

Spring 2026 – Marcellus Policy Analysis

Ending the Open-Ended Commitment: A Phased US Withdrawal from Kosovo

By Catherine A. Day

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

U.S. military involvement in Kosovo began in 1999 with NATO's bombing campaign to end the war in Kosovo. Since that time, the United States has contributed to the NATO-led Kosovo Force (KFOR), which was established to deter renewed hostilities and stabilize the country. After more than two decades, these objectives have largely been achieved. Although the U.S. military presence in Kosovo was originally intended as a short-term stabilization measure, 600 U.S. troops remain deployed there today. This ongoing security commitment does not align with U.S. national security interests. Continued U.S. presence may perpetuate the political stalemate between Kosovo and Serbia, as Kosovo relies on U.S. security guarantees and engages in destabilizing actions without an incentive to negotiate. Such commitments risk entangling the United States in conflicts peripheral to its core interests.

The United States must plan for a phased withdrawal of the majority of U.S. troops from Kosovo, with European allies assuming primary security responsibility. European members of the KFOR coalition possess the capacity to lead the mission and should assume responsibility for security matters within Europe. As both Kosovo and Serbia are formally on the path to EU membership, an EU-led peacekeeping mission would signal the EU's commitment to regional stability and the integration of the Western Balkans.

A phased withdrawal from Kosovo aligns with an American reorientation of strategic resources to higher-

Catherine Day is a graduate student at Columbia's School of International and Public Affairs, where she concentrates on international security policy and is pursuing a Certificate from the Harriman Institute. She holds a B.A. in Russian Language and Literature from Boston College and is proficient in Russian and fluent in Serbian. She previously served as a Peace Corps Volunteer in Kosovo, leading community economic development and education initiatives.

The John Quincy Adams Society is a nonpartisan, independent national network of professionals and students focused on U.S. foreign policy, with a centering vision of restraint. The Society does not take specific policy positions and all views, positions, and conclusions expressed in this publication should be understood to be those of the author.

priority theatres. This policy recommendation is particularly timely given ongoing U.S. discussions in 2026 to scale back peripheral NATO missions and focus on core threats. Without an exit plan, continued U.S. involvement in KFOR weakens incentives for burden-sharing with European allies. Since Russia's 2022 invasion of Ukraine, Europe has increased its defense spending and reinforced its military capacity. The United States should capitalize on this momentum by transferring responsibility for European security missions, such as Kosovo, to our European allies.

Background on US involvement in Kosovo

The Kosovo war was the final conflict of the Yugoslav wars, which ended the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. In 1998, fighting broke out between the Armed Forces of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (FRY) and the Kosovo Liberation Army (KLA), an ethnically Albanian separatist militia seeking independence for Kosovo. The escalation of violence in Kosovo and stalled peace talks between the Yugoslavian leadership and the KLA led NATO to conduct "Operation Allied Force." Beginning on March 24, 1999, NATO led a 78-day bombing campaign against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.¹ While 14 nations contributed forces to the operation, 200 of the 350 NATO aircraft engaged were from the United States.²

Although the operation eventually forced Yugoslavian President Slobodan Milošević to withdraw his forces from Kosovo, NATO peacekeepers were required to deter further Serbian aggression. NATO established the Kosovo Force (KFOR), which was deployed into Kosovo on 12, June 1999. KFOR derived its mandate from the United Nations Security Council Resolution 1244 (1999) and was established with the primary objectives of deterring renewed hostilities and establishing a secure environment.³ The initial deployment consisted of approximately 50,000 troops from NATO member states, partner nations, and other non-NATO contributors, of which roughly 7,000 were American.

KFOR Mission and Command Structure

KFOR is divided into two regional commands, each

consisting of two battalions with separate functions. The first battalion is a mobile maneuver battalion for rapid deployment to emerging flashpoints, while the second battalion is a non-kinetic battalion dedicated to civil liaison.⁴ Regional Command East has been historically led by the United States and is headquartered at Camp Bondsteel. UN Security Council Resolution 1244 granted KFOR freedom of movement throughout Kosovo, including in the Serb-majority northern municipalities. KFOR's original responsibilities included assisting with the return and relocation of displaced persons and refugees, reconstruction and demining, maintaining security and public order, weapons destruction, and border security.⁵ As Kosovo's security environment has improved, NATO's focus has shifted toward building the capacity of Kosovo's security institutions. KFOR now serves as the third responder to security incidents after the Kosovo Police and EULEX.⁶

