2015

*Papers

Towards Reassurance and Solidarity in the Euro-Atlantic Community

Austers
Āboltiņš
Biscop
Bugajski
Daugulis
David
Devlen
Galeotti
Jermalavičius
Korosteleva
Kudors
Lang
Lieģis
Ozoliņa
Perthes
Piebalgs
Rácz
Rēboka
Romanovs
Schmidt-Felzmann
Vilpišauskas
Veebel

THE *Rīga* CONFERENCE

LATVIAN INSTITUTE OF
INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Edited by Andris Sprūds,
Kārlis Bukovskis

Riga Conference Papers 2015

Towards Reassurance and Solidarity in the Euro-Atlantic Community

**LATVIAN INSTITUTE OF
INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS**

Riga Conference Papers 2015 "Towards Reassurance and Solidarity in the Euro-Atlantic Community" is a collection of analytical articles compiled by the Latvian Institute of International Affairs (LIIA) for The Riga Conference 2015. The authors of this publication seek to explain the turbulent and unstable environment in the European Neighbourhood and its effects on the European Union and Transatlantic security. The publication attempts to define the character of changes Europe has recently experienced and their impact on future policies. The publication is a result of a collective effort by the Latvian Institute of International Affairs, the Latvian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Konrad Adenauer Foundation and the Latvian Transatlantic Organization.

Introductory Notes

Andris Sprūds, Kārlis Bukovskis

We are experiencing a dynamic shift in the tectonic plates of international politics and economics. The turbulent years of sovereign debt crisis have led to recurring challenges to the Eurozone's financial stability, the Arab Spring has accelerated internal contradictions in societies of the southern Neighbourhood while Russia's geopolitical incursion into Ukraine has transformed a political and security environment in Europe. Europe has withstood many crises during its existence and will continue facing challenges from both domestic and external actors. However, it was during the last year when national and regional tensions and conflicts have spilled over borders with an increasing impact on the European Union.

The tragic *Charlie Hebdo* attacks became a precursor for a challenging year apparently ending with a protracted refugee crisis. The influx of people from war-torn and economic problem ridden countries of the Middle East and North Africa will have lasting repercussions on the future of the European project. It goes beyond the economic challenge to embrace an enormous migration wave into Europe. The economic sustainability, political solidarity and global normative authority of the European project now increasingly depends on a responsible and far-sighted political leadership in European countries. It is the European project that has been characterized by openness and accessibility, which now needs to be reinvigorated. The change of paradigm is yet to be seen in Europe, but the new international role of the EU in a transforming international environment must be redefined.

The redefining of the Euro-Atlantic community's global role begins in the Neighbourhood. The conflict in Ukraine may haunt Ukraine, Russia and neighbouring European countries for decades to come. Russia's assertive actions and intervention not only stirred up worries about possible Russian military expansion, but also transformed debates about, and attempts for, geopolitical equilibri-

um and stability of the post-Cold War Europe. The re-emergence of geopolitical concerns in eastern European, the Eastern Partnership and Central Asian countries revealed the impact that Russian foreign and security policy actions have left on Europe. Approaching the Neighbourhood, however, must certainly go beyond interacting with Russia. Eastern and southern neighbourhood requires vision and an efficient tool-box from the EU.

The Baltic countries have demonstrated resilience in this transformed and challenging security environment. The solidarity and reassurance within the community of those "like minded" has allowed and encouraged a pro-active and confident international and regional agenda. Latvia has continued to pursue its engagement strategy by leaving channels of dialogue with Russia open, promoting Europeanization of Eastern Partnership countries, and strengthening cooperation with Central Asian states. Latvia followed Lithuania's example in leading a successful presidency in the EU Council. The NATO Center of Excellence on Strategic Communication was opened in Riga. As a result, Latvia's capital become one of the hubs for political decision-making and intellectual thought exchange in the Euro-Atlantic Community in 2015. On the other hand, protracted conflicts in the Neighbourhood and the refugee crisis have reminded Baltic countries that reassurance, solidarity building and home works are continuous efforts in progress.

The Riga Conference Papers 2015 *"Towards Reassurance and Solidarity in the Euro-Atlantic Community"* embraces the views of authors of divergent backgrounds. It is an international project that aims to understand how the migration crisis, the war in Syria, and the current state of play in eastern Ukraine will affect political and economic choices in Europe and security choices in the Baltic States. The authors address issues of leadership during defining moments of crisis, and evaluate Russian hybrid warfare and the role of propaganda on modern liberal democratic systems. Russia tends to dominate the security scenery debate not only of the Baltics, but also from a wider Transatlantic perspective. The opinion pieces create a unique blend of ideas and approaches to explain the

current complex political and security environment. Distinguished representatives from an expert community have made this publication an indispensable part of the annual Riga Conference.

The publication is a result of a traditionally successful collaboration between the Latvian Institute of International Affairs, the Latvian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Konrad Adenauer Foundation and the organizers of the Riga Conference – the Latvian Transatlantic Organization. Yet again the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Latvia has demonstrated its leadership by encouraging intellectual debates and policy-relevant recommendations. We expect the Riga Conference Papers 2015 will be a valuable reading material for decision-makers, foreign policy and security analysts, journalists, along with university students of different countries and approaches.

THE EU: FINDING A NEW ROLE AND SOLVING THE REFUGEE CRISIS

Seeking Stability in Turbulent Times

Imants Lieģis[1]

As the Rīga Conference marks its tenth anniversary, let me first of all acknowledge the inspirational leadership skills of the Patroness and initiator of the Conference, President Vaira Vīķe-Freiberga. Her international contribution to debates and discussions on defense and security policy continues to play an invaluable role for our region. At the same time, the Rīga Conference itself has successfully hosted high caliber politicians, academics and intellectuals who have been able to raise public awareness in Latvia and beyond of crucial challenges faced in our part of Northern Europe.

Since Latvia hosted the NATO Summit and first Rīga Conference in 2006, turbulence has abounded. More recently, this has been caused by Russia's aggression against Ukraine. In my contribution to this year's Anniversary Conference Rīga papers, I will mention briefly the past decade in Latvia, which has witnessed turbulence in a variety of ways, and briefly comment on some consequences of Russia's aggression in Ukraine. I will then look at how this turbulence could be reduced, specifically in the handling of Euro-Atlantic–Russian relations.

Attempts to lessen tensions which have arisen in relations with Russia is not the same as getting back to "business as usual". Any formal renewal of cooperation needs to be based on a return to the acceptance of international norms and laws, rather than a return to "realpolitik". Engagement cannot mean abandoning core principles and values upon which the post war, law-based UN, EU and NATO order has evolved. The Cold War showed that deterrence and containment combined with engagement can prevail.

