

DOSSIER STRATÉGIQUE

SÉCURITÉ GLOBALE ET SURPRISES STRATÉGIQUES EN EUROPE : LES RÉPERCUSSIONS SUR L'OTAN ET L'UE

- **THE UKRAINE CRISIS, NATO'S WALES SUMMIT AND THE FUTURE OF CSDP**

LUIS SIMÓN

- **AN AMERICAN PERSPECTIVE ON THE WALES SUMMIT: NOW COMES THE HARD PART**

LEO MICHEL

- **LE SOMMET DE L'OTAN ET L'AVENIR DE LA SÉCURITÉ EN EUROPE**

GUILLAUME LASCONJARIAS

- **GERMANY'S TOUGH HIKE FROM SUMMIT TO SUMMIT**

HENNING RIECKE

- **NATO AFTER THE WALES SUMMIT: A NEW DIRECTION IN A TURBULENT WORLD**

DIEGO A. RUIZ PALMER

- **NATO'S RESONANCE IN UK DEFENCE**

DR CLAIRE CHICK

- **WALES , TO SPUR ON EUROPEAN DEFENCE**

JO COLMONT

- **THE NATO SUMMIT IN NEWPORT: POLISH PERSPECTIVE**

JUSTYNA ZAJĄC

- **EU DECEMBER 2013 COUNCIL, NATO WALES SUMMIT 2014 AND THE UKRAINIAN CRISIS
- A VIEW FROM HELSINKI**

TOMMI KOIVULA

- **SÉCURITÉ GLOBALE ET SURPRISES STRATÉGIQUES EN EUROPE**

MAURICE DE LANGLOIS

AVERTISSEMENT

Les opinions émises dans ce document n'engagent que leurs auteurs.

Elles ne constituent en aucune manière une position officielle du ministère de la défense.

INTRODUCTION

Il était important de consacrer dans la lettre de l'IRSEM, un dossier stratégique sur les approches de nos pays partenaires et des organisations à la suite de deux grands rendez-vous, le Conseil de l'UE de décembre 2013 et le sommet de l'OTAN en septembre 2014, et au regard de l'évolution sécuritaire de l'environnement de l'Europe.

Vous trouverez dans ce dossier des analyses d'auteurs sur leur pays ou l'organisation dans laquelle ils servent. Leurs différentes réactions vous donneront une idée de la diversité des appréciations, qui sont toutes données ici à titre personnel.

Il en ressort une impression de manque de confiance vis-à-vis de l'UE et de sa capacité à se développer dans le domaine de la sécurité et de la défense, doublée d'un sentiment diffus mais pas totalement partagé de désengagement des Américains. Cela se traduit par un cri d'alarme partagé sur la nécessité des Européens à se prendre en charge concrètement au niveau de leur propre sécurité. Il existe cependant de nombreuses divergences entre les Etats, que les événements actuels ne semblent malheureusement pas avoir rapprochés.

Malgré tout, plusieurs auteurs appellent l'Europe à devenir une puissance dotée de tous ses attributs et réclament une nouvelle réflexion stratégique sur sa sécurité et sa défense.

Ont contribué à ce dossier stratégique :

Luis Simón, Institute for European Studies, Bruxelles;
Leo Michel, National Defense University, Washington;
Guillaume Lasconjarias, NATO Defense College, Rome;
Henning Riecke, Deutsche Gesellschaft für Auswärtige Politik (DGAP), Berlin ;
Diego A. Ruiz Palmer, NATO's International Staff, Bruxelles;
Claire Chick, Defence Franco-British Council, Londres;
Jo Colmont, Institut Egmont, Bruxelles ;
Justyna Zając, Institute of International Relations, Université de Varsovie;
Tommi Koivula, Finnish National Defence University, Helsinki;
Maurice de Langlois, Institut de recherche stratégique de l'Ecole militaire, Paris.



THE UKRAINE CRISIS, NATO'S WALES SUMMIT AND THE FUTURE OF CSDPLUIS SIMÓN¹

Questions: In what ways can the EU's Common Security and Defense Policy (CSDP) contribute to security in Eastern Europe? And what does NATO's renewed emphasis on defense and deterrence mean for CSDP?

Since Russia's annexation of Crimea in February 2014, NATO has adopted a number of measures aimed at "reassuring" the Central and Eastern European allies. Such measures include the suspension of all practical cooperation with Russia, a greater presence of allied naval and air assets in the Baltic and Black Sea areas, and large-scale exercises and training initiatives in Central and Eastern Europe. More recently, at their September 2014 Wales Summit, NATO's Heads of State and Government decided to adopt a Readiness Action Plan to strengthen the Alliance's ability to react to any crises swiftly and firmly.

NATO's efforts to reassure the Central and Eastern European allies are understandable, given Russia's challenge to Europe's rules-based liberal international order through force and intimidation. However, Moscow's immediate focus appears to be on those non-NATO countries that straddle Russia and the West geopolitically, namely Ukraine, Moldova, Georgia and Belarus. Moreover, when it comes to expanding its influence in such countries, Moscow is showing a preference for "non-traditional" ways and means such as the use of energy as a blackmail, undercover assets (the so-called "little green men"), financial and political penetration, cyber-attacks, information and propaganda campaigns, etc.

If Europe's rules-based liberal international order is to be preserved and Europeans are to restore their relationship with Russia from a position of strength, they must integrate NATO and EU solutions into a coherent foreign policy strategy towards Eastern Europe. Such strategy must gravitate around forward European engagement in Eastern Europe and the Caucasus at the political, economic, diplomatic and military-strategic level. While there might not be enough political support in Europe for the outright integration of non-NATO, non-EU Eastern European countries into the Euro-Atlantic structures, it is important to underpin their political autonomy and ability to withstand Russian penetration. In what ways can CSDP contribute to such objectives?

While the EU does not "do" defense proper, civilian and civ/mil initiatives within the CSDP framework can play an important contribution in building the security capabilities of the EU's Eastern partners. The ongoing CSDP mission to assist the Ukrainian government with the reform of its civilian security sector is certainly a step in the right direction. However, the EU must do more than just react to events, and should seek to integrate its Ukraine mission within the framework of a broader CSDP strategy towards Eastern Europe. In this regard, European Union Assistance Mission Ukraine should be given a long-term focus, be expanded to cover the military sector, and complemented with similar initiatives in regard to Moldova and Georgia. In addition to this, Europeans should look at ways of using CSDP to strengthen the cyber-security capabilities of their Eastern partners.

When thinking about the EU's potential contribution to security in Eastern Europe, the "civilian" and "civ-mil" levels are the first ones that come to mind. This is understandable. On the one hand, the EU itself has a clear preference for "civ" and "civ-mil" solutions to security problems. On the other hand, Russia's attempt to avoid head-on military aggression and tendency to resort to more subtle means of political intimidation means Europeans would do well to look at diplomatic, "civilian" and "civ-means" of influence in Eastern Europe. However, it is important that the EU plays also a military contribution to security in Eastern Europe, by looking at mil-to-mil engagement in the area of training and exercising, educational exchanges, or capability building through the participation of Eastern partners in CSDP military operations, etc. This leads to a broader point: there is a risk that the ongoing revitalization of NATO results in the cornering of CSDP into the civilian and "civ-mil" end of security, and serves to further damage military CSDP.

Europeans should be careful of buying into the narrative of a "division of labour" whereby NATO equals military power and the EU and CSDP mean diplomacy, civilian and "civ-mil" operational solutions to security problems. If nothing else, the EU has an important ability to influence the strategic culture of its Member States. This means

that the concept of an EU-NATO division of labour would allow European countries to do “forum shopping”, and offer them the possibility to keep their military-strategic responsibilities at NATO to a testimonial level and cling to the kind of soft power narratives promoted at the EU/CSDP level. This poses a problem. In an increasingly volatile regional and global environment, what truly matters is that European countries take security more seriously, and that necessarily includes thinking about the strategic and military levels of security. For that reason, and notwithstanding the specific value of diplomatic or civilian operational initiatives, it is important that NATO and the EU speak a similar language when it comes to security. Relatedly, capability discussions in a CSDP context must begin to transcend their hitherto emphasis on crisis management and develop more of a multi-task mind frame.