US Military Bases in Kosovo

Despite the intention to deploy peacekeeping forces in Kosovo only temporarily, the United States began constructing two large military bases shortly after KFOR's mandate was established. Camp Bondsteel and Camp Monteith were built to house the U.S. forces assigned to KFOR's Regional Command East. The construction costs for both camps were approximately \$230 million in 1999.⁷ Camp Bondsteel, the larger of the two camps, is the largest U.S. military base in Europe since the Vietnam War.⁸ Sprawling 1,000 acres, it can accommodate 5,000 people. This required the U.S. Army "to build the equivalent of a small town in a wheat field in a few months."⁹ Colonel Robert L. McClure, who commanded the engineer brigade responsible for the construction effort, wrote that "engineer planning for operations in Kosovo began months before the first bomb was dropped" and that planners had "convinced decision makers to reach base-camp 'end state' as quickly as possible."¹⁰ The U.S. military's long-term infrastructure projects were intended to support an enduring presence, indicating KFOR's presence would become more than a short-term stabilization force. While Camp Monteith was downgraded to a forward operating base in 2006, Camp Bondsteel remains operational today.

Continued US involvement in KFOR

More than two and a half decades after NATO's bombing campaign in Kosovo, U.S. troops are still deployed in the country as part of KFOR, with no benchmarks established for withdrawal. As of February 2026, 590 U.S. troops are deployed in Kosovo.¹¹ Although this number is significantly lower than the approximately 7,000 U.S. personnel deployed in 2000, it has held steady for several years. In addition to troop deployments, U.S. military spending in Kosovo remains substantial. The Army's FY2024 Operation and Maintenance budget justification requests \$7.234 million for KFOR headquarters support and reflects a \$10.8 million increase for Balkans operations from FY2023.¹² Military spending and troop deployments to Kosovo will continue, as no U.S. administration has articulated the necessary conditions for a U.S. force withdrawal from Kosovo. UN Resolution 1244 itself was created without defining exit conditions, stating that the mission's authorization continues "unless the Security Council decides otherwise."¹³ Bureaucratic inertia has allowed U.S. involvement in Kosovo to become a permanent deployment.

Despite substantial U.S. military and financial support for KFOR, there have been few attempts at congressional oversight of U.S. troop deployments in Kosovo. The Byrd-Warner amendment was the most notable of these attempts. The amendment was introduced in 2000 by Senators Robert Byrd (D-WV) and John Warner (R-VA) to the Senate's defense appropriations bill for fiscal year 2001 (S. 2521). Although narrowly defeated, the amendment would have cut off funding for U.S. troops in Kosovo after July 1, 2001, unless the President submitted a detailed deployment request for congressional approval.¹⁴ The close vote indicated that a significant number of senators shared concerns about the open-ended nature of the U.S. commitment to Kosovo. Following the September 11th attacks, there was renewed attention towards peacekeeping missions in the Balkans. Lawmakers questioned whether these operations might be taking away resources from operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. Yet this concern did not translate into meaningful oversight or a defined endpoint for the mission. As a 2004 Congressional Research Service report observed, there was "no timeline for

a withdrawal from Kosovo," with NATO's presence expected to continue until the province's political status was resolved.¹⁵ Congressional oversight of U.S. involvement in Kosovo has not led to meaningful change.

Reassessing US Involvement in Kosovo

The Case for Burden-Sharing in a Multipolar Era

American leadership in NATO's intervention in Kosovo reflected the permissive strategic environment of post-Cold War unipolarity. An "activist" American foreign and security policy emerged simply because it was possible, with the United States leading operations only tangentially tied to American security interests.¹⁶ During NATO's intervention in Kosovo, the United States shouldered a large share of the operational costs despite the conflict's more direct consequences for European security. Realists argue that this imbalance is the structural result of U.S. security guarantees. U.S. allies have underinvested in their own defense postures, becoming overreliant on U.S. security guarantees. Over decades, this has degraded the defense capabilities of U.S. allies and led to the overextension of U.S. force posture. As John Mearsheimer argues, powerful states can only pursue liberal hegemony in a unipolar system.¹⁷ As the international system shifts toward a multipolar world, it is widely recognized that the United States now faces significant resource constraints and degraded readiness due to overextension.¹⁸ This security environment makes burden-sharing within NATO increasingly necessary. The United States must work to shift responsibility for peripheral missions, like Kosovo, to its allies and partners.

