Europe's World*, Autumn 2009

## Upcoming Events:

NATO Parliamentary Assembly's 55<sup>th</sup> [Annual Session](#), Edinburgh, United Kingdom, 13-17 November

[NATO and the credit crunch](#), International Conference, Security and Defence Agenda, Brussels, 17 December

## Security News from NATO Member States:

### Czech Republic

[Czechs Consider Gripen Purchase](#), *Defence IQ*, 28 October

[Czech Army to purchase Raven Miniature UAVs](#), *Defence IQ*, 15 October

### Netherlands

[Dutch Military Intervention Decision Making Revisited: Getting A \(Constitutional\) Grip On 21st Century Wars](#), Tim Sweijts, The Hague Centre for Strategic Studies, October 2009. Provides an overview of Dutch modern military interventions and examines military intervention decision-making reform over the last 15 years.

### France

[Sarkozy's three-way NATO bet](#), Camille Grand, *Europe's World*, Autumn 2009



## Germany

[German Limits on War Face Afghan Reality](#), *New York Times*, 26 October



## Norway

[Norwegian Defence Budget to Rise 4 Percent in 2010](#), *Defence IQ*, 28 October

## Slovak Republic

[Opening address](#) by the Slovak Minister of Defence at the conference 'New Challenges – Better Capabilities', 21 October

[Opening address](#) by the Slovak Minister of Foreign Affairs, Miroslav Lajčák, at the conference 'New Challenges – Better Capabilities', 21 October

(photo credit: [darkmatter](#))

## United Kingdom

[Britain must pool defence capabilities](#), Clara Marina O'Donell, *CER Bulletin* No.68, October/November 2009

[Damning UK defence equipment review](#), *Financial Times*, 15 October

## United States

[Hillary Clinton wraps up tough mission in Pakistan](#) - Secretary of state sought to blunt anti-Americanism amid Pakistani anger over drone attacks, *The Guardian*, 30 October

[Resetting US-Russia Relations](#), Barry Blechman, Stimson Center, 26 October

[US raises pressure on Japan air base](#), *Financial Times*, 21 October

♠♠ [Jane Mayer on Predator Drones and Pakistan](#), *The New Yorker*, 21 October

[Cashing in the War Dividend -The Joys of Perpetual War](#), Jo Comerford, TomDispatch.com, 20 October

[Who's Next? Lessons from the Long War and a Blowback World](#), Tom Engelhardt, TomDispatch.com, 18 October

[Biohazard - Why U.S. bioterror research is more dangerous than bioterrorism](#), Lynn C. Klotz and Edward J. Sylvester, *Foreign Policy*, 13 October

### The Daisy Alliance 2010 Student Scholarship/Essay Contest

#### “The Role of NATO in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century”

**1st Prize - \$1,000; 2nd Prize - \$500; 3rd Prize - \$250**

Bruce Roth, Founder of Daisy Alliance, will award the above cash prizes to the students who submit the best original papers. **Papers must be submitted by 26 January 2010.** For more information click [here](#)

## IDEAS, FEEDBACK, SUGGESTIONS?

**Ideas, feedback, suggestions?** We want to hear from you. Please contact us at [info@iandavisconsultancy.com](mailto:info@iandavisconsultancy.com) with any feedback or suggestions.

NATO Watch | 17 Strath | Gairloch | Scotland | IV21 2BX