Latvia's turbulent decade

Latvia, along with many of our Euro-Atlantic partners, has experienced a turbulent decade. Ten years ago, we were in an economic boom cycle, but by 2009, Latvia was on the verge of bankruptcy. Nevertheless, five years ago the country was back on the road to recovery and export-led growth. Austerity, fiscal consolidation and fulfilling the Maastricht conditions for joining the euro were the priorities. The talented political leadership of Latvia's longest serving Prime Minister and current EU Commissioner, Valdis Dombrovskis, saw Latvia joining the Eurozone in January 2014. This economic recovery enhanced stability and security for the country, even though it came at a price. There were social costs such as depopulation of the countryside with an exodus of those seeking work and more economic gain elsewhere in the EU. The defense sector was slashed because of political failure (unlike in Estonia) to accept the need to uphold defense spending for geo-security reasons. These latter errors are being corrected by Latvia's current political leadership because of the dramatic changes to the security situation in Europe. But Latvia's successful economic recovery gave the confidence to conduct what many perceived as being a very successful first Presidency of the Council of the EU in the first half of this year.

Russia's aggression in Ukraine

Setting aside the refugee crisis and ongoing concerns about BREXIT and/or GREXIT, the main recent cause of turbulence emanates from Russia's aggressive actions in Ukraine. This has been widely acknowledged as the cause for the breakdown in Russia's relations with Western partners and has resulted in the isolation of Russia through sanctions and other measures. The declaration of NATO countries' Heads of State and Government at the Summit meeting in Wales last year also referred to this.

In addition, a number of US Generals regard Russia as the main and increasing threat to American security. The top NATO and US Commander in Europe, General Breedlove, said: "We have

a nation that has used force to change internationally recognized boundaries. Russia continues to occupy Crimea. Russian forces now are in the Donbass in eastern Ukraine. And this is a nation that possesses a pretty vast nuclear inventory and talks about the use of that inventory very openly in the past."[2]

In his nomination hearing for the position of Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Joseph F. Dunford referred to Russia posing an "existential threat" to the US.[3] This in turn has led to reports that the Pentagon has been focusing on contingency planning, especially for the Baltic region.[4]

The concerns expressed by the military top brass of NATO's most important member have to be taken seriously. Of course, the role of the military is to plan for worst case scenarios. The threat assessment for Latvia remains that there is no imminent threat, but in light of Russian actions in Ukraine both contingency planning and deterrence measures by the Alliance have to be prioritized. Indeed questions relating to collective defense, such as the improvement of rapid reaction capabilities and strengthening of the military presence in our region are some prerequisites for maintaining deterrence capabilities. Increase in military activities have put the region high onto the security policy agenda during the past 18 months.

This is likely to remain the case in the lead up to the NATO Summit in Poland next year and beyond. Given the prospect of a lack of improvement to the security environment in the foreseeable future, NATO will need to continue to face new challenges head on and develop a response for the long term. Russia's recent military interventions in Syria also have implications for NATO – Russia relations, especially given the incursions by Russian aircraft into NATO airspace in Turkey in early October and the emergency NATO meeting called on 5 October 2015 as a result of these actions.

---

2 "NATO Commander: Russia's use of force in Europe is a major threat," *PBS News Hour*, July 29, 2015, http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/nato-commander-russias-use-force-europe-major-threat/.
3 Dan Lamothe, "Russia is greatest threat to the U.S., says Joint Chiefs chairman nominee Gen. Joseph Dunford," *The Washington Post*, July 9, 2015, https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/checkpoint/wp/2015/07/09/russia-is-greatest-threat-to-the-u-s-says-joint-chiefs-chairman-nominee-gen-joseph-dunford/.
4 Julia Ioffe, "Exclusive: The Pentagon Is Preparing New War Plans for a Baltic Battle Against Russia," *Foreign Policy*, September 18, 2015, http://foreignpolicy.com/2015/09/18/exclusive-the-pentagon-is-preparing-new-war-plans-for-a-baltic-battle-against-russia/.

But Russia's actions in Syria should not be used as a bargaining chip over Ukraine, nor detract from the ongoing need for the implementation of the Minsk Agreements signed by Ukraine and Russia.

Seeking solutions

In the midst of all this turbulence, every opportunity should be used to reduce tensions as and when circumstances allow. Engagement with Russia should be based on a position of strength and in light of ongoing measures to strengthen the security of Euro–Atlantic partners. There should be no let up on collective defense and improving resilience against various hybrid threats, including information warfare.

In seeking opportunities for engagement, it should be recalled there are rewards for tireless, drawn out, even boring negotiations. Positive examples abound, even for the EU. Both High Representatives Ashton and Mogherini contributed to substantial progress in relations between Serbia and Kosovo in the last few years. Not to mention their (and previous EU foreign policy actors') engagement and prominent role in reaching the agreement this year to prevent Iran from proceeding with nuclear armament.

Bearing in mind such precedents, I would like to offer some insights and suggestions on handling Euro-Atlantic relations with Russia. This vexed question is likely to test policy makers for the short and long term.

Latvia's EU Presidency was in the driving seat of guiding policy earlier this year. These responsibilities certainly helped concentrate foreign policymakers' minds. Despite suspicions of an "anti–Russian" approach, a pragmatic policy prevailed. Foreign Minister Rinkēvičs visited his counterpart Lavrov in the first months of the Presidency. Expectations concerning the outcome of the Rīga Eastern Partnership Summit in May were kept deliberately low, perhaps partially so as not to over antagonise Russia. Maintaining a more neutral stand because of Presidency obligations seemed to influence the decision not to sign the UK, Danish, Estonian and Lithuanian Foreign Ministers "non-paper" on strengthening EU strategic

communication vis-à-vis Russia. So rather than being "anti–Russian", the Presidency was "pro-Europe".

Combined with our recent historical experience, Latvia's geographic location as a direct neighbour of Russia also increases the sense of insecurity within the country. However this history and geography also provide unique opportunities. Our expertise in developing niche capabilities is beginning to bear fruit. I heard personally from a top Slovenian foreign policy colleague how useful his trip to Latvia was last year when the Russian takeover of Crimea in Ukraine was taking place. It helped him get a detailed perspective from the region. He has subsequently made use of worthy analyses from Latvian Think Tanks.

Developing expertise in the area of Strategic Communication has also proved essential at a time when Russia's information and propaganda war as an effective instrument of hybrid warfare is being increasingly recognised. The jury may of course still be out as to how much support is given by other EU member states to the External Action Services Russia Media Taskforce, established specifically to challenge Russia's ongoing information campaigns.[5]

Nevertheless, Latvia's Presidency successfully brought this issue onto the EU agenda. Given the NATO Centre of Excellence for Strategic Communication was recently inaugurated in Rīga, Latvia has this year begun to carve out a niche in this particular area of Euro-Atlantic relations with Russia.

The EU Presidency also gave Latvia the opportunity to kick start discussions amongst member states on preparing a new European Security Strategy given recent radical changes to the security environment. The new strategy will inevitably have to address the EU's strategy towards Russia. Seeking ways to overcome the current deep mistrust between the Euro-Atlantic Community and Russia calls for innovative approaches. Let me mention a few of the endeavors already taking place.

---

5 see James Panichi, "EU splits in Russian media war," *Politico*, September 17, 2015,
http://www.politico.eu/article/eu-russia-propaganda-kremlin-media/

Firstly, on the specific issue of Russia's aggression in Ukraine which largely contributed to the current breakdown of Russia's relations with Europe and the US, the "Normandy Format" plays a crucial role. Embracing the leaders of France, Germany, Ukraine and Russia, has clearly helped to lessen conflict and keep dialogue open between Russia and Ukraine. However, this format of course excludes the US and there is no EU institutional presence.