The accumulation of individually modest military commitments has contributed to an overextended U.S. force posture. When evaluated independently, the rationale behind each mission can be presented as justifiable at a low cost. However, when aggregated, these small missions are responsible for substantial force commitments and military spending. This pattern has led to the proliferation of U.S. military bases globally. The United States has 800 bases in

more than 70 countries, which are estimated to cost between \$60 billion and \$120 billion annually.¹⁹ As the location of U.S. overseas military bases continues to expand, the imbalance between U.S. commitments and U.S. interests has become increasingly apparent. In addition to the financial burden this imposes on the United States, it also risks leading to what International Relations theorists call the “commitment trap.” Because the United States feels compelled to continue with a promised course of action, allies can take advantage of this to draw the United States into conflicts peripheral to U.S. security concerns.

U.S. overextension diverts limited financial resources and force structure from theaters of primary strategic interest. The deployment of 600 troops to Kosovo does not reflect the true cost of this commitment. Sustained rotational deployments significantly increase strain on force structure. Analysis of U.S. armored rotations in Europe found that sustaining a single continuous rotation requires three units for every one deployed, one forward, one recovering, and one preparing to replace it. Soldiers and equipment cannot be held in a state of perpetual forward readiness without cycles of reset, retraining, and refit.²⁰ Although KFOR is a lighter mission than the armored rotations to Europe, the same strain applies. U.S. forward force posture limits military options in a crisis. To strengthen its defense posture in a multipolar world, the United States must rethink its commitments to missions in peripheral theatres.

Risks of entanglement in Kosovo

Alliance Security Dilemmas

The alliance dynamics between the United States and Kosovo illustrate the entrapment risks associated with open-ended security commitments. Glenn Snyder’s theory of the alliance security dilemma explains how security guarantees to weaker allies can distort their behavior.²¹ In this context, the protected state gains domestic political advantages from assertive actions, while the patron state bears the resulting security costs. NATO’s commitment to deter any Serbian military action against Kosovo assures its security and eliminates political incentive for Pristina to seek compromise. Over time, this dynamic intensifies. NATO’s ongoing willingness to absorb

the consequences of Kosovo’s unilateral actions has reinforced Pristina’s expectation that NATO will maintain its security guarantees, irrespective of Kosovo’s political conduct.

Since NATO’s bombing campaign in Kosovo, there has been limited progress toward a political settlement between Serbia and Kosovo. The United States and NATO allies supported Kosovo’s formal declaration of independence from Serbia in 2008, but Serbian leadership has never recognized Kosovo’s political status and remains vehemently opposed to its recognition as an independent state in the international system. Despite persistent efforts by Western mediators to reach a political settlement, Kosovo’s leadership has not felt pressure to engage meaningfully in negotiations, as Serbian retaliation is deterred by open-ended NATO security guarantees. In March 2023, Kosovo and Serbia signed the Ohrid Agreement to normalize diplomatic relations between the two countries. Since signing the agreement, neither side has implemented any of its significant provisions. Kosovo has categorically refused to allow the Association of Municipalities with a Serbian Majority.²² In 2025, Kosovo’s Prime Minister Albin Kurti defied U.S. and E.U. warnings by installing Albanian mayors in Kosovo’s Serb-majority northern municipalities. This unilateral provocation of Serbia led the United States to suspend its strategic dialogue with Kosovo. These actions exemplify the risks Kosovo is willing to take, as it is not the primary guarantor of its own security.

Escalation Risks in North Kosovo

Escalating tensions between Prime Minister Albin Kurti’s administration and the Serbian-majority municipalities in North Kosovo pose a risk to the stability of the KFOR peacekeeping mission. The Serbian-majority municipalities of North Mitrovica, Leposavić, Zvečan, and Zubin Potok are formally part of Kosovo but have retained a high degree of local autonomy and close ties to Serbia. In 2022, Kosovo required all vehicles to have Kosovo-issued license plates, prompting Serbian communities in North Kosovo to erect road barricades. In 2024, Pristina banned the use of the Serbian dinar, which pensioners, teachers, and hospital workers in Serb communities receive from Serbia. Kosovo authorities also attempted

to reopen the contested Mitrovica bridge, which separates the city's Serb and Albanian communities. In May 2023, dozens of KFOR troops were injured during Serb protests against the appointment of Albanian mayors in Serb-majority towns after the Serbian population boycotted local elections.²³