Given the prospect that the NATO defence planning process reaffirms its influence over force planning and force structure in Europe, it is only logical that this process feeds into capability discussions at the EU level too. Insofar as “external crisis management” has organized most CSDP capability assumptions for the past decade or so, a more balanced conversation about capability development is needed. It is therefore fair to ask to what extent Europeans should not be talking a bit less about air-to-air refueling, strategic airlift and sealift, tactical airlift and so on, and more about long-range strike, AirLand capabilities (air combat, air defence, heavy armour and artillery, etc.), strategic and theater missile defense, cyber capabilities or energy-based weaponry. In order to be successful, this process will necessitate greater coordination between the North Atlantic Council and the European Council, as well as greater efforts to link Allied Command Transformation, Allied Command Operations and NATO’s International Military Staff with the EU Military Staff and the European Defense Agency.

¹ Research Professor at the Institute for European Studies (Vrije Universiteit Brussel) and co-founder and senior editor of European Geostrategy.



AN AMERICAN PERSPECTIVE ON THE WALES SUMMIT: NOW COMES THE HARD PART

LEO MICHEL¹

Separated by less than 28 months, NATO's most recent summits took place in very different strategic environments. In May 2012, Alliance leaders in Chicago relegated mention of Russia to a few rather anodyne paragraphs buried in the last half of their declaration. They stressed the positive ("we welcome important progress in our cooperation with Russia over the years") and cited only two items of "concern": Russia's "stated intentions regarding military deployments close to Alliance borders" and its "build-up of...military presence on Georgia's territory." In contrast, at their September 2014 summit in Wales, the Alliance leaders warned, in the second sentence of their final communiqué, that "Russia's aggressive actions against Ukraine have fundamentally challenged our vision of a Europe whole, free, and at peace." Ensuing paragraphs detailed the Allies' grievances ("we condemn in the strongest terms Russia's escalating and illegal military intervention in Ukraine") and their "demands" that Russia take concrete action to comply with its international obligations, "end its illegitimate occupation of Crimea," and stop its support of pro-Moscow separatists.

Forceful language can be useful. In this case, the Wales declaration probably helped to ensure that the 28 EU member states (of whom 22 are members of NATO) reached a consensus soon thereafter to augment sanctions against Russian firms and individuals. But now comes the hard part: implementing the Wales decisions to meet current challenges while preparing for future, hard to predict contingencies. Several areas deserve special attention.

The NATO measures taken over the past several months—for example, reinforced air police missions in the Baltic states, deployment of AWACS over Poland and Romania, increased maritime presence in the Baltic and Black seas, and quickly organized ground force exercises in the Baltic states and Poland— seem to be having the desired effect of reassuring Allies most worried about Russia." Moreover, NATO's higher profile in the region almost certainly has been welcomed by Partner countries Sweden and Finland, where recent Russian military maneuvers may have violated their airspace and territorial waters.

Over the longer term, NATO's Readiness Action Plan should demonstrate that the Alliance is able to respond in timely way and with credible effect to deter and respond to potential contingencies, including the "hybrid warfare" practiced by Russia against Ukraine. In particular, the planned Very High Readiness Joint Task Force (VJTF)—a brigade-size land force with special operations, air, and maritime elements able to be deployed within a few days— should improve NATO's responsiveness along its periphery. The planned enhancements to NATO's Multinational Corps Northeast headquarters in Szczecin, Poland, should be another step in this direction.

But key questions remain. Will the Allies provide the prepositioned assets and improved reception facilities needed by the VJTF? Which countries will contribute to the new force, for how long, and how will those contributions relate to the larger NATO Response force (for which the VJTF is intended to serve as a "spearhead") or to other "rapid response" formations (such as the EU's Battle Groups or the French-British Combined Joint Expeditionary Force)? What will be SACEUR's authority to call "snap" exercises or perhaps deploy elements of the VJTF? And what part of the new force will be subject to NATO common funding?

Behind these questions lurks a wider challenge: reversing the trend of declining defense budgets, using available funds more effectively, and finding a more equitable sharing of costs and responsibilities. The language agreed at Wales—notably, that Allies will "aim to move toward the 2 percent (of GDP) guideline (for defense expenditures) within a decade"—is, of course, far from a guarantee, and NATO's poor record of performance with similar targets can leave one a bit skeptical. While a handful of Allies have announced spending increases, the French and German defense ministries seem to be struggling to maintain their current budgets, which fall far short of the 2 percent target, and a recent report by the respected British think-tank, RUSI, estimates that UK defense spending will fall below the target—to less than 1.9 percent—as early as next year. And while the summit unveiled a new "framework nations concept" intended to facilitate multinational cooperation on capabilities development, it will take some time to evaluate if, in practice, this initiative will generate more capabilities than the "smart defense", "Connected Forces Initiative," or EU "pooling and sharing" efforts.

Another question: Given the attention devoted in Wales to responding to Russian policies and actions, what did the Alliance agree to do for Ukraine? In the near-term, at least, NATO's practical assistance seems modest relative to the situation on the ground: more help to Kiev on military organizational reform, defense education, improving interoperability, and some new programs improve Ukrainian C3, logistics, and "military career transition."

On a national basis, the United States has promised \$116 million in security assistance—including body armor, vehicles, night and thermal vision devices, engineering equipment, advanced radios, and counter-mortar radars—of which only a portion has been delivered. But the administration of President Barack Obama has declined, so far, Ukrainian requests for lethal weaponry, despite calls to do so by some members of Congress. As one unnamed American official explained in late September: "It's our assessment that if we were to provide [lethal aid], a likely result would be military escalation and greater Russian involvement. Our concern is that Ukraine faces inescapable military asymmetry with Russia."

Thus, at this juncture, the best deterrent against more interference by Moscow in Ukraine may be the combination of EU and American sanctions, which appear to be having some effect on important sectors of the Russian economy. Unfortunately, in the near term, these also have served as a pretext for President Putin's increasingly strident rhetoric against the transatlantic allies. Hence, Ukraine is likely to take its place among the "frozen conflicts" like Georgia and Moldova.

A final observation: the understandable focus at Wales on reaffirming the collective defense aspects of the Alliance risks overshadowing its other "core tasks" of crisis management and cooperative security. The continuing, complex, and violent conflicts in Afghanistan, Syria, Iraq, and parts of northern Africa (especially Libya and the Sahel) will pose an array of dangers for, and demands upon, the transatlantic allies for years, possibly decades, to come. And simmering tensions—arising from the Israel-Palestinian impasse and Iranian nuclear dossier, to cite only two examples—could reach a boiling point with little advance warning. "Our Alliance remains an essential source of stability in this unpredictable world," as the Wales declaration reminded us. Left unsaid—but just as true—is that the gap between acknowledging that fact and mobilizing our national and collective resources and political will to project "stability" is still alarmingly wide.

¹ Distinguished Research Fellow, National Defense University. Washington. These are the author's personal views.



LE SOMMET DE L'OTAN ET L'AVENIR DE LA SÉCURITÉ EN EUROPE

GUILLAUME LASCONJARIAS¹

Les sommets de l'OTAN se suivent mais ne se ressemblent pas : à bien des égards, le Sommet de l'OTAN à Newport (Pays de Galles), qui s'est achevé le 5 septembre dernier, aura été sinon un des plus ambitieux, du moins un des plus réussis de ces dernières années. La raison en est simple : l'évolution rapide du contexte international – et notamment la crise russo-ukrainienne – a sonné comme un rappel à l'ordre pour une alliance dont la principale mission, depuis douze ans, était tournée vers l'Afghanistan. Sans céder à la tentation du raccourci, la comparaison mérite d'être faite avec les conclusions du sommet européen de décembre 2013, consacré pour une large part aux questions de défense. La lecture du communiqué otanien – sans doute le plus long dans l'histoire de l'organisation – ressemble presque à un inventaire à la Prévert, où l'on retrouve les sujets d'interrogations et de préoccupations communs aux 28 ainsi qu'à un grand nombre de partenaires : les fondements de l'alliance en sortent renforcés par l'annonce de nouveaux éléments supposés répondre à une nouvelle forme de guerre, sans toutefois occulter des thèmes déjà abordés à Lisbonne (novembre 2010) et Chicago (mai 2012). Il en va autrement à la lecture du compte-rendu européen, marqué par une concision et un ascétisme que d'aucuns pourraient analyser comme la formulation d'ambitions limitées. Pourtant, à y bien regarder, les deux organisations partagent plus de sujets communs qu'elles ne l'imaginent. Elles l'assument, puisque qu'il s'agisse de la notion de « complémentarité » ou de « partenariat stratégique », UE et OTAN savent qu'ils ne peuvent faire seuls mais qu'ils sont condamnés à s'entendre.