Secondly, there may be room for a more active EU role by expanding the Normandy Format to include the EU. After all, since the Lisbon Treaty, the EU has had at its disposal the office of its Council President as the interlocutor with the outside world. Donald Tusk is therefore, in theory, the person to telephone if, as Henry Kissinger once asked, someone needs to contact the EU. Tusk represents the common and joint views of the 28 member states at the highest level, even though in practice US counterparts may well call up Chancellor Merkel instead. In turn, the High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy is the EU's top diplomat who steers its foreign policy and represents the EU in negotiating formats such as with Iran and Serbia-Kosovo. The pitch for a more engaged EU role has recently been made by Poland's former Foreign Minister, Radek Sikorski, who points out that: "On Ukraine, the EU is not even at the negotiating table."[6]

Irrespective of the idea of an enlarged Normandy format bringing in the EU, there have also been references to the EU negotiating with the Eurasian Economic Union (EEU) as a way of somehow moving ahead with EU-Russia relations.[7] It is probably inappropriate to look at such an option whilst Russia fails to implement the Minsk agreements, return Crimea to Ukraine and revert to abiding by international norms. In addition, the EEU is still in its early stages of development with some members who may well

---

6 See Radek Sikorski, "Member states must back their jointly chosen EU leaders", *Financial Times*, August 16, 2015, http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/92f54bb8-3791-11e5-bdbb-35e55cbae175.html.
7 See Igor Jurgens, in *Riga Dialogue: Towards a Shared Security Environment. Afterthoughts from the Riga Security Seminar 2015*, ed. Andris Sprūds (Riga: Latvian Institute of International Affairs, 2015), 22-29; Sergei Karaganov, "A Eurasian Solution for Europe's Crises", *Project Syndicate*, September 16, 2015, http://www.project-syndicate.org/print/how-to-improve-europe-russia-relations-by-sergei-karaganov-2015-09.

wish to pursue their own distinct individual relations with the EU. In conducting relations with Russia, given the right circumstances, there may be scope for initiatives coming from Europe, whether on an institutional or nongovernmental level.

Thirdly, in the 40th Anniversary year of the OCSE, it seems the organization has shown its political relevance in forging an important role following Russia's aggression against Ukraine last year. The irony is that this renewed relevance has emerged as a result of violations of some of the OSCE's most important principles.[8] Despite limited operational resources deployment of the OSCE Special Monitoring Mission, the work of the Observer Mission at the checkpoints on the Ukrainian border, and establishment of the Trilateral Contact Group have contributed to reducing the conflict.

At the same time the consecutive Swiss, Serbian and German Chairmanships of OSCE have commissioned a Panel of Eminent Persons led by Ambassador Wolfgang Ischinger to "provide advice on how to (re) consolidate European security as a common project".[9] Their Interim Report of June 2015 focused on lessons learnt from the OSCE engagement in Ukraine, although Russia's panel member Karaganov was unable to concur with a number of conclusions. The final report is due by the end of 2015. Latvia's Former President Vaira Vīķe-Freiberg is part of this Eminent Persons group thereby giving Latvia a special insiders' role.

Fourthly, work of the London based Think Tank, the European Leadership Network (ELN) has helped raise the level of debate about relations with Russia, offering specific policy recommendations on how to move ahead. (As an ELN Board Member please note my personal interests in this NGO.) Their researchers have provided papers about close military encounters between Russia and the West[10],

8 Stefan Lehne, "The Way Ahead for the OSCE in Ukraine," *Carnegie Europe*, September 22, 2015, http://carnegieeurope.eu/2015/09/22/reviving-osce-european-security-and-ukraine-crisis/ii06.
9 see *Lessons learned for the OSCE from its engagement in Ukraine* (Panel of Eminent Persons on European Security as a Common Project, 2015).
10 Thomas Frear, Łukasz Kulesa, Ian Kearns, "Dangerous Brinkmanship: Close Military Encounters Between Russia and the West in 2014", *European Leadership Network*, November 10, 2014, http://www.europeanleadershipnetwork.org/dangerous-brinkmanship-close-military-encounters-between-russia-and-the-west-in-2014_2101.html.

and on recent military exercises.[11] In addition, their broad, bi-partisan membership is able to offer focused proposals on, for example, encouraging NATO and Russia to work on Rules of Behaviour for the Safety of Air and Maritime Encounters between the two sides.[12] Whilst recommendations offered by the Think Tank community are welcome, we can see that actions on the ground sometimes diminish their relevance. For example, violations of Turkey's airspace by Russian planes engaged in military action in Syria illustrate that Russia seems disinterested in pursuing mutually acceptable rules of behavior.

At the same time, by linking in with like-minded organizations such as the Washington based Nuclear Threat Initiative (NTI), the US Atlantic Council, and the Russian International Affairs Council, the ELN has reached out to a broader audience. Indeed Latvian Institute of International Affairs has also successfully engaged with ELN and NTI by organizing conferences in Riga during the last two years that bring together practitioners and policy makers from Europe, Russia and the US. In parallel, ELN is promoting the idea of a new Euro-Atlantic Security Leadership Group mandated by political leaders to conduct a dialogue to elaborate specific policy recommendations to overcome the current security crisis in Europe.[13]

Given the importance of maintaining dialogue, all such endeavors at least offer possibilities to exchange views on the challenges faced and lessen the risk of future conflict.

Conclusions

Although the minds of politicians and policy makers have, in recent months, been more concentrated on the refugee crisis and continuing flows of asylum seekers and others into Europe, the ongoing consequences of Russia's aggression in Ukraine remain to be resolved. Looking back at Euro-Atlantic–Russian relations, of course,

---

11 Thomas Frear, Łukasz Kulesa, Ian Kearns, "Preparing for the Worst: Are Russian and NATO Military Exercises Making War in Europe more Likely?", *European Leadership Network*, August 12, 2015, http://www.europeanleadershipnetwork.org/ preparing-for-the-worst-are-russian-and-nato-military-exercises-making-war-in-europe-more-likely_2997.html.
12 "ELN Network Members Endorse Task Force Proposal," *European Leadership Network*, accessed September 30, 2015, http://www.europeanleadershipnetwork.org/eln-network-members-endorse-task-force-proposal_3082.html.
13 See Des Browne, Igor S. Ivanov, Sam Nunn, "Securing the Euro-Atlantic Community," *Project Syndicate*, Fenruary 3, 2015, http://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/ukraine-russia-crisis-european-leadership-by-des-browne-et-al-2015-02.

there have been mistakes made during the last decade and beyond. However, mistakes made on the part of the EU and NATO on no account justify Russia's annexation of Crimea and subsequent support to the fighting in Eastern Ukraine.

Latvia is able to make a contribution in the search for a return to greater stability. Running the EU Presidency, making full use of the lessons learned and contacts made during the Presidency, as well as engaging with the OSCE Eminent Persons panel or the work of ELN, provide opportunities for such contributions.