Relations between Albanian authorities and Serbian communities continued to deteriorate, culminating in the October 2023 Banjska monastery attack, when armed Serbian militants assaulted Kosovo police. The attack killed one Kosovo police officer and was labeled an act of terrorism by the Government of Kosovo.²⁴ In response, KFOR deployed 1,000 additional troops, marking the largest reinforcement of the peacekeeping mission in a decade.²⁵ Kosovo's provocation of Serbian-majority communities risks drawing KFOR and U.S. troops into a direct confrontation with Serbia. Despite pressure from U.S. and EU leadership, Kosovo's government has continued to act aggressively in North Kosovo, and tensions remain high.

Spillover Risk

Serbia's historic and cultural ties with Russia heighten the risk of U.S. entanglement in Kosovo. Since Russia's invasion of Ukraine in 2022, Serbian President Aleksander Vučić has refused to align with EU sanctions against Russia. In May 2025, President Vučić visited Moscow to attend the 80th-anniversary Victory Day parade. Serbia's close alignment with Russia means that any NATO–Serbia military friction over Kosovo carries a spillover risk disproportionate to Kosovo's strategic value. Russia could provide Serbia with military supplies and intelligence during a conflict with NATO.

European Capacity and Responsibility in the Western Balkans

Assessing European Strategic Stake and Existing Capacity

Maintaining regional stability in the Western Balkans and deterring renewed conflict in Kosovo are strategic priorities for the European Union. The violence of the Yugoslav wars displaced millions of people. Approximately 3.7 million people, or 16% of the

Yugoslavian population, left their homes, creating the largest migration flow in Europe since the end of World War II.²⁶ In the 1990s, Germany alone resettled 700,000 Yugoslav refugees, 250,000 of whom came from Serbia and Kosovo.²⁷ In the event of renewed instability, refugee flows from Kosovo would disproportionately affect Europe, which is already struggling to resettle millions of Ukrainian refugees. Instability in the Western Balkans could also exacerbate the negative impact of organized crime corridors linked to EU markets. The Western Balkans route has been identified as a key smuggling corridor for drugs, human trafficking, and migrant smuggling.²⁸ The majority of cocaine trafficked from South America to Western Europe reaches the market through the Balkan corridor.²⁹ In addition to the risks posed by potential refugee flows and criminal spillover, the EU has a direct stake in Balkan stability due to its enlargement into the region since the 2000s. Slovenia and Croatia joined the European Union in 2004 and 2013, and all of Kosovo's neighboring countries are candidates for EU membership. For Europe, stability in Kosovo is a primary security concern.

In addition to stronger strategic interests in maintaining stability in Kosovo, Europe already has the military and logistical capacity to assume responsibility for the KFOR mission. EU countries already provide the majority of KFOR troops, with Italy, Hungary, Austria, and Germany among the largest contributors. As of 2026, the 4,636 troops deployed include 907 from Italy, 590 from the United States, and 408 from Hungary.³⁰ In 2024, Italian General Enrico Barduani became the 29th commander of KFOR. General Barduani is the 14th Italian to hold this position, underscoring Italy's prominent leadership role in KFOR.³¹ European command capacity for KFOR is well established in practice and has increased since 2022. In response to a German request for additional forces for KFOR in 2025, Lithuania deployed its first platoon-sized unit to Kosovo, effectively increasing its troop commitment by more than tenfold.³² More broadly, a European-led peacekeeping model in the Western Balkans already exists, as the EU has successfully led Operation Althea in Bosnia and Herzegovina since 2004.