Le premier, et sans doute le principal point d'accord, avant même les considérations géopolitiques immédiates, tient à l'importance de la défense comme thème. Certainement, l'OTAN y est moins étranger que l'Europe ; encore peut-on saluer l'aggiornamento de l'UE qui juge la défense importante. « *Defence matters* », lit-on dans le compte-rendu du Conseil européen, une formule reprise par le Secrétaire général de l'OTAN lors de la Conférence de Sécurité de Munich en février 2014. L'emphase est mise sur la réduction inquiétante des budgets de défense, dont les conséquences sont significatives en termes de capacités opérationnelles limitées. Mais là où l'UE comprend qu'il faut des moyens et des investissements suffisants, l'OTAN insiste pour une relance et une hausse des budgets. Les alliés s'entendent sur un minimum de 2% du PIB consacré à la défense, un seuil défendu depuis quelques années et qui n'est donc pas nouveau. En revanche, les engagements sont précisés et pour la majorité des alliés, cela sous-entend un accroissement constant de leur budget de défense au cours de la prochaine décennie, dont au moins 20% seraient dédiés aux matériels de nouvelle génération. Après des années de réductions sévères, cela pourrait marquer un coup d'arrêt que tous jugent nécessaires, mais auxquels bien peu s'attèlent (à l'exception de la Pologne et plus récemment, des Pays-Bas qui ont annoncé une allonge de 100 millions d'euros).

Le second point tient à la poursuite des actions de partage du fardeau, c'est-à-dire la mutualisation et le partage des ressources dans le domaine des capacités militaires. Qu'il s'agisse du programme européen de « *pooling and sharing* » ou de la « *smart defence* » otanienne, les collaborations sont déjà bien engagées. Le travail entre l'Agence de Défense Européenne et *Allied Command Transformation*, bien qu'il ne soit pas cité, se poursuit, même s'il se trouve moins sous les projecteurs qu'il y a deux ans, au moment de son lancement, signe à la fois de maturité et de difficulté à lancer de nouveaux programmes multinationaux. Certes, le constat est partagé sur les déficiences capacitaires : ravitaillement en vol, transport stratégique, drones et communication. Quelques solutions sont cependant aujourd'hui intéressantes à observer car elles ont atteint un seuil de maturité critique : ainsi, l'UE signale la valeur ajoutée de l'*European Air Transport Command* (EATC) dont on pourrait espérer une réplique dans d'autres services². Autre domaine transverse dont chacun juge de l'importance, le cyber, où l'OTAN bénéficie d'un centre d'excellence à Tallinn (Estonie). Le choix d'une coopération approfondie se marque aussi par une transparence accrue et un meilleur partage de l'information en termes de planification de défense. Alors que le nouveau cycle du *NATO Defence Planning Process* débute, la cohérence poursuivie entre UE et OTAN devrait éviter les duplications et redondances³.

D'une façon plus générale, et tout en se souvenant des combats politiques et industriels qui y sont associés, la dimension industrielle et technologique n'est pas occultée des deux rapports. Cependant, reconnaître l'importance d'une industrie de défense compétitive et plus intégrée ne résout nullement les tensions toujours sensibles entre

un complexe états-unien et une industrie européenne plus fragmentée, dans un contexte de recomposition et de glissement vers de nouveaux marchés – essentiellement en Asie du Sud-Est. Pour autant, le maintien de capacités industrielles et technologiques propres est relevée par l'UE qui y voit le prix de son indépendance stratégique. Et l'OTAN par deux fois, reconnaît le rôle essentiel de cette dimension, en réclamant « *Une industrie de défense forte dans toute l'Alliance, notamment une industrie de défense plus forte en Europe...reste indispensable à la fourniture des capacités requises* »⁴ et le besoin de « *développer et de maintenir les capacités de défense nationales et la base technologique et industrielle de défense dans toute l'Europe et en Amérique du Nord* »⁵.

Sur un plan purement opérationnel, les deux organisations disposent en théorie d'un outil de réaction rapide, qu'il s'agisse de la *NATO Response Force* (NRF) ou des *European Battle Groups* (EUBGs). Le Sommet de Newport a inauguré un nouvel étage au travers de la *Very High Readiness Task Force* (VJTF) qui doit avant tout servir d'outil de réassurance aux alliés, au travers une brigade hautement mobile et déployable sous très court préavis. Cette décision est avant tout une réponse à la posture agressive de la Russie et aux actions menées en Crimée et en Ukraine ; elle s'inscrit dans le cadre du *Readiness Action Plan* dont les effets sont avant tout de nature politique, inscrits dans le principe de défense collective qui scelle les relations entre alliés. Pour autant, NRF 2.0 ou EUBGs, les modalités de prise de décision et de financement pèsent lourdement sur le choix et la volonté des pays-membres d'user de ces outils autrement qu'à la marge, comme un vecteur d'interopérabilité par exemple. Enfin, ces outils s'inscrivent dans la palette des moyens conventionnels, et rien ne dit qu'ils soient en mesure d'assurer une réponse efficace à des formes de guerre irrégulière ou à des menaces hybrides.

En conclusion, dans un cas comme dans l'autre, la succession de crises dans leur environnement géopolitique proche (la contagion de la crise syrienne et l'émergence de Daesh, le conflit en Ukraine, l'instabilité de la Libye et de l'ensemble de la bande saharo-sahélienne...) doit convaincre les Européens que le prix de leur liberté passe par le maintien d'une crédibilité stratégique et capacitaire. Toutefois, cette crédibilité ne peut se déconnecter d'une analyse politique et stratégique. À l'heure des menaces globales et de la gestion des crises, il ne s'agit plus simplement de penser la complémentarité UE-OTAN en séparation des tâches entre une Europe qui apporterait essentiellement des capacités civiles et l'OTAN ses moyens militaires. Il faut aller plus loin : cela signifie, pour l'UE, la volonté de ne pas simplement proposer une réponse capacitaire sans savoir à quoi, ni à qui, cela pourrait servir. Il est temps pour l'Europe de se penser comme puissance, en mettant véritablement en pratique ce qui avait déjà été écrit en 2003⁶. Pour l'OTAN, il en va autrement, au sens où l'Alliance dispose déjà d'un document de référence, le Concept stratégique de 2010 qui semble finalement aujourd'hui sinon dépassé, du moins peut-être à réécrire. La crise ukrainienne devrait aider à non plus simplement rappeler les missions principales de l'alliance, mais les re-prioriser en se souvenant que l'OTAN est d'abord et avant tout une organisation de sécurité régionale. Pour les deux, cela passe par une meilleure communication stratégique, une analyse fine des menaces et notamment des formes de « guerre hybride », mise en lumière à travers un discours clair et une véritable approche doctrinale et conceptuelle qui garantissent le soutien des opinions publiques.

¹ Chercheur au *NATO Defense College* Rome. Les propos sont ceux de l'auteur et ne reflètent pas les vues et opinions du Collège de Défense ou de l'OTAN

² L'EATC n'est pas une initiative de l'UE et n'a aucun lien fonctionnel ou de subordination avec les instances de Bruxelles. Ce commandement est placé sous la direction d'un comité où siègent 4 CEMA (le *MATRAC : Multinational Air transport Committee*).

³ Il existe au sein de l'EU un Plan de développement des capacités (CDP) dont la dernière version date de 2010 (http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/esdp/118348.pdf). Elle insiste cependant sur la coopération entre programmes OTAN/UE et la complémentarité devant exister.

⁴ Article 14 des conclusions du sommet de Newport

⁵ Article 74 des conclusions du sommet de Newport

⁶ Jolyon Howorth, *European Security Post-Libya and Post-Ukraine: In Search of Core Leadership*, *Imagining Europe* n°8, IAI, Rome, Mai 2014 et Conseil Européen, *A Secure Europe in a Better World. European Security Strategy*, Bruxelles, 12 décembre 2003, <http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cmsUpload/78367.pdf>.

GERMANY'S TOUGH HIKE FROM SUMMIT TO SUMMIT

HENNING RIECKE¹

The NATO summit in Wales has both been a presentation of upbeat resolve and deep frustration. While the reaction of the alliance to the changed security environment after the Ukraine crisis has been decisive and credible, it comes with the sobering acknowledgement that the partnership approach NATO has held up over a quarter of a century can no longer be applied to Russia. The partnership for peace and the membership preparation have brought stability in a region in transition. Moscow did not adopt the paradigm of democratic participation, rule of law and free markets. The alliance has to find new ways to make partnership attractive, deterrence credible, and its partnership policy open – also for Moscow.