In seeking greater stability, certain principles will have to be upheld – no return to "geopolitical spheres of influence" with decisions being made over the heads of those directly involved; ensuring that engagement is balanced with deterrence and is not pursued as an end in itself. Certain goals have to be pursued – implementing the Minsk Agreements; implementing the decisions of the NATO Wales Summit concerning collective defense.

President Putin has played a deft hand at using Syria as a means of attempting to bring Russia back from isolation by the Euro-Atlantic community. It may conceivably provide an opportunity for re-engagement, although initial indications do not augur well. However, neither Syria nor the related refugee crisis should detract from the need to stick to a principled solution to dealing with Russia's aggression against Ukraine. As Joschka Fischer so eloquently puts it:

"Europe should avoid the kind of dismal realpolitik that would betray its core values elsewhere. It would be a grave mistake, for example, to sell out Ukraine's interests and lift the sanctions imposed on Russia out of the mistaken belief that the Kremlin's assistance is needed in Syria. Cooperation with Russia, however useful and advisable, must not come at the expense of third parties and Western interests and unity."[14]

A firm, consistent and united approach is needed, combined with the use of opportunities for dialogue and a realization that a

---

14 Europe's Reality Check by Joschka Fischer - *Project Syndicate*
https://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/european-solidarity-refugee-crisis-by-joschka-fischer-2015-09#U-v60pegtzedfWAGd.03 30.09.15

solution is likely to be a long way down the road. On that basis, perhaps the next decade need not be as turbulent as the past one and we will be able to celebrate the 20th Rīga Conference in an environment of greater stability and security.

Leadership in Times of Crisis: Managing Change in Europe

Ramūnas Vilpišauskas

These days decicion-makers and the broader public are faced with a rather different situation compared to the early 1990s, when political, security and economic transformations in this part of Europe inspired optimism, and more recent events of enlarging the European Union (EU) and NATO, which were associated with further strengthening of the values such as freedom and peace and the foundations for prosperity. Currently the word "crisis" is probably one of the most frequently used words in public debates in Europe, be it debates in EU institutions or its member states.

Usually debates about the crisis are associated with the economic and financial problems the EU and its member states had to deal with when the decade of economic growth was interrupted by the Great Recession originating in the USA in 2007-2008. The depth of the economic decline and the broader social and economic effects differed among EU countries with, for example, Baltic States' experiencing the deepest recessions but coming out of them quite fast, while Southern euro zone countries, in particular Greece, continued to struggle with loss of competitiveness, high debts, budget deficits and stagnating economies. Thus, since 2010 the management of the euro zone crisis has preoccupied EU decision-makers, with the ups and downs of this process far from being resolved. The reform package linked to the third bail-out agreement between the Greek government and creditors still has to be implemented and it will be a very challenging task, having in mind how many people have to change their usual routines, work longer, receive lower social benefits, and face stronger competition. In other words – to adjust to a new economic and social environment, or face a very real prospect of having to leave the euro zone and deal with all the risks linked to this. The euro zone itself is still struggling to restore

economic growth making it difficult to deal with huge debts and challenging the welfare systems created half a century ago.

Since 2014 the aggression of the Russian regime against Ukraine has led to another crisis in the EU's Eastern neighborhood (some would date this crisis back to August of 2008 or earlier). The perceived threat that reforms in Georgia, Ukraine and Moldova might inspire similar changes in Russia, thus threatening established political and social order there, can to a large extent explain its actions in the EU's Eastern neighborhood. The new geopolitical situation has created a need for Western leaders to re-examine their old assumptions about the relationship of the EU and NATO institutions, and their member states with Russia. The possibilities for cooperative relationships based on win-win logic and a similar understanding of mutual challenges have been radically narrowed down, creating the need to review policies in the fields of trade, energy and others. The gap between the official rhetoric and actual behavior of the Russian regime has further strengthened the need to revise the habits of Western political and economic elites of dealing with Russia in a "business as usual" manner, although economic sanctions have necessitated difficult adjustments by companies in the EU and especially those member states for whom Russia has been an important market or supplier of energy resources. The policy-makers in a number of NATO countries had to increase defense expenditures and to revise their national priorities accordingly.

In addition to the security crisis in the EU's Eastern neighborhood, since 2015 the EU and its member states have faced yet another crisis, originating mostly in its Southern neighborhood (which can be traced back to the events of 2011 in a number of countries in the Middle East and North Africa). Failure to manage political transformations in those countries since the Arab Spring events by local policy makers and insufficient support of those efforts by the West led to the conflicts in countries like Syria, which in turn caused massive internal and international migration and refugee flows to neighboring countries and, more recently, to Europe. Refugee crisis has become the most recent "crisis item" on the EU agenda. Initially

it mostly affected several EU member states – Greece, Italy, Hungary, Austria, Germany – and onto others for example, Baltic countries seeming like a "virtual crisis". However, it is going to exert powerful pressure not only on the future of Schengen, asylum and migration policies of the whole EU but also on established social practices in all its member states, local communities, labor, education, welfare and other policies.

Although the causes of these crises are different, they are all interlinked in their effects. They all are challenging the way of life and social habits that many people in Europe are used to, they challenge established public policies and institutions, be it a UN-based system of international rules, basic EU principles such as the free movement of people, or national policies of welfare. They increase uncertainty and risk – sometimes risk to the security and safety of people, but often the potential of material loss by domestic populations, the risk that is associated with the need to change traditional habits and adjust to a new economic and social environment.

Usually policy analysts discuss those issues from a policy perspective – what are the right policies to respond, what are the right institutions to be involved (municipal, national, regional or international), what particular policy choices are required and what are their effects (national isolation versus integration and cooperation, budgetary consolidation versus macroeconomic stimulus, etc.). All these are definitely important issues and one of the striking features of the debate about all those crises the EU and its member states are faced with is the lack of consensus on the most appropriate responses to manage them. There is a lack of consensus between policy-makers in different EU member states, and also between expert communities and other groups of population.

To be sure, there are exceptions such as the surprising consensus of the EU and it member states on economic sanctions towards Russia in reaction to its policies vis-à-vis Ukraine in 2014. But there is an evident lack of consensus on most other issues linked to those crises. How should the EU and its member states restore economic growth and implement reforms to enhance competitiveness with-

in the single currency area to avoid similar crises in the future (in terms of federal euro zone measures versus national solutions, supply side versus demand side economic policies)? How should the EU and its member states support reforms in neighboring countries (offering an EU membership perspective or not, increasing financial and other assistance or not)? How should they deal with massive refugee flows (how to distribute refugees across EU member states, how to treat economic migrants, what should be the allocation of competences between the EU and its member states, how resources should be channeled, etc.)?

This lack of consensus which results in political decision-making often described as "too little too late" points to an important and often neglected issue of leadership under times of crises. The idea that the lack of leadership on global, EU and national levels partly accounts for the slow, fragmented and often contradictory responses of Western institutions to these crises is not very novel. However, often analysts either present this as a judgement which needs no further elaboration, or as a conclusion based on the evidence of inadequate policies of the West. What is often missing is what particular characteristics of political behavior should be cultivated in order to exercise leadership that could help to react to those crises by preserving fundamental values and patterns of social order in the West which define those liberal democratic societies and are valued by their members, and at the same time grow stronger and become more resilient to such challenges in the future.