Post-2022 European Defense Shift

The Russo-Ukrainian war has fundamentally reshaped Europe's security environment and attitude towards defense policy. As of 2025, all NATO allies have reached the longstanding target of spending 2 percent of GDP on defense, and with the exception of Spain, all have committed to a new 5 percent target by 2035. Poland now leads NATO defense spending in Europe at 4.48 percent of GDP, followed by Lithuania at 4 percent and Latvia at 3.73 percent.³³ In 2022, Germany established the Sondervermögen Bundeswehr, a €100 billion special fund for the armed forces, marking a notable shift away from its traditional austere defense spending.³⁴ The EU has also introduced a set of industrial and financial instruments to increase domestic defense production capacity, including the Security Action for Europe (SAFE) instrument and The European defence industry programme.³⁵ These commitments mark the most significant reorientation of European defense policy since the end of the Cold War. Europe is increasingly willing to build its defense capacity and take responsibility for its own security. The United States should capitalize on this momentum by transferring KFOR's responsibilities to European NATO members. Given the scale of resources Europe is now mobilizing, sustaining a 5,000-troop peacekeeping mission is well within its capacity.

EUFOR Althea as a Model of Success

The EU's takeover of NATO's peacekeeping mission in Bosnia demonstrates its ability to assume NATO peacekeeping operations in the Balkans. After the Dayton Accords were signed in 1995, which ended the war in Bosnia, NATO deployed the Stabilization Force (SFOR) to ensure the implementation of the peace agreement. In 1998, the United States deployed 8,500 of the 31,000 SFOR troops. In December 2004, SFOR's mission transitioned from NATO to EU leadership under Operation Althea. The EU took over with approximately 7,000 troops, maintaining the mandate of the Dayton Accords.³⁶ The transition was facilitated by the Berlin Plus arrangements, a 2003 NATO-EU framework that allows EU military operations to use NATO's military and intelligence assets.³⁷ While still operational under EU command, the mission has reduced the number of

troops deployed to Bosnia as the country's security environment remains stable. NATO maintains a headquarters in Sarajevo, but U.S. military presence is minimal and focused primarily on training and intelligence.

Since assuming responsibility in 2004, EUFOR has deterred renewed hostilities in Bosnia for over two decades. This illustrates that European allies possess the operational capacity and the political will to lead peacekeeping operations in the Western Balkans. In response to heightened tensions caused by secessionist rhetoric from the Republika Srpska leadership in 2022, EUFOR was reinforced and helped prevent the situation from escalating. This demonstrates that the mission can scale up quickly to address emerging challenges and is an effective deterrent. The structural parallels between the peacekeeping operations in Bosnia and Kosovo suggest that this model can be successfully replicated. In many aspects, Bosnia's security challenges in 2004 were more pressing than Kosovo's current security environment. The transition from SFOR to EUFOR occurred only nine years after the signing of the Dayton Accords, and inter-ethnic tensions remained high. In contrast, Kosovo has experienced 25 years of relative stability since the 1999 conflict ended, and its institutional capacity is more developed.

Assessing Objections to US Withdrawal

The primary arguments in support of continued U.S. military presence in Kosovo claim that a withdrawal could embolden a Serbian attack or that Russia or China will exploit the power vacuum. In response to the first argument, this position overstates the United States' role in Kosovo. European troops make up the majority of KFOR's force, and command of the mission has consistently rotated among European officers. Additionally, European allies would not be taking responsibility for an unfamiliar mission, as they have been part of KFOR since its inception in 1999. EUFOR's success in Bosnia is further proof that European forces can operate peacekeeping forces in the Balkans, independent of U.S. forces. This logic applies to the second argument. U.S. forces in Kosovo will be replaced by EU forces, preventing the creation of a power vacuum to be filled by Russia or China. Additionally, Europe has a much greater

strategic interest than the United States in preventing Russian or Chinese influence on its continent. The EU's engagement in Bosnia is also proof of its ability to counter Russian influence that could destabilize the region.

Policy Recommendations: Advancing US Strategic Objectives Through a Phased Withdrawal from Kosovo

Phase 1: Announcement and Transition Planning

Before a phased withdrawal of U.S. troops can take place, the United States must engage key European partners in planning the transition. First, the United States should engage EU leadership in private discussions about transitioning responsibility for the peacekeeping mission in Kosovo from NATO to the EU. The United States should confirm that the EU is ready to assume responsibility and frame the transition as a planned handover rather than an American departure. NATO, EU, and U.S. leadership must reach an agreement on command and control arrangements, force size and composition, and the scope of continued NATO support. As was negotiated during the EU takeover of SFOR in Bosnia, the EU and NATO could use the Berlin Plus arrangements, which would allow an EU mission to access NATO military and intelligence assets. Official planning by EU and U.S. leadership for the EU-led mission can be executed within a few months. Once a plan has been confirmed, the United States and the EU should jointly brief Belgrade and Prishtina. This should be done in parallel to avoid the perception that either country is being favored.