Compared to the EU summit in December 2013, where the Union members put ESDP back on the agenda, quite a bit has changed: European defense then seemed to lack a direction. The EU leaders agreed to do more, in areas of most blatant incapacity, such as air-to-air-refueling, drones, satellite communication, and cyber. The Union asked for deeper defense cooperation, but was offered few initiatives from the members. Most of the decisions referred to homework, reviews to be finalized, and projects to be finished later. Yet there was no clear strategic outlook, and, as defense pundit Nick Witney has pointed out, none of the big three Union states was eager to champion defense.

Germany had then launched initiatives that looked like a slimmed down version of expeditionary warfare, more easily to sell to an unwilling electorate. Berlin proposed to build up partners in crisis regions with training and exercise, to help them do jobs that Europe was unwilling to fulfill. German ideas about reforms of the Battle Groups concept were designed to make them more deployable, but also more civilian and flexible. But reality overtook the conceptual debate. The demand for weapons assistance for the Iraqi Kurds forced the Germans to apply tools they had just announced. Obviously, the crises in Ukraine, Syria and Iraq have caused a rebalancing of Europe's attention to its neighborhood.

The new adverse relationship to Russia was an even more painful shift for Germany that had always been a staunch supporter for a partnership and cooperation approach. Driven by historical experience, many of the German Rus-siophiles routinely opposed the deterrence posture of NATO demanded by the Baltic States and Poland and saw no alternative to a negotiated partnership. Today, with Russians infiltration in Ukraine, these bridge-builders find it hard to lean towards Moscow. Germany has sent more planes to help with air policing over the Baltic States and will strengthen the multinational Corps Northeast in Szczecin. The belief persists however, that cooperation, multi-lateral frameworks, and confidence-building are just the right tools in coping with the difficult neighbor. Even Angela Merkel sees a value based partnership with Russia as a mid to long-term objective.

As yet, NATO has shifted its attention towards defense and deterrence. Given that the new "Very High Readiness Joint Task Force" can be created until the next summit in Warsaw (so the Poles hope), as an extension of the NATO response force, NATO has tools that can be quickly deployed to meet an intrusion on the margins of NATO territory. That would mean not only to the East but also to the South. The new structure is itself a compromise: Both its *tous azimuts* orientation, as well as the insistence, that the new posture does not put the NATO Russia Founding Act of 1997 in question, have been German demands. So the new force has to be credible enough as deterrence posture to please the nervous Baltic allies, and vague enough not to be seen as offensive for Moscow.

The alliance has to do other homework as well. It has not yet found an answer to the new sort of "hybrid threats", when nonmilitary elements of cyber war, propaganda, informal fighters and energy dependence play important roles in overall strategy. Now, no war has ever been only fought by the military, but Russia has perfected the strategic use of non-military pressure. NATO seeks to signal vigilance with language in the summit declaration, to apply "the full range of capabilities necessary to deter and defend against any threat to the safety and security of our populations, wherever it should arise. The alliance document also placed cyber-attacks in the context of Article 5. Germany, for long in opposition against such a functional expansion of NATO defense, could help to work to include non-military aspects of security into the Article 5 realm.

In Wales, Germany authored a new initiative on defense cooperation, offering to stand in as Framework Nation for joint procurement. Nations with the full spectrum of capabilities should offer cooperation to smaller countries with the goal to eliminate individual capabilities in the course of procurement. Germany is leading a group of ten to help procurement in the areas of logistics; RNBC protection, fire-power and deployable headquarters. Great Britain and Italy are the other two framework nations. The concept was welcome, but the UK had a different approach in mind: The Brits look at deployability of a new Joint Force working with existing equipment.

What Germany will do to support NATO's paradigm shift depends on the current re-shuffling of its defense and security policy. Germany needs to be more responsible, said the Federal President at the Security Conference in Munich - in terms of using German power and weight for in international relations. This cannot be reduced to military power projection alone, but the reflexive military restraint cannot be the guiding star of German foreign policy any longer. The Foreign Office has started a review process about improving German Foreign Policy and the Defense Ministry is scrutinizing German procurement policy - a report in mid-October brought embarrassing inefficiency to light. After German planes carrying humanitarian aid to the Ebola region had to be grounded for repairs, new reports about the miserable state of the Bundeswehr equipment put decades of budget cuts in question. Facing skeptical partners for defense cooperation, a Bundestag committee is now examining ways to loosen parliamentary co-decision on out of area deployment of the units in which partners should join. Add to that the current squabbles about the politico-moral implications of arms exports. A lot is in flux, so this might lead to further muddling through, but could also initiate a substantial change in German defense policy. Even for Germany, an active and well funded defense policy could be an aspect of being a normal state.

The plans that NATO has announced could show Russia the limits of its influence in competition with the West, could reassure the Eastern European NATO members that do not trust their bigger allies to aid against Russian intrusions. The NATO summit could also play part in the building of the coalition against one of the most dangerous Islamist movements now striving in Syria and Iraq. With these new goals in mind, Germany needs to be a forerunner in defense cooperation. That would mean not only procurement of new capabilities together with its partners but also deploying them if a security emergency demands that.

¹ Head of the Transatlantic Relations Program. Deutsche Gesellschaft für Auswärtige Politik (DGAP) Berlin



NATO AFTER THE WALES SUMMIT: A NEW DIRECTION IN A TURBULENT WORLD

DIEGO A. RUIZ PALMER¹

In the real-estate and retail businesses, it is often said that location is everything. This seems to have been no less true for NATO, in relation to its turbulent eastern and southern periphery, in the run-up to the recently-completed NATO summit meeting held in Wales, United Kingdom, on 4-5 September. At Wales, the Allies decided upon a new course, aimed at cementing NATO's political credibility and military capacity in the face of strategic challenges to European security from a resurgent Russia and an emerging Islamic State in Iraq and Syria (ISIL). In particular, Allies affirmed the preeminence of NATO's long-standing collective defense clause and the enduring centrality of the transatlantic bond, while strengthening partnership ties with non-NATO countries across the globe and keeping the door to membership for aspirants open.

To back-up their commitments, the Allies approved a Readiness Action Plan aimed at enhancing the Alliance's readiness and responsiveness, notably through the further bolstering of the NATO Response Force and the establishment of a Very High Readiness Joint Task Force that will be able to deploy within a few days; a "defense planning package" oriented to fulfilling capability priorities; and a "Defense Investment Pledge" designed to reverse the decline of defense spending and military capability among many Allies since 2008. Once implemented, these decisions will result in Alliance forces that have restored their operational capacity across a broad spectrum of missions. In effect, the Wales Summit set in motion the most ambitious and substantive set of measures to strengthen NATO since the end of the Cold War.

Challenges should not be overlooked, however. The Alliance faces a confluence of diverse and evolving security risks, of an increasingly complex and hybrid nature, at the very time when Allies are confronted with the gravest economic crisis in a generation. Defence budgets are depressed, force structures deflated and equipment inventories divested. NATO's operational capacity and readiness have been degraded in some areas and, overall, the margin for safety thinned. Restoring Alliance military capabilities to their full potential will require resolve and resources.

A determined reorientation in a more uncertain security environment

Originally, the Wales Summit had been seen as the capping public event of NATO's transition from a "deployed Alliance" to a "prepared Alliance" initiated at the Chicago Summit in May 2012. At Chicago, Alliance leaders had set out a shorter-term horizon – the completion of the NATO-led International Security Assistance Force's (ISAF) engagement in Afghanistan by December 2014 – and a longer-term one for the continuing transformation of allied capabilities, labeled "*NATO Forces 2020*".

Russia's actions vis-à-vis Ukraine over the last year, notably the illegal annexation of the Crimean Peninsula and other coercive behavior in relation to Ukraine, as well as ISIL's emergence, altered significantly that calculus. In the run-up to Wales, Allies could no longer assume safely that Europe would be exempted from the threat of political intimidation and military coercion, or from the risk of widening instability and accidental escalation. Deterrence, assurance, and defense required a fresh look.

Increasingly, Russia's discourse and military preparations reveal a misplaced and worrying perception of the Allies as an adversary and of NATO as a threat. Strategically, Russia's occupation of the Crimean Peninsula bears all of the markings of a deliberate enterprise to bolster Russia's western deployments opposite NATO, by making Sebastopol a strategic "outpost" in the Black Sea and, thereby, complementing similar outposts in Kaliningrad and Murmansk.