Leadership is often understood as an activity aiming "to create and achieve shared goals", or as the "practice of mobilizing people to tackle tough challenges and thrive".[1] It involves mobilizing members of particular communities – be it political communities of particular cities, European states or the EU – who face similar challenges and are searching for the most appropriate ways to deal with them. Leadership is different from authority but it is very often

---

1 Joseph, S. Nye, Jr., *The Powers to Lead*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008, p. 18; Ronald Heifetz, Alexander Grashow, Marty Linsky, *The Practice of Adaptive Leadership. Tools and Tactics for Changing Your Organization and the World*, Boston: Harvard University Press, 2009, p. 14.

associated with authority, since people in the position of authority often have resources required to mobilize people and manage change. Voters expect it would be people in the position of formal authority, whom they elect, or who get appointed by those elected, that exercise leadership in dealing with such challenges as the euro zone crisis, geopolitical crisis or refugee crisis.

A brief assessment of how the EU and national decision-makers have responded to those crises might provide direction for deeper analysis of the state of leadership in Europe at times of crises. Often the exercise of leadership starts with a detailed assessment of the situation, interpretations regarding the nature of the challenge and the most appropriate ways of dealing with it. As was mentioned above, the views regarding the nature of euro zone crisis, geopolitical crisis and refugee crisis vary significantly depending on particular EU member state government, expert community or different societal groups. Some see the euro zone crisis as a result of an "incomplete Economic and Monetary Union" and therefore advocate further integration of the euro zone, a fiscal union to complement a monetary union as a way to deal with such crisis in the future. Others see this crisis mostly as an outcome of irresponsible fiscal behavior of governments, responding to the wrong incentives and violating rules of the Stability and Growth Pact. Thus the way to avoid such crisis in the future is by removing incentives for irresponsible borrowing. Although interpretations of the causes of geopolitical crisis in the Eastern neighborhood are somewhat less divergent and the response by the EU is based on the evidence of Russia violating international norms, in particular the sovereignty of Ukraine, there are competing explanations, for example, placing the blame on the Western policies of NATO enlargement and the EU's Eastern neighborhood which supposedly threatened Russia's interests and provoked its reactions. The divergences in the assessment of the nature of the crisis and ways to respond to it have also been visible in the attempts of trying to manage refugee flows into EU member states. It was mostly due to the differences in those assessments in different EU member states that the Council on Min-

ister of Interior in September 2015 had diverged from the usual practice of decision-making by consensus and undertook a formal vote by outvoting several EU member states on the issues of refugee quotas to be distributed to EU member states which do not have opt outs from the Justice and Home Affairs policies.

The divergence of national positions and preferences of different ways of managing those challenges is not really new. However, what seems to be missing is the exercise of leadership by those who could take the initiative at communication to actors involved either on the EU level (for example, in the Council) or on the national level with the populations in member states in order to discuss those different interpretations of the situation we are faced with, provide the evidence available and try to mobilize some sort of consensus about the most appropriate responses. Most of the possible responses might create the need to adjust patterns of behavior for many people in the EU which would imply losses of different kinds. Therefore honesty in communication and dialogue is particularly important, with decision-makers having to present different trade-offs involved into, for example, dealing with refugee flows in trying to limit inflows into particular member states as much as possible or by letting them just pass a country as a transit route or publicly announcing they are welcome and will be given asylum under required conditions.

Germany, and in particular Angela Merkel, is often viewed as a leader in dealing with those crises in Europe. However, although the management of the euro zone crisis has prevented the dissolution of the euro zone, it remains to be seen whether the lack of agreement on reforms linked to the bail-out by the authorities in Greece and other euro zone countries might not bring this issue back to the EU agenda. Forcing the adoption of reforms just because the alternative option of leaving the euro zone seemed more risky is going to create many obstacles to reforms in Greece. If the Prime Minister and other officials publicly claim they do not believe in those reforms they are supposed to implement, it reduces the room for transformation which is required for the single currency to be shared by such a diverse group of countries. In addition to the lack

of will, there is also lack of capacity to introduce reforms which is also an important barrier to the exercise of leadership in managing change on the national level.

In the case of the refugee crisis, A. Merkel also received a lot of attention, initially mostly positive for her brave and welcoming approach. Many citizens in Germany followed her example by extending material support and assistance to asylum seekers. However, it seems she acted on the impulse of her heart rather than showing compassion and careful assessment of the situation and only then deciding on the most appropriate response. It can be disputed to what extent her stance contributed to the massive increase in refugee flows to the EU and Germany in particular. But increasing tensions among Germany's political elites and society due to unexpectedly huge numbers of immigrants and the growing difficulties of managing them also point to the courage to lead not being backed by resources and the capacities to manage this challenge. As the domestic opinion becomes more skeptical and political debate intensifies, it is quite likely she will have to step back from the position taken and try to reduce tensions.

EU affairs and management of international interdependencies have long been a matter of national and supranational elites, in particular under the conditions of economic growth. Economic restructuring was often compensated by welfare policies. European solutions such as the Single Market project or the Economic and Monetary Union have been made possible by the convergence of dominant economic policy ideas regarding the nature and ways of dealing with economic decline of the 1970s and 1980s held by political and economic elites of the EC and its members, as well as the permissive consensus of the population regarding those integration measures provided they were often shielded from disruptive economic and social changes. Interestingly, by looking back into the past, many policy-makers comfort themselves by repeating that throughout its history the EU faced so many crises, always coming out of them stronger and more integrated. They often employ a famous quote of Jean Monnet that "Europe will be forged in crises,

and will be the sum of the solutions adopted for those crises" to support this conviction. However, this time the uncertainty about the possible solutions adopted and whether they might lead to further strengthening of EU institutions and the collective responses to those crises is much higher.

The euro zone crisis revealed growing popular discontent with European solutions while the refugee crisis seems to be revealing an even stronger divergence of national preferences and popular attitudes. Some of this discontent might be just a usual game of "blame shifting" that national policy-makers practice so often when unpopular decisions have to be taken. But this in itself is another sign of the lack of leadership on both EU and national levels. National authorities, in particular centrist parties that have been in power in most EU member states, have not learned to communicate and engage in honest dialogue with their voters, often leaving this to the Eurosceptic parties. The later proved increasingly skilled at attracting voters' attention, often by presenting only partial evidence or trying to ignore the new reality to which people in most European countries need to adapt. But the dominant political elites have not come out as leaders of managing change and investing adequate efforts and maintaining honest communication with their voters, in particular as elections approach. Although EU institutions are better placed to take a long-term view not interrupted by election cycles, they have also not exercised leadership in terms of actively engaging in discussions with citizens in all EU member states. Instead, supranational institutions seem very distant, often detached from reality and concerned more about their positive image and organizing sterile visits of Commissioners to national capitals rather than honest and self-critical debates on the ground. They treat the current crises as technical problems to be solved by expert solutions rather than adaptive challenges which require very different responses.[2]

---

2 For the discussion of the distinction between technical and adaptive challenges see Ronald Heifetz, Alexander Grashow, Marty Linsky, *The Practice of Adaptive Leadership. Tools and Tactics for Changing Your Organization and the World*, Boston: Harvard University Press, 2009.