This should be followed by formal NATO and U.S. announcements of the leadership change. These announcements should be accompanied by U.S. diplomatic reassurances to both Kosovo and European leaders. Executing the withdrawal in phases mitigates the risk that the transition leads Serbia to take destabilizing action in Kosovo. This timeline also gives the EU adequate time to prepare to assume permanent rotating command of the mission.

Phase 2: Drawdown

Once the planning phase is complete, the United States can begin withdrawing forces from Kosovo. The 2004 transition from NATO's SFOR to the EU's Operation Althea in Bosnia offers a replicable model. After the SFOR mission ended, approximately 200 U.S. personnel remained in Bosnia until 2006, providing intelligence support and conducting counterterrorism operations. A smaller U.S. intelligence element continues to serve at NATO headquarters in Sarajevo.³⁸ In Kosovo, the United States could withdraw most of its troops from KFOR while retaining a residual force of roughly 100 personnel to support intelligence sharing with the EU successor mission. Because the United States currently provides only about 12 percent of KFOR's troops, it is feasible that European troops could scale up their deployments to account for these forces within a year. During this period, the United States should also consolidate its remaining operations at Camp Bondsteel and negotiate a transfer of the facility to the Kosovo government or the EU successor mission. The 2007 handover of Eagle Base in Tuzla offers a direct precedent for the United States to follow in Kosovo.³⁹

Strengthening NATO Through Responsibility Sharing

Burden-sharing in NATO has been a contentious issue for the alliance since its founding.⁴⁰ Although the United States has long pressured its European counterparts to increase defense spending, the range of security challenges facing NATO today makes burden-sharing imperative. The outbreak of the Russo-Ukrainian war in 2022 has increased European defense spending, and all European NATO members now meet the 2 percent of GDP target. While this is a positive development, burden-sharing requires going beyond defense spending. To strengthen the alliance, NATO leadership must also work on "responsibility sharing," distributing mission responsibilities from U.S. leadership across the alliance.⁴¹ Transferring responsibility for KFOR's mission to the EU could set a precedent for similar transitions elsewhere and is a viable option for the current strategic moment. European political leadership and public support for assuming expanded defense responsibilities have reached their strongest levels in a generation. As

instability in the Balkans poses a more direct threat to European security, it is in the interest of European leaders to assume responsibility for its security now.

Force Posture Reallocation

The 2025 National Security Strategy reorients U.S. foreign policy to prioritize engagement in the Western Hemisphere and the Indo-Pacific. It explicitly calls on the United States to enable Europe to take “primary responsibility for its own defense.”⁴²

Within this framework, European responsibility for ensuring stability in the Balkans advances U.S. strategic interests. Furthermore, the strategy identifies advancing U.S. deterrence against China in the Indo-Pacific as a primary security objective. While 590 troops in Kosovo may seem small relative to the scale of U.S. force requirements in the Indo-Pacific, it will signal to adversaries that the United States is serious about reorienting its force posture.

Conclusion

After 25 years of U.S. military involvement in Kosovo, the United States has achieved its objective of stabilizing the country and deterring renewed Serbian aggression. The deployment of 600 U.S. troops to an open-ended peacekeeping commitment does not further U.S. security or prosperity. Withdrawing U.S. forces from Kosovo will advance broader U.S. interests and facilitate a more balanced NATO alliance. As the EU demonstrated in Bosnia, European allies are capable and well-positioned to take over peacekeeping operations in Kosovo. Regional stability in the Balkans is critical to the EU, and the United States should encourage EU leadership to assume primary responsibility in the region.

The conditions for a successful transition are in place. The United States should capitalize on Europe’s increased defense spending and attention to its security environment to transfer ownership of peacekeeping operations in Kosovo from NATO to the EU. Transferring leadership of KFOR to European allies is a necessary step toward an alliance better suited to confront the security challenges of a multipolar era.