Key aspects of the determined restoration of Russia's military capacity for large-scale, geo-political maneuver on its periphery include:

- The establishment of joint operational commands, super-imposed over four large military districts (West; East; South and Center);
- The conversion of many former Soviet divisions into combined-arms brigades, several of which are manned with volunteers, rather than conscripts;
- The restoration of the Russian Navy and Air Force's expeditionary capacity, in the form of more frequent oceanic deployments and long-range flights;
- The conduct of short-notice, "snap alert" exercises designed to test the readiness and preparedness of various forces;
- The staging, on rotation among the four joint commands, of large-scale, live exercises (e.g., *Zapad* 2009 and 2013; and *Vostok* 2010 and 2014); and
- The provision of modern equipment at the tactical level, notably for the infantryman, as well as the operational-strategic level, for instance new generations of advanced surface-to-surface and surface-to-air missiles.

These measures have been on display in and around Ukraine, in the form of a comprehensive and savvy theater strategy that mixes old and new, hard and soft power means and methods, including the use of conventional military formations, special operations forces, clandestine intelligence agents, proxies, deception, propaganda and misinformation, all knit into a smart communications narrative.

For its part, the rise of ISIL is a reminder that *al Qaeda* was a precursor *jihadi* movement, which, in its time, "showed the way," but is no longer the sole repository of Islamic extremism. The wide-ranging diffusion of malevolent ideologies and the ease of international travel have helped make extremism an increasingly entrenched and ubiquitous phenomenon, with local roots in Central Asia, the Middle East and parts of Africa, but with global appeal and connections, including in Europe.

Implications of a new strategic age for the Alliance

Following Wales, the way ahead for enhancing promptly the readiness, responsiveness and operational capacity of the Alliance is clear. The emergence of a new strategic age, however, invites a longer-term reflection on the strategic assumptions that should underpin NATO's deterrence and defense posture and drive NATO's defense planning process in the years ahead.

Items that may merit further reflection include, but are not limited to:

- The interaction between deterrence, assurance and defense, particularly in blurred crisis circumstances characterized by the risks of intimidation and coercion, rather than the threat of aggression, and the use of hybrid means and methods;
- The complementarity between the security of the Allies and that of partner countries that aspire to get closer to the Alliance and which may face threats to their sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity;
- The balance in operational capability that should be pursued in preparing Alliance forces to undertake counter-coercion and counter-aggression operations, as well as counter-terrorism and counter-insurgency operations, while maintaining a capacity for stabilization and peace-enforcement operations;
- The level of ambition for achieving a deterrent capacity for prompt and large-scale, "counter-concentration" maneuver, to de-escalate a crisis, which is distinct from a capability to conduct high-intensity operations in either conventional or asymmetric environments, in as well as beyond Europe; and
- The desirable degree of mutual complementarity between European and North American forces, as well as among European forces, that NATO should aim for, in the quest for more effective and equitable task- and responsibility-sharing.

NATO can pride itself of having played the uncontested role of a transformation hub for decades, lifting the military capabilities of all Allies, larger and smaller alike. Never has this role been as important as in helping implement the decisions made at Wales.

¹Diego A. Ruiz Palmer serves on NATO's International Staff, Brussels. The views expressed herein should not be taken to reflect the position of NATO or of NATO member nations.



NATO'S RESONANCE IN UK DEFENCE

DR CLAIRE CHICK¹

Back in December 2013, the gathering of the European Council had been much expected as its purpose was to tackle defence issues neglected over five long years. In the end, it was a disappointment. The British had gone there clutching the dossier of military capabilities, and had made the replenishing of the defence budgets of EU members a priority. In the cacophony of diverging paths, they returned from Brussels to London without having convinced anyone. But without any animosity. They were confident that their road map would be listened to at the 2014 NATO summit.

2014 Wales summit - British happiness was in the air

It's the end of the summer, but the skies above Wales are clear for the Atlantic coalition's fly-past. David Cameron is not only satisfied, he is happy. Happy that he has brought together major international leaders for an event qualified as historic, the first objective of which is the transformation of the Alliance. This has now been achieved. Twenty-four years after the London NATO summit, which had opened the way to the post-cold war reconversion, the UK believes that the Newport meeting has put an end to the nagging question of NATO's future role.

The decisions taken in September 2014 cover a wide range of commitments. In Britain, the robust response to Russia is considered to be a significant achievement that confirms the importance of Article 5 of the Washington Treaty with regard to security in the 21st century. The embodiment of capacity building and the Armed Forces Declaration are other firm markers that have been put down by the twenty-fourth NATO Summit. But for the UK, the real input lies elsewhere. "Collective security cannot be a perpetual free lunch" the Secretary of State for Defence had declared at the Franco-British Council 2013 Defence conference. This short phrase says it all – burden sharing can no longer be put off. Hence Britain's clear enthusiasm for two deliverables decided in Newport – the Readiness Action Plan (RAP) designed to guarantee increased interoperability between allies in the service of a coalition of the willing; the defence investment pledge to ensure that the twenty-eight states (including 22 members of the EU) shall no longer be tempted to heed the siren calls for reductions in military spending. Two weeks ahead of the Scottish referendum, the Prime Minister cast his net wide in a bid to avert the break-up of the United Kingdom. With the NATO summit, in the heart of Wales, he provided a demonstration on British identity defined by the security structure that has been in place for over sixty years. And based on the special relation with the United States.

European partnerships remain behind the scenes

Has nothing changed therefore between NATO and Britain? The question is a valid one, as the parameters are no longer the same, and, in particular, the US so-called pivot towards Asia and the fundamentalist terrorist threat have raised questions about the basics of the Alliance. But in Newport, the strengthening of UK-US ties was unequivocal, and demonstrated by the joint determination of David Cameron and Barack Obama to combat ISIL.

The return of France into NATO's integrated military command and the recent Franco-British defence partnership could also have impacted the NATO-UK relationship. But in its renewed rapprochement with France, Britain is both complimentary and prudent. The final Newport Declaration does indeed highlight the deterrent role of independent strategic nuclear forces from Britain and France, but it is the only aspect of the bilateral flagship on display at the Wales summit. Everything put in place over the last four years between the UK and France on conventional defence as a result of the Lancaster House Treaty, has remained in the wings. UK officials are indeed keen to point out that they have very few areas of disagreement with their French partner. The alignment of national strategies, the similarity of the vocabulary used in the respective White Papers, the absence of any disagreement on substantive issues in defence and the permanent dialogue have all been sincerely underscored. But this mutual trust and even the intensity of the exchanges of views on the sidelines of the summit have not received any publicity. Although the

French have been exhorting the partnership to increase its visibility, in particular on the Atlantic stage, UK officials point out that the opportunity simply did not arise.

No easy deal can be guaranteed with France on the side of the EU

Could it arise in the framework of the EU? This is what had been said shortly before December 2013, Franco-British defence co-operation having been considered by many as a driving force for EU security. But it is also what didn't happen. And it is clear that the general elections in the UK and the implementation of the next Strategic Defence and Security Review (SDSR) will give rise to a particularly difficult context in so far as concerns the preparation of the Brussels discussions in June 2015, in particular with regard to defence industrial perspectives.

However, two areas may be of particular interest - Africa, which is not a NATO subject, could become more significant for the EU. Beyond the current cooperation in the Sahel, the new sensitive dossier of the pooling of intelligence between Britain and France, bears witness to the advances made regarding future joint deployment. Second, the European Council could contribute to removing the confusion on the guidelines of the UK Joint Expeditionary Force (JEF) which is largely turned towards NATO, by clarifying the role of the Franco-British CJEF, described in Newport as a force initiated by « two allies » for the « full spectrum of operations, including at high intensity ». An activated window for a potential EU rapid reaction tool as well?

The appetite to clarify European capabilities will always resonate with Whitehall civil servants, all the more so as declarations at the Wales summit on Euro-Atlantic relations validate the necessary complementarity with the EU. The only dirty word that must be avoided at all costs is duplication. And here, in terms of UK narrative, Newport has just been business as usual.

¹ Head of Defence Franco-British Council, London



WALES , TO SPUR ON EUROPEAN DEFENCE

JO COLMONT¹

The Wales summit was a remarkable one, in many ways. “Events, dear boy, events” had an impact on the meeting. However, the final outcome was reflected but well known strategic views and aimed at boosting already well known policies to act accordingly. It was not really about introducing novelties, although some have been, and got much attention.

Wales, most peculiar.