To conclude, despite the history of European integration being marked by numerous crises the current situation might be different to the extent of the divergence of positions regarding both the nature and appropriate response to managing current crises. Political as well as societal tensions linked to those issues might necessitate significant modification of the habits of life that people in the EU are used to. Preserving the achievements of the EU and its member states that have characterized the continent as a place of free and prosperous societies with their particular cultural norms, as well as responding to the current crises, requires such an exercise in leadership that is very rare and difficult to sustain. Beneath the will and skill needed for such an exercise is honest public communication with members of political communities which so far has been a deficit no less important than a fiscal deficit or a deficit of strategic perspective.

Values and Interests that are at the Heart of the European Union's Foreign Policy

Sven Biscop

When designing and analysing foreign policy the first question asked is: Whose foreign policy is it? This essay seeks to understand what the foreign policy of the European Union (EU) is, without any attempt to hide what the author feels it ought to be. It is in equal measures analysis and design (or, some might say, wishful thinking). The starting point therefore must be: Which EU are we talking about? What is Europe?

In his 2005 magnum opus *Postwar*, British historian Tony Judt answered that question very concisely: the heart of Europe is the European social model. Through a combination of democracy, capitalism and government intervention at a European and national level, Europeans have constructed a model of society distinguished by its egalitarian aspiration. And the model really works. Europe is the most equal continent on the planet, providing the greatest security, freedom, and prosperity (the three core public goods to which every citizen is entitled) to the greatest number of citizens. Security: every citizen has to be kept free from harm. Freedom: every citizen needs to participate in democratic decision-making, have his human rights respected, and be treated equally before the law. And prosperity: every citizen has a right to a fair share of the wealth society produces; not an equal share, but a just one. The model does not of course work perfectly, and there are many differences in how the social model is organized between one Member State and another. But the aspiration is real and shared. In 2009, Member States even codified it in the Lisbon Treaty, which amended Article 2 of the Treaty on the European Union by adding 'equality' and 'solidarity' to the list of values on which the EU is based: "The Union is founded on the values of respect for

human dignity, freedom, democracy, equality, the rule of law and respect for human rights, including the rights of persons belonging to minorities. These values are common to the Member States in a society in which pluralism, non-discrimination, tolerance, justice, solidarity and equality between men and women prevail."

Because they constitute an integrated economy with a distinctive social model, Member States also have shared interests. Values and interests are not in contradiction: one's values determine which kind of society one wants to build and preserve, which in turn determines conditions needing fulfilment for that to be possible: one's vital interests. One's values further determine which types of instruments one can legitimately use to achieve those conditions. Thus the EU need not be timid in defending the following vital interests, but must do so as much as possible in such a way that it does not harm the legitimate interests of others:

1. Preventing direct military threats against Europe's territory from materializing: such threats may appear unlikely today, but that does not mean this will always be the case.

2. Keeping open all lines of interaction with the world, notably sea lanes and cyberspace - as a global trade power any interruption of the global marketplace immediately damages the European economy.

3. Assuring the supply of energy and other natural resources that society and the economy need.

4. Managing migration in an ethically acceptable way: on the one hand migration is necessary in order to maintain a viable work force, yet on the other the social model might not be able to cope with a surplus of migration.

5. Mitigating the impact of climate change in order to limit the multiplier effect on security threats and, of course, to save the planet.

6. Upholding the core of international law, notably the interdiction of the use of force in the UN Charter and the Universal

Declaration of Human Rights: the more the rules are respected, the better for international stability.

7. Preserving the autonomy of decision-making by preventing undue dependence on any foreign power: Europe should make its own decisions and not have decisions taken for it in Moscow, Beijing, or Washington.

What many have forgotten is the social model that depends on safeguarding these vital interests was, and remains, an inherent part of the EU project. Everybody is familiar with the founding myth of the EU: after the end of the Second World War, in order to prevent another world war starting in Europe, the founding fathers launched upon a path of integration between states that made war between them a practical impossibility. But this is only half of the story. At the same time the countries of (western) Europe also made a quantum leap in the establishing the comprehensive welfare state. Their reasoning was they had learned in the 1930s that without the social buffer of the welfare state, democracy could not cope with severe economic crisis and the resulting political upheaval. For the founding fathers, the social model was an inherent part of their peace project. It is not a luxury, something nice to have when things are going well but easily discarded when things are going badly; on the contrary, it is precisely in times of crisis that one has to invest in it. At the time building the welfare state was, of course, a national undertaking. Today, when there is a single market and, for most Member States a currency union, a banking union, and common budgetary rules enforced by the European Commission, maintaining the social model increasingly requires some aspects at least are incorporated into this common EU system of governance.

The strength of EU foreign policy is that it takes this very same egalitarian aspiration and turns it into a positive project for Europe's relations with the world. "A secure Europe in a better world" is the subtitle of the 2003 *European Security Strategy* (ESS), the first grand strategy for EU foreign and security policy adopted by the Heads of State and Government. That says it all. The aim of EU for-

eign policy is to secure Europe and the best way of doing that is to make the world a better place. The core of this strategy is neatly captured by just two sentences in the ESS: "The best protection for our security is a world of well-governed democratic states. Spreading good governance, supporting social and political reform, dealing with corruption and abuse of power, establishing the rule of law and protecting human rights are the best means of strengthening the international order."

In other words, the key to everyone's security are effective states who provide for the security, freedom, and prosperity of their own citizens. Only where governments treat their citizens equally is lasting peace and stability possible. Where governments do not provide for their citizens however, tensions will arise, instability, repression, and conflict will follow; citizens will eventually revolt, and regimes will either implode relatively peacefully (think of the Soviet Union in 1991 or Tunisia in 2011), or explode with a lot of violence (as is happening around Europe today). Therefore, put less diplomatically: the more the rest of the world becomes like Europe, the better for everybody. Better for Europe because there will be less ground for mass migration to Europe, less interruption of trade, and less risk of conflict spilling over to its territory. But better also for the rest of the world's citizens because they will enjoy more security, freedom, and prosperity.

That does not mean however that the EU should simply try to export its own social model in all its intricate detail to the rest of the world. Not only would that be too paternalistic, it just would not work. Circumstances around the world are too different for a one-size-fits-all model. What Europe should try to promote is an egalitarian aspiration, the sense that government is responsible for the *res publica* – and not just for the well-being of the ruling elite. Europeans should abandon the idea they know better how to govern other countries than citizens of those countries themselves, but they can legitimately advertise the results they have achieved in Europe. There are many ways of achieving the same result, and it is the result, as well as the sincere commitment to at least attempt it, that counts. In many countries that is what citizens are already

demanding, loudly and clearly. The brave people who went out into the streets in Tunisia in 2011 and whose actions would ultimately bring down the authoritarian regime of Ben Ali and trigger the Arab Spring, demonstrated because they wanted exactly this: a government that protects their security, respects their human rights, gives them a say in decision-making, and tries to make the economy work for everybody. These Tunisian demonstrators were not different from Belgian workers striking and getting shot at for the right to vote in the 1880s, Polish trade unionists resisting dictatorship in the 1980s, or Chinese citizens denouncing corruption today.