Endnotes

- 1 “NATO’s Air War in Kosovo: A Strategic and Operational Assessment,” RAND Corporation, Research Brief RB-75-AF, 2001, https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_briefs/RB75.html.
- 2 Larry Wentz, ed., *Lessons from Kosovo: The KFOR Experience* (Washington, DC: Department of Defense Command and Control Research Program, 2002), 106, http://www.dodccrp.org/files/Wentz_Kosovo.pdf.
- 3 “NATO’s Role in Kosovo,” North Atlantic Treaty Organization, last updated February 9, 2026, <https://www.nato.int/en/what-we-do/operations-and-missions/natos-role-in-kosovo>.
- 4 Ibid.
- 5 Ibid.
- 6 Ibid.
- 7 U.S. General Accounting Office, *Contingency Operations*, GAO/NSIAD-00-225, Report to the Chairman, Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support, Committee on Armed Services, U.S. Senate, (Washington, DC: GAO, 2000), <https://apps.dtic.mil/sti/tr/pdf/ADA382598.pdf>
- 8 “Camp Bondsteel, Kosovo,” Army Technology, accessed April 11, 2026, <https://www.army-technology.com/projects/campbondsteel/>.
- 9 GAO, *Contingency Operations*, 9.
- 10 McClure, Robert L. “The Engineer Regiment in Kosovo.” *Engineer: The Professional Bulletin for Army Engineers*, April 2000, 6. Gale Academic One-File Select, accessed April 11, 2026, <link.gale.com/apps/doc/A64732415/EAIM?u=columbia&sid=book-mark-EAIM&xid=aad7a311>.
- 11 North Atlantic Treaty Organization, *Kosovo Force (KFOR): Key Facts and Figures*, NATO Fact-sheet (Brussels: NATO, February 2026), <https://www.nato.int/content/dam/nato/webready/documents/factsheets/kfor/KFOR-Placemat.pdf>.
- 12 Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Financial Management and Comptroller), *Fiscal Year (FY) 2024 Budget Estimates: Operation and Maintenance, Army, Volume I, Justification of Estimates* (Washington, DC: Department of the Army, March 2023), <https://www.asafm.army.mil/Portals/72/Documents/BudgetMaterial/2024/Base%20Budget/Operation%20and%20Maintenance/Regular%20Army%20Operation%20and%20Maintenance%20Volume%201.pdf>.
- 13 UN Security Council, *Resolution 1244 (1999)*, *Resolution 1244 (1999) [on the Deployment of International Civil and Security Presences in Kosovo]*, S/RES/1244 (1999), June 10, 1999, <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/274488?ln=en>.
- 14 John C. Hulsman, “The Myth About America’s Commitment in Kosovo,” Heritage Foundation, August 24, 2000, <https://www.heritage.org/europe/report/myth-about-americas-commitment-kosovo>.
- 15 Steven Bowman, *Bosnia and Kosovo: U.S. Military Operations*, CRS Report No. RL32282 (Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service, February 16, 2004), <https://www.everycrsreport.com/reports/RL32282.html>.
- 16 Barry R. Posen, *Restraint: A New Foundation for U.S. Grand Strategy* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2014).
- 17 John J. Mearsheimer, *The Great Delusion: Liberal Dreams and International Realities* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2018).
- 18 Katherine Thompson, “Pay Attention to the Prioritizers,” Cato Institute, February 5, 2026, <https://www.cato.org/commentary/pay-attention-prioritizers>.
- 19 John Glaser, “Withdrawing from Overseas Bases: Why a Forward-Deployed Military Posture Is Unnecessary, Outdated, and Dangerous,” Cato Institute Policy Analysis No. 816, July 18, 2017, <https://www.cato.org/policy-analysis/withdrawing-overseas-bases-why-forward-deployed-military-posture-unnecessary>.
- 20 Ryan C. Van Wie, “Forward Presence at What Cost? Rethinking U.S. Armored Brigade Rotations in

Europe,” *Military Review* 106, no. 2 (March–April 2026), <https://www.armyupress.army.mil/Journals/Military-Review/English-Edition-Archives/March-April-2026/Forward-Presence/>.

21 Glenn H. Snyder, “The Security Dilemma in Alliance Politics,” *World Politics* 36, no. 4 (July 1984): 461–495, <https://doi.org/10.2307/2010183>.

22 Antigonë Isufi and Ardita Zeqiri, “Two Years On, Kosovo-Serbia Normalisation Deal Still Pending,” *Prishtina Insight*, March 18, 2025, <https://prishtinain-sight.com/two-years-on-kosovo-serbia-normalisation-deal-still-pending-mag/>.