One should point out the many peculiarities of this NATO summit. Russia was not invited. However, it was the elephant in the room. Secondly, an even more evil creature was omnipresent, called ISIS. According to observers it consumed about 60% of political energy. Thirdly, the strategic objectives of the US - and to a great extent even its priorities - remained unchanged. There was real concern about the crisis in Ukraine. However, Washington's priorities, clearly, continue to lie elsewhere. Fourthly, the EU as such was present and, on specific topics, appeared to be a relevant actor. As to the Union's more strategic objectives not much clarity was displayed. Finally, the issue of CSDP - NATO relations was not on the agenda. This topic was, once more, considered to be a “temporary” taboo. In sum, most of political attention was absorbed by non-NATO issues, except for the “reassurance measures” taken. In essence, Wales was more about global security concerns and, in particular, a more balanced burden-sharing among Allies to take up responsibility. The immediate practical outcome: a streamlining of the economic sanctions against Russia to be taken by the US and the EU.

While intervening directly in Ukraine, Russia intentionally conducted a series of specific actions to directly harass some NATO countries. In doing so, exploring and even crossing limits, the objective of Moscow was to divert attention from operations in the Crimea and Eastern Ukraine towards a debate within NATO on the more internal matters, which led to the debate on reassurance among Allies – which is not to say that Moscow was masterminding this process. Reassurance and deterrence were and are key to all Allies and to NATO as its “raison d'être”. And thus actions on reassurance have been taken, rightly so. Moreover, in doing so, it was equally important for the US to indirectly provide reassurance to its Asian partners as well.

The main message.

However, the real political message stemming for Wales was twofold. It has been reiterated that within NATO the emphasis is on collective defense, with the focus on military assets and capabilities and on interoperability among Allies and Partners. And yes, conducting crisis management operations is also within the remit of NATO. However, there is a Transatlantic consensus that it is the crisis at hand that determines the organization, the nation or the coalition of nations to take the lead. In this respect no hierarchy exists, let alone any right of first refusal. Secondly, there is a general understanding that every military crisis management operation is to be part and parcel of a comprehensive approach. In this respect, the European Union and the Alliance are seen as complementary. But the main political message put forward in Wales is that the current imbalance between American and European defense efforts is no longer tenable. Europeans have to gain more autonomy rather swiftly so as to be able to conduct crisis management operations without being too dependent on US military capabilities. In short, the EU as such has to become a security provider, not least its own region, and it even has to become a significant contributor elsewhere.

A contradiction.

It is remarkable to notice that such clear political guidance, subscribed to by all, once it is being translated into a

series of taskings, be it NATO or in the Union, leads to a swamp, drawing in the overall political objectives into the murky waters of fragmentation, duplication, redundancies, and persistent capability shortfalls. This is definitely the case for NATO – EU relations. Wales was not helpful in this respect, by introducing new initiatives related to capabilities that have the potential to even augment confusion. With the *Very High Readiness Joint Task Force*, a kind of double sized EU Battle Group, a new stand-by force is created. The focus is indeed on deterrence, so hopefully the forces will never to be called upon. Will it have an impact on the capability to deploy forces elsewhere? The real novelty is that NATO is to embrace the “*Framework Nation Concept*”. Among the three nations taking the lead in such a framework there are quite different views as to the desired outcome. Is it about capability building, about a force generation concept to support crisis management operations or about new islands of cooperation? At the looks of it, it seems to hold the middle between the EU concepts on “Pooling and Sharing” and “Permanent Structured Cooperation”. It is indeed a very creative instrument that has real potential. But is all this the right answer to the overall political guidance given at Wales?

How come?

How to explain that on the one hand there is a clear common view on the main transatlantic objectives while on the other hand there still is no clarity at all about the more concrete but crucial questions such as : who is to do what, where, when, how and with which means? In other words, where is the strategy? The US has a strategy. NATO, as an instrument of strategy, has a strategic concept. And the EU? Not yet! The 2003 security strategy is dealing with the question on *how* to act, that is: *comprehensively, preventively and worldwide, through multilateralism* - noble objectives. What about a strategy for European defense? What about gaining more autonomy and being able to act as a security provider?

We once tried to set up European Defence outside the EU structures, through the WEU and it failed. Then we tried within NATO with a *European Security and Defence Identity (ESDI)*, and it failed. We are now on the third and last avenue available. European Defence will be European or not. And European Defence will also be part and parcel of a comprehensive approach, i.e. the EU approach, or none.

How to overcome?

It is clear that the issue of a strategy can no longer be ducked. Fortunately the European Council meeting of December 2013 provided ample guidance and a series of taskings to provide the answers to all outstanding issues in order to forge a genuine security strategy, and it even ordered a strategy as such.

Fortunately, since most countries are members of both NATO and EU, all duplications can and must be eliminated. No taboos allowed. As to the Strategic Headquarters, that is not such a sensitive issue after all. A solution can and will be found to the too many options existing at present within the EU, the way we did years ago within NATO. But what we are really lacking at the EU level to autonomously conduct military operations are some specific Force HQs. They do exist, even on European soil, and are co-financed by European countries. Time has come to forge a new arrangement. Time has come ensure that some more of the existing FHQs become answerable to EU/ CSDP and to NATO alike. Time has come to forge a “*Brussels + agreement*”.

In the end:

The ball is now in the camp of the Europeans. That was the main message of Wales. Not that new. The translation “in clear” was. The main threat to Europe is now to lose its Allies and partners, because of its relative weakness, due to fragmentation and a, so far, persistent reluctance of EU Member States to use to the full extent the instruments of cooperation and solidarity that they have themselves created at the EU level. And in this respect, Wales constitutes an important pillar to bridge the December 2013 and the June 2015 EU meetings, both stepping stones of a new EU “Defence Matters Process” to do away with any reluctance. Euphoria is not justified, nor “CSDP fatigue”. After all, it is not about a revolution. “A la méthode Monnet”, it is simply about taking the next logical step,

pressed to do so by “events, dear boy, events”. Mr. Putin, although absent in Wales, pointed to the urgency of the matter. Hope is justified. However, hope is not a strategy. We ought indeed to remain vigilant.

¹ Brigadier General Jo Coelmont is a Senior Associate Fellow - Europe in the World Programme EGMONT, Royal Institute for International Relations, Brussels



THE NATO SUMMIT IN NEWPORT: POLISH PERSPECTIVE

JUSTYNA ZAJĄC¹

The decisions taken by the NATO Summit in Newport (4-5 September 2014) received mixed reactions in Poland. Insofar as the parties of the governing coalition and the presidential circles viewed them with approval, the largest opposition party, Law and Justice (PiS) was critical, while the smaller opposition parties – SLD, Twój Ruch, and Polska Razem – adopted a moderate stance. From President Bronisław Komorowski's viewpoint, the Newport summit addressed two issues of importance for Poland. Firstly, NATO member states agreed that Russia had to be treated as a potential adversary, something they had been reluctant to do until then. They thus recognized the need to stress the importance of the North Atlantic Treaty's Art. 5, that is, of the defense of member states' territories. Secondly, an unequivocal declaration was adopted about reinforcing the Alliance's eastern flank from Estonia to the Black Sea. In doing so, NATO member states adopted the position that Poland had been advocating for several years, i.e., that NATO's principal task is to defend the territory of its member states. This entails the necessity for the existence of contingency plans, and for their continual adaptation to changing conditions. The decisions taken at the Wales summit have been seen in Warsaw as important and beneficial for these reasons, and because they signaled the military reinforcement of NATO's eastern flank. Representatives of the Law and Justice opposition party do not agree however, and think the decisions taken in Newport to be of no military significance. "In order to deter Russia from additional military temptations, now with regard to the Baltic States, Poland or Slovakia, because those countries are located nearest to Russia, NATO should take steps to station larger military units and military planes of western allies in Central Europe, to build airfields for military planes there, or to transfer part of its military bases from Western Europe there"². PiS remains a proponent of closer alliance with the USA, and considers that American military units – or at least mixed American-Polish units – should be stationed in Poland.