In the end, EU foreign policy embodying the same values on which its domestic social model is based is also a moral duty. No polity can be called truly democratic unless it is democratic in all of its actions. One could never imagine that for the sake of expediency the EU would suspend the rule of law or respect for human rights when dealing with the Common Agricultural Policy or regulation of the telecommunications sector. It should be as unimaginable in foreign and security policy. If the EU gives up on its own values, its foreign policy would perpetuate the very challenges it tries to address with war, authoritarianism, and inequality. The more Europe is perceived to bring the values it propagates into practice, not just in its foreign policy but even more so domestically, the more legitimacy it gains with citizens of other countries. The biggest source of Europe's influence is neither its soldiers nor even its trade, but the success of the way it does things internally.

The implication for the EU is evident: a foreign policy founded on promoting the results of its social model cannot be credible if it no longer adheres to it itself. Unfortunately this is exactly what the EU and several Member States began to do when the financial and economic crisis hit Europe. That the crisis did not bode well for EU foreign policy was self-evident. In times of austerity there simply is less money available for foreign policy, and as EU Heads of State and Government devoted summit after summit to the crisis, foreign policy inevitably lost out. Faced with the fact the Eurozone as it existed did not work, Member States could do one of two things: they

could abandon the Euro, or save it by deepening financial and economic integration. The fundamental choice for the latter option has been made and the trend therefore remains an ever closer union. But the painful and drawn-out decision-making process created the image of a weak Union, paralyzed by dissent and unable to take resolute action. Even today the EU is struggling to find a just answer to the crisis in Greece. Could anyone imagine the United States would seriously consider kicking a state out of itself? Yet this is what many in the EU seem to steer towards when it comes to Greece. All of this inevitably undermines the credibility of any foreign policy initiative which the EU might want to undertake.

But the Eurozone crisis also affected EU foreign policy at a less evident but actually much more fundamental level, because the way it was initially addressed was at odds with values underpinning the EU. How to save the Euro was presented as a technocratic issue, devoid of political or ideological choices. The medicine was known, it was just a matter of convincing the unwilling patient to swallow it. Certainly the purpose could not be doubted: the Euro had to be saved. But not as an end in itself. The Euro is a political project of course, and a symbol of European integration, but first of all it is a means – to enhance the security, freedom, and prosperity of European citizens. If the Euro were to be saved in such a manner that the prosperity and equality of European citizens were destroyed, the end result would be extremely dangerous for the European project and as such citizens would no longer feel committed to the Union and those governments that did not respect its core egalitarian aspiration. Great internal instability would be the result – hardly a base for decisive external action. Many citizens have already lost faith in the EU. Even though the European Commission under President Jean-Claude Juncker has now charted a different course, accepting that jobs and growth are more likely to save the Union than austerity, restoring trust in the EU will be a work of many years.

However, the world will not stand still waiting until the EU has found it bearings again. The turmoil in Europe's neighbourhood, rising tensions in a multipolar world, and the pivot of the focus of US strategy to Asia more than merit the drafting of a new

strategy for EU foreign policy to replace the 2003 ESS. At the June 2015 meeting of the European Council, Heads of State and Government gave a mandate to the High Representative, Federica Mogherini, to draft an EU Global Strategy for Foreign and Security Policy by June 2016. As the EU is working out which kind of Union it wants to be for its own citizens, so it must work out which kind of power it wants to be in world politics.

The existing ESS outlines an agenda for EU foreign policy that is not only ambitious, but one that in political science terms makes the EU into a revolutionary power: a power that seeks to change the existing order. To state as the ESS does that "the quality of international society depends on the quality of the governments that are its foundation" is to say in couched yet clear enough terms the EU does not think that quality is now assured. To add "the best protection for our security is a world of well-governed democratic states" is a call for regime-change across the globe, for there are unfortunately far too few of these. The EU would of course like to see this happen gradually and smoothly, not by force of arms, but through "positive conditionality" where governments are offered greater access to the European market (for people, goods, services, and capital) for every step they take towards more equal provisions of security, freedom, and prosperity for their citizens.

Yet in practice the EU more often behaves as a status quo power, happy with things as they are. The clearest symptom of this is Europe's addiction to partnership as a way of conducting international relations. It seems as if almost every country in the world has a formal partnership of some kind or other with the EU. In reality partnership cannot be the beginning of a diplomatic relationship, but is its desired end-state. Effective partnership is only possible if there is a sufficient consensus on foreign policy objectives and what are the acceptable ways of achieving them so as to enable systematic consultation and regular joint action. The EU has ten high-profile "strategic partnerships": with NATO allies the United States and Canada, with the BRICS (Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa), and with Japan, Mexico, and most recently South Korea. But with many

of them that degree of consensus does not exist. Rather than stimulating its "partners" to change (for why would they as they are on the "good guys" list already) the EU has become tainted by associating too uncritically with all kinds of unsavoury regimes. That is the consequence of something that happens too often in the EU: after a while it begins to mistake an aspirational notion in one of its policies for reality. Thus, the EU ended up believing that all those it had dubbed partners really were partners. Europe's southern neighbourhood is a case in point. The EU gave up on its reform agenda and promotion of egalitarian aspirations in favour of a status quo policy and worked with every dictator that seemed to meet its concerns over terrorism, migration, and energy supply. Then came the Arab Spring that toppled Europe's "partners" in Tunisia, Libya, and Egypt... The eastern neighbourhood presents a mirror image: in Ukraine the EU pushed too fast too far, ignoring that the country was not ready for a Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Agreement and that its other neighbour Russia might have a not so benign reading of EU intentions. The resulting image is one of a blundering and reactive EU.

The easiest way to overcome this problem of double standards would be to simply give up on the high-flown rhetoric and pursue a status quo strategy in words as well as deeds. That however is not an option for the EU because, as we have seen, the notion that "the best protection for our security is a world of well-governed democratic states" remains absolutely true and is but a reflection of the EU itself. If EU foreign policy abandons its distinctiveness, this would be a disavowal of its own values – Europe would simply no longer be Europe. Europe would be but one international actor among others, and a weak one at that: an EU without its distinctive egalitarian project would be just like the US, but without the latter's armed strength. The EU cannot and should not give up on its "revolutionary" agenda, but find better ways of achieving it.

Therefore a middle way has to be found – neither dreamy idealism nor unprincipled pragmatism. The revolutionary agenda has proved to be far too optimistic. If change does not emerge organically from within a country, it cannot be engineered from the outside. All

attempts to do so have ended in disaster, as in Iraq and even Afghanistan. In such circumstances playing a reforming role is extremely difficult. However, a pure status quo policy, just working with the powers that be, has also proved to be harmful to Europe's interests. Regimes that do not provide for the security, freedom, and prosperity of their citizens are inherently unstable and will eventually implode or explode – one cannot count on long-term cooperation therefore. When change does occur, driven internally, Europe has to be on the right side of history or it will find itself without legitimacy. An external actor can attempt to play a moderating role, aiming to curb excesses by exerting pressure via diplomatic channels, and in case of serious threats to EU interests or serious human rights violations, sanctions. Military intervention under the principle of the Responsibility to Protect is the ultimate emergency break in case of the gravest violations (genocide, ethnic cleansing, war crimes, and crimes against humanity), which only the Security Council can trigger. But these are emergency measures and not a basis for day-to-day policy.