23 “Ethnic Albanian Mayors Take Office In Northern Kosovo Amid Serb Protests, Clashes With KFOR,” *Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty*, May 26, 2023, <https://www.rferl.org/a/northern-kosovo-ethnic-albanian-mayors-kfor-serbs/32432330.html>.

24 U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Counterterrorism, “Country Reports on Terrorism 2023: Kosovo,” accessed April 11, 2026, <https://www.state.gov/reports/country-reports-on-terrorism-2023/kosovo>.

25 NATO, “NATO’s Role in Kosovo.”

26 Dany Bahar, Andreas Hauptmann, Cem Özgüzel, and Hillel Rapoport, “Migration and Knowledge Diffusion: The Effect of Returning Refugees on Export Performance in the Former Yugoslavia,” *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 106, no. 2 (2024): 287–304, https://doi.org/10.1162/rest_a_01165.

27 Bahar et al., “Migration and Knowledge Diffusion.”

28 Azem Kurtic, “Western Balkans Remains Key Smuggling Corridor in Europe: Report,” *Balkan Insight*, November 10, 2025, <https://balkaninsight.com/2025/11/10/western-balkans-remains-key-smuggling-corridor-in-europe-report/>.

29 Kurtic, “Western Balkans Remains Key Smuggling Corridor.”

30 NATO, KFOR: Key Facts and Figures.

31 “Italian General Enrico Barduani to Be Ap-

pointed the KFOR Commander on 11 October,” *European Western Balkans*, October 9, 2024, <https://europeanwesternbalkans.com/2024/10/09/italian-general-enrico-barduani-to-be-appointed-the-kfor-commander-on-11-october/>.

32 “Parlt OKs Deployment of About 40 Lithuanian Troops to NATO Mission in Kosovo,” *The Baltic Times*, May 15, 2025, https://www.baltictimes.com/parlt_oks_deployment_of_about_40_lithuanian_troops_to_nato_mission_in_kosovo/.

33 Atlantic Council, “NATO Defense Spending Tracker,” accessed April 11, 2026, <https://www.atlanticcouncil.org/commentary/trackers-and-data-visualizations/nato-defense-spending-tracker/>.

34 “The Bundeswehr Special Fund: 17 Months Later,” *European Security & Defence*, January 2024, <https://euro-sd.com/2024/01/articles/35987/the-bundeswehr-special-fund-17-months-later/>.

35 European Parliamentary Research Service, *Scaling Up EU Arms Production Capacity*, Briefing no. PE 779.178 (Brussels: European Parliament, 2025), [https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/ATAG/2025/779178/EPRS_ATA\(2025\)779178_EN.pdf](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/ATAG/2025/779178/EPRS_ATA(2025)779178_EN.pdf).

36 European Parliament, “Fact Sheet: EUFOR Althea,” Directorate-General for External Policies, Policy Department, accessed April 12, 2026, https://www.europarl.europa.eu/meetdocs/2009_2014/documents/sede/dv/sede031011factsheetalthea_/sede031011factsheetalthea_en.pdf.

37 North Atlantic Treaty Organization, “Relations with the European Union,” NATO, accessed April 12, 2026, <https://www.nato.int/en/what-we-do/partnerships-and-cooperation/relations-with-the-european-union>.

38 Congressional Research Service, *Bosnia and the European Union Military Force (EUFOR): Post-NATO Peacekeeping*, CRS Report No. RS21774 (Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service, January 15, 2008), <https://www.everycrsreport.com/reports/RS21774.html>.

39 Jim Greenhill, “Turnover of Eagle Base Sym-

bolizes Success in the Balkans,” National Guard Bureau, July 2, 2007, <https://www.nationalguard.mil/News/Article/572997/turnover-of-eagle-base-symbolizes-success-in-the-balkans/>.

40 Charles Cooper and Benjamin Zycher, Perceptions of NATO Burden-Sharing, R-3750-FF/RC (Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 1989), <https://www.rand.org/pubs/reports/R3750.html>.

41 Kathleen J. McInnis and Daniel Fata, From Burden Sharing to Responsibility Sharing: A New Approach for NATO’s Washington Summit, CSIS Brief (Washington, DC: Center for Strategic and International Studies, June 7, 2023), <https://www.csis.org/analysis/burden-sharing-responsibility-sharing>.

42 White House. National Security Strategy of the United States of America. Washington, DC: White House, November 2025. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2025/12/2025-National-Security-Strategy.pdf>.