Generally, the vast majority of Poland's political class publicly holds the view that although there is no direct threat of aggression against Poland, such an eventuality can not be excluded in the future, especially in the context of recent developments in Ukraine. The new National Security Strategy of Poland adopted at the beginning of November this year considers possibility of conflicts in Poland's neighborhood. Polish officials fear Russia's use unmarked military troops, as it did when it annexed the Crimea, or of some other form of a territorial war. The threat of *aterritorial* conflict (where the adversary does not intend to occupy the attacked territory) has already been foreseen in the *White Book on National security of the Republic of Poland*, adopted in 2013. As Poland's former foreign minister Radek Sikorski pointed out in connection with this, 'NATO should not have ruled out military action at the beginning of the Ukrainian conflict, because this implicitly signaled the Alliance's acquiescence to the military methods used by Russia'.³

The North Atlantic Treaty is consistently seen in Warsaw as the main pillar of Polish external security. Poland did take active steps to strengthen the Common Security and Defense Policy (CSDP) toward the end of the first decade of the 21st century – by issuing the so-called 'Weimar Letter' in conjunction with France and Germany in December 2010 and by adopting the reinforcement of the EU security and defense policy as one of the priorities of its presidency of the EU Council in the second half of 2011, among other things. Nevertheless, there remains in Warsaw a lack of faith in the European states' effectiveness in the sphere of security and defense. In light of the differences between the interests of EU member states and their tendency to renationalize their policies, exacerbated after the outbreak of the financial crisis of 2008, prior to the EU summit of December 2013 Poland promoted the idea of drawing up a White Book of European security. Such a document was supposed to facilitate a rapprochement between the stance of EU member states in their security and defense policies and, in effect, to provide a point of departure for a reworking of the European Security Strategy (2003), which has become inadequate in the face of the fast-changing international order. Poland's postulates have not been adopted thus far. In fact, decisions in three spheres were taken during the European Council meeting: 1) increasing the effectiveness, visibility and impact of the CSDP, 2) enhancing the development of capabilities; and 3) strengthening Europe's defence industry, but they can not be called a turning point in the improvement of the EU's security and defence policy. Relatively much attention was devoted to the latter issue – EU armaments policy – with regard to which Poland had serious reservations. In effect, during the meeting of EU defense and foreign affairs ministers, Poland blocked the document in this matter, holding the view that the proposed program of consolidation for the European armament industry would threaten Polish small and medium-size enterprises in this sector. Neither the decisions of the Euro-

pean Council in December 2013 nor the subsequent policy of the EU and its individual member states in the face of the Ukrainian crisis – a policy which was viewed in Poland as excessively dilatory – increased Poland's trust in its EU partners. Poland's lack of faith in the effectiveness of the CSDP is made the greater by the drop in defense expenditures in most EU member states. Poland is one of the few countries that spend almost 2% of their GDP on the military budget. In fact, it was decided at the NATO Summit in Newport to increase military spending among NATO members during the coming decade but, at the same time, Eurostat published data showing that the economies of Euro zone countries remain in stagnation. This leads to questions about the likelihood that this commitment will be realized, and these have also been voiced lately by the German media.

In such circumstances, the priority for Poland is to reinforce its own military potential. The so-called Komorowski Doctrine, adopted several months ago presupposes the shift of Poland's security priorities from external involvement to tasks directly connected with defense. The doctrine has four main points: 1) transferring the strategic effort from Poland's participation in expeditionary missions to tasks related to the provision of defense; 2) recognizing Poland's own defense potential as the principal pillar and guarantee of national security; 3) creating capabilities to counteract unforeseen and unconventional threats in which it is difficult to reach a consensus (among allies), as well as in the circumstances of aterritorial, selective, unpredicted threats of a limited scale, caused by unclear or hidden political motives, as Poland's specialization within NATO and the EU, in addition to territorial defense abilities (mainly such abilities as: intelligence and reconnaissance, air defense, including anti-missile defense, mobility of troops, especially helicopter-borne); 4) the reinforcement of Poland's strategic influence on the international stage by active participation in international organizations and their shaping in keeping with Poland's strategic interests.

One of the first manifestations of the implementation of those premises is Poland's decision not to take an active part in the coalition fighting against the Islamic State in the Middle East. As President Komorowski said, Poland's involvement on a larger scale in another region of the world could be easier and more comprehensible when Poles themselves will feel more secure on their eastern flank. The situation in the EU's neighborhood is becoming increasingly worrisome, however. The growth of Islamic fundamentalism in the Middle East and in Africa is creating increasingly greater threats for the West. In fact, in the longer perspective, lack of solidarity among NATO allies in the struggle against this phenomenon could weaken the Alliance's effectiveness in the face of other potential threats.

The next NATO summit will take place in 2016, in Warsaw. As president Komorowski said it could be a good occasion to launch work on a new Alliance strategy to cope with the crisis in East Europe and he pointed out the crisis on the (NATO) eastern flank will have a lasting character.

¹ Associate Professor Section of History and Theory of International Relations, Institute of International Relations, University of Warsaw

² *Witold Waszczykowski dla Fronda.pl: Rosję odstraszy jedynie większe, militarne zaangażowanie NATO w Europie Środkowej*, 5 September 2014, <http://www.fronda.pl/a/witold-waszczykowski-dla-frondapl-rosje-odstraszy-jedynie-wieksze-militarne-zaangazowanie-nato-w-europie-srodkowej,41337.html>

³ *Sikorski: potrzebna rewitalizacja NATO*, 14 października 2014 r., (<http://www.www.pap.pl>)



EU DECEMBER 2013 COUNCIL, NATO WALES SUMMIT 2014 AND THE UKRAINIAN CRISIS - A VIEW FROM HELSINKI

TOMMI KOIVULA¹

With the EU December 2013 Council and the 2014 NATO Summit in Wales, two key security political gatherings are over and the Western community has spoken. Either directly or between the lines, it has expressed its view of the current security situation and of the main challenges facing it. How should we assess this message, in particular in the light of the resurgent and increasingly aggressive foreign policy of Russia, which seems to be set to question the existing security order in Europe?

It is evident that the issue of Russia was not much on the agenda of the first gathering, the 19th-20th December 2013 European Council. As one studies the conclusions of the Council, one easily finds the document to be full of encouragements, calls for improvement, commitments to explore and reinforce, and invitations to re-examine, propose, and prepare various fields of European defence industry and capability issue-areas.² Basically, this is most welcome, as the Council dedicated a significant portion of its meeting to the issues of Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP), the first time it has done so since 2008.³

Then again, the NATO Summit in Newport took place in circumstances that were much more visibly affected by the events in the Crimea and Eastern Ukraine. A return to article V has rightly been pointed out as one of the key outcomes of the Summit. Despite this clear emphasis on collective defence, the Wales Summit also dealt with the growing insecurity in North Africa and the Middle East, raising questions of whether NATO is truly able to concentrate on a large spectrum of issue-areas at the same time.

However, even though different on the surface, it seems that both gatherings share a number of important similarities when it comes to the wider view of the Western countries security political outlook. Indeed, on the basis of the two summits, at least two qualities characterize the contemporary security mood of the Euroatlantic area both of which should be a source for concern and serious deliberation:

First, projects and achievements are small-scale. Within the CSDP framework, the EU Member-States discuss clusters, small projects and small operations. Work on issues like air-to-air-refueling, drones, satellite communication, and cyber is of course important, but it confirms, even at the hour of rapid worsening of the regional security situation, the criticism according to which in the CSDP discourse, word "defence" stands little less than capability work or overseas crisis management operations. Then again, NATO Summit's most concrete decision, the idea to create a Very High Reaction Force, has more symbolic than material content. A much more vigorous message would have been sent if the majority of European NATO members would have genuinely committed to reverse their shrinking defence budgets and invest in deterrence.

Secondly, these meetings indicate that the West is turning its look inwards. Be it the European defence industrial basis or a re-emphasis on Article V, the concern is clearly on the Euroatlantic area itself and in the Member State security in the narrowest sense - in effect on the immediate security environment. Above all, the West seems to be less willing to engage in the crises of the outside world, and to defend its values in all concrete ways. Overall, this lacking Euroatlantic ambition is all the more odd, as nobody seems to disagree with the argument that European security covers not just the area itself but also a wider sphere of stability. It is unfortunate that economic hardships and short-sighted perceptions of security blur this profound vision of European security. While struggling with nitty-gritty's, we are losing the sight of the big picture.

These issues gain a particular salience in the face of the ever intensifying attempts by Russia to challenge the Post-Cold War security arrangement and the ongoing Russian campaign in the Ukraine. There we see that war has returned to Europe, a war initiated and sustained by one of Europe's grand powers. The ramifications of this war extend more and more beyond Ukraine, materializing as airspace violations, staged bomber attack dives, missile launches and information campaigns against several European nations.

In essence, for the current Russian leadership, power seems above all to mean military power. Therefore, the recent decisions and the ensuing policies by the EU and NATO easily send an unintended signal. Whatever economic consequences the Western nations exert on Russia, they come with delay and don't have any immediate effect. In the Putin regime's reading, the Euroatlantic community seems *de facto* to be saying that there will be no true - read military - response to attacks. Even though the phrasing 'Red Line' remains a politically uncomfortable concept, this is exactly what is lacking.

We may criticize NATO for a timid approach in front of the resurgent Russia with some justification. More troubling in the NATO perspective is probably the loose and somewhat unconvincing timetable in which most European member states' shrinking defence spending is scheduled to be turned. Measures achieved at Wales are significant but partial and require further steps in terms of deterrence.

However, for the EU the ongoing year signifies a crisis in a more fundamental sense. If NATO could and should do more, it is the Common Foreign and Security Policy which is not at all on track with the current challenge. Even though there have been signs of the Russian revanchist stance already since at least 2008, it was the Accession Treaty between the Ukraine and the EU that initially set the current crisis ongoing. Curiously enough, it seems that the Union somehow unknowingly first caused fear among the ranks of the Putin's regime by signalling to Ukraine that there was also a Western option for Ukraine, and then as a response to Russia's military aggression tried to pressure it with statements and sanctions which the latter does not see as carrying relevance at least in the short or mid-term perspective. Something very essential was lost in translation here and a number of EU policies towards Russia should be re-evaluated.

This applies also to the CSDP. Granted, the December 2013 Council took place before the current crisis escalated to its present phase. Still, the year since then poses the Union with an urgent need to re-assess the basics of its Common Security and Defence Policy: at this hour of profound threat to European achievements and values it the CSDP risks totally losing its relevance if it remains focused on European capability work and minor overseas operations, however useful such projects are. More CSDP is needed, both in terms of scope and in terms of relevance. Europe may have invented a post-modern approach to military power, but it should not fall into obscurity in the face of a more traditional threat. Indeed, what does it mean for the EU that a neighbouring great power perceives the EU as a threat to itself and millions of Europeans feel a growing sense of insecurity because of this? Where is the CSDP in this equation?

¹ Senior Researcher, Finnish National Defence University Helsinki

² Antonio Missiroli, "European Defence – to be continued". EUISS Media alert No. 44. www.iss.europa.eu/uploads/media/Alert_44_Defence_Council_Displayed_on_18_November_2014.

³ Matteo Ricci, "Outcomes of the December Defence Council ", Nouvelle Europe, Friday 17 January 2014, <http://www.nouvelle-europe.eu/node/1780>, displayed on 14 November 2014.

SÉCURITÉ GLOBALE ET SURPRISES STRATÉGIQUES EN EUROPE

MAURICE DE LANGLOIS¹

Indéniablement, la déstabilisation générale du voisinage de l'Europe a eu un impact inégal sur la Politique de défense et de sécurité commune (PSDC) et l'Organisation du traité de l'Atlantique nord (OTAN). Elle ne semble pas malheureusement avoir suffisamment mobilisé les pays européens.

Les conclusions des deux grands rendez-vous, celui du Conseil de l'UE en décembre 2013 et celui du sommet de Newport en septembre 2014, si elles revêtent un certain nombre de points communs, montrent cependant une différence d'appréciation dans les réponses à apporter. Cela est dû, non seulement à une différence de calendrier, mais surtout à la nature même de chaque organisation, l'une étant une alliance militaire, l'OTAN, l'autre, une entité civile et militaire, l'UE.

Le Conseil de l'UE au format défense s'est tenu quelques semaines après le déclenchement de la crise ukrainienne et on peut regretter que ses conclusions aient manqué d'un niveau d'analyse géostratégique et d'évaluation de la menace. Néanmoins la déclaration finale est empreinte de détermination : un effort particulier est demandé aux Etats membres « d'approfondir la coopération en matière de défense en améliorant la capacité de mener des missions et des opérations et ... en s'appuyant sur une base industrielle et technologique de défense européenne (BITDE) plus intégrée, plus durable, plus innovante et plus compétitive ». Ceci est incontestable pour peu que les Etats concrétisent leur engagement.

Là où l'UE a demandé un effort important en matière de coopération de défense, l'OTAN, au sommet de Newport, a été plus précise sur les objectifs : ramener d'ici 10 ans les budgets de défense nationaux à 2% du PIB, dont un minimum de 20% à consacrer aux investissements. L'analyse de la menace a été particulièrement détaillée, avec, il est vrai, une prise en compte de la crise ukrainienne exacerbée par rapport à celles du Moyen-Orient et de l'Afrique du Nord. Ce fut l'opportunité pour l'Alliance de rappeler l'importance de la défense collective, l'article V, et se donner une nouvelle raison d'être, gommant toute question existentielle qui avait circulé avant le sommet.

Les chefs d'Etat et de gouvernement du Conseil de l'UE ont décidé de se revoir en juin 2015 sur des points précis. Tout en encourageant les travaux sur la réactivité, l'efficacité de l'approche globale, la mise en commun des capacités, la définition de normes et de standards, le Conseil contrôlera l'avancement des projets capacitaires en cours, dont notamment les drones, le ravitaillement par air, les communications satellitaires et la cyber-défense. Ces projets ont le mérite d'être concrets, même s'il est surprenant de constater qu'aucun ne concerne le domaine des armements et des munitions. Finalement, ce qui manque, c'est une cohérence d'ensemble guidée par une stratégie générale qui reste à écrire.

Les problèmes de réactivité du côté de l'OTAN ont débouché sur la création d'une force interarmées à haut niveau de réactivité (VJTF), d'un volume environ de 4000 hommes, qui aura vocation à se déployer en quelques jours. Ce dispositif vise à compléter la *NATO Response Force* (NRF) et sa force de réaction immédiate (IRF). Cette décision a été prise sous la pression de la crise ukrainienne, sachant que les Etats-Unis et plusieurs nations ne voulaient pas repartir sur une logique de prépositionnement, comme certaines nations de l'est de l'Europe le réclamaient, principalement la Pologne et les pays baltes. Mais cette décision est-elle un signal suffisamment clair et adapté face à un Poutine qui ne raisonne qu'en termes de rapports de forces?

Du côté européen, le Conseil a certainement permis de donner l'impulsion politique nécessaire pour le lancement de l'opération EUFOR RCA en République Centre Africaine, dans les premiers mois de l'année 2014. Cette opération, qui vient de se terminer avec le transfert à l'ONU, s'est révélé un succès, même si elle est restée modeste dans son ampleur. En revanche, la question de la crise ukrainienne et de ses conséquences sécuritaires, notamment le scénario du pire, n'a pas semblé faire partie des préoccupations de la PSDC. Même si le Conseil de l'UE travaille actuellement sur une mission de formation des forces de sécurité ukrainiennes, ne faut-il pas se poser la question du périmètre de la PSDC qui semble dépassé ? Ne faudrait-il pas plutôt raisonner sécurité globale au niveau européen ?

Il est certain que les deux modèles OTAN et PSDC peinent à atteindre le niveau d'ambition qu'ils ont défini, respectivement dans le concept de 2010 et au Conseil européen d'Helsinki de 1999, rappelé fin 2008. La part des pays européens dans l'atteinte du niveau d'ambition de l'OTAN n'est que de 12% de la cible finale, contre 50% pour les seuls Américains. Si les Etats européens ont projeté un peu plus de 60000 hommes en 30 opérations et missions différentes en 10 ans, ceci reste bien faible par rapport à l'ambition d'atteindre ce même volume en une seule opération. Ce sont bien les pays européens qui font preuve de faiblesse. Le chef d'état-major des armées américain, le général Dempsey, ne s'y est pas trompé quand il a demandé à ses homologues, juste après le sommet de Newport, de ne plus parler de réassurance mais d'auto-assurance pour l'Europe.

Pour lutter contre l'impression générale d'un abandon et d'une démission de l'esprit de défense, l'Europe doit travailler sur une nouvelle définition de sa sécurité au sens large. Cette sécurité globale doit couvrir aussi bien la gestion extérieure des crises que la défense collective et la solidarité en cas d'attaque terroriste ou de catastrophe naturelle. Elle doit se traduire par des engagements des Etats européens à consentir des efforts financiers significatifs afin de renforcer leur outil de défense national et exprimer concrètement leur volonté à s'engager si nécessaire.

Outre le fait que cela soulagera notre pays déjà fortement impliqué dans les opérations, ces engagements donneront plus de visibilité et de crédibilité à l'Europe. Cela permettra à l'OTAN de renforcer ses capacités de défense collective et à l'Union européenne de devenir un partenaire reconnu des Etats-Unis, un interlocuteur respecté de la Russie et un acteur plus visible de la sécurité et du développement au Moyen-Orient et en l'Afrique.

¹ Directeur du domaine Politiques de défense comparées, Institut de recherche stratégique de l'Ecole militaire, Paris