The middle way could be an activist strategy of pragmatic idealism. To remain consistent with itself, Europe has to adhere to the long-term overall objective of "a world of well-governed democratic states", but in the knowledge that it will only be reached through mostly incremental steps.

Where, for the time being at least, the situation seems impervious to change, Europe should at the very least not do anything that puts even more obstacles in the way of achieving "well-governed democratic states". In other words, if one doesn't see what can be done, at least don't do anything that clashes with one's own values. Therefore a pure status quo policy of cooperation with the powers that be is not an option. This does not mean the EU cannot cooperate at all with them. On the contrary, it should seek to continuously engage all relevant actors in such countries, the opposition and civil society as well as the regime – but it cannot cooperate with any regime in ways that strengthen its authoritarian foundations. To put it very bluntly: rendition of terrorist suspects to be "interrogated" by the security services of an autocracy while preaching about hu-

man rights is not good for Europe's credibility. But the EU definitely ought to engage economically: trade and even more so investments leading to job creation are the best ways of permeating a society.

When a situation is unfrozen and change does occur it can be for better or for worse, but then at least there will be a chance for improvement. This is when, building on the legitimacy that a policy of pragmatic idealism ought to have endowed it with, the EU can actively attempt to generate multiplier effects and steer change in a direction that is beneficial to its interests. While Europe's preferred instruments are diplomatic and economic, military intervention is an option if change creates security concerns. A cost-benefit evaluation must determine, on a case-by-case basis, whether European military involvement is called for. If Europe does not intervene, will there be a threat against its vital interests? And what will be the humanitarian consequences for the population of the country? If it does intervene, what are the chances of averting the threat and creating conditions in which change for the better can be consolidated? And what are the risk of creating negative effects (such as escalation to other countries), incurring casualties among European forces and collateral damage?

Trade-offs are inevitable. When choosing to intervene militarily against the self-styled Islamic State in Iraq and Syria, one cannot do without regional actors in the coalition, even if many of those countries sustain practices (such as decapitating criminals and hanging homosexuals) that are absolutely at odds with universal values. Academics may try and develop elegant strategic concepts, but unfortunately elegance cannot always be preserved when conducting foreign and security policy. And yet these strategic concepts can help the EU to make decisions, to assess what is important for Europe and what is not, which responses are possible and which are not, and which resources ought to be allocated to them. Pragmatic idealism ought to ensure two things: that the EU remains true to universal egalitarian values and thus to itself, and that it plays an active, leading role. Sometimes taking the lead will lead to failure, but oftentimes it will lead to success – passively accepting the course of events will never.

Towards the European Global Security Strategy: Challenges and Opportunities

Elena Korosteleva[1]

Setting the scene: from a fragmented to more integrated European Security Strategy

In this paper we will briefly examine the interplay between the European security strategic vision, its institutional architecture and policy implementation practices. In what follows below, we will first offer a short overview of the major milestones in the development of the EU's security strategy, and then will examine the existing disconnects and opportunities for fostering a coherent and more inclusive security discourse to enable the EU to become a global and influential player.

The EU has considerably progressed in fostering a common vision for the European Security Strategy. It moved beyond the national priorities of individual member states to collectively consider the interests of the European Union (EU) as a whole, and to separately articulate its external (2003) and internal (2010) security priorities. At the same time, more challenging tasks still lie ahead relating to (i) the facilitation of a joined-up vision, merging external and internal dimensions of security; (ii) the development of a joined-up inter-institutional approach involving all members states and EU institutions, and connecting policy instruments and geographical silos into a European Security Model (ESM); and (iii) the facilitation of sustainable partnerships (including strategic interests) with regional and global actors. If successful, this would enable the EU to extend its security impact well beyond its bor-

---

ders, and to move closer to its aspiration to become a global (rather than regional) security player.

Let's examine the trajectory of EU security thinking in the process of fostering an effective, sustainable and legitimate European Global Security Strategy (EGSS) aimed for June 2016.

European (External) Security Strategy 2003 (EESS)

The 2003 ESS was explicitly externally facing, underlying the importance of developing a uniform response ('effective multilateralism') to global challenges – "No single country is able to tackle today's complex problems on its own"[2] – and the need to enhance the EU's presence and leadership in the global governance system. It had three particular objectives, which were recognised as strategically important. More specifically, it aimed to focus on (i) addressing global threats: including terrorism, proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, regional conflicts, organised crime, and state failure; (ii) building security in the neighbourhood – to "promote a ring of well governed countries...with whom we can enjoy close and cooperative relations"[3]; and (iii) fostering effective multilateralism – "a rule-based international order"[4] – by developing closer cooperation with WTO, NATO, OSCE and regional organisations (ASEAN, MERCOSUR, and African Union). To support these external objectives EU institutions were tasked to develop a more active approach to realising EU strategic objectives; more capabilities especially via EU-NATO cooperation; and a more coherent alignment of the EU Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) and Security and Defence Policy (CSDP). Thus, the EESS was too narrowly focused prioritising only the external aspects of security, and it was too context laden, valid for a specific political time and promoting narrowly defined multilateralism and strategic partnerships. This led to the 2008 review of the strategy, in an attempt to balance out strategic priorities.

---

2 European Council, *European Security Strategy: Secure Europe in a Better World*. Brussels, 12 December 2003, p. 1.
3 European Council, *European Security Strategy: Secure Europe in a Better World*. Brussels, 12 December 2003, p. 8.
4 European Council, *European Security Strategy: Secure Europe in a Better World*. Brussels, 12 December 2003, p. 9.

European (Internal) Security Strategy 2010 (EISS)

The 2010 ESS strategically shifted its focus more exclusively on the internal aspects of the ESS, with the purpose to strengthen the EU operational capacity, and develop "a larger consensus on the vision, values and objectives which underpin EU security"[5]. It identified three strategic objectives, which involved (i) protecting people in Europe as part of the global response; (ii) addressing global threats: including terrorism, organised crime, cybercrime, cross-border crime, violence, and natural and man-made disasters; and (iii) developing a European Security Model (ESM) consisting of common tools; cooperation and solidarity between member states (MS) and all EU institutions; and recognising "a greater interdependence between internal and external security"[6].

To achieve them, the EU internal security strategy had to develop more horizontal and vertical cooperation synergies; more effective democratic control and judicial supervision of security activities; a more proactive and intelligence-led approach for prevention and anticipation of conflicts; and more operational cooperation between central and in-country law-enforcing representations. Furthermore, two specific operational steps were prioritised, which remit and rationale, however, caused much contention at the national level[7]: development of the operational capacity of COSI – Standing Committee on Operational Cooperation on Internal Security; and establishment of an internal security fund to promote the implementation of EISS. Thus, this EISS focussed too narrowly on developing internal capabilities and institutions to improve the implementation practices. Consequently, the excessive emphasis on internal instruments, capacities and agencies brought about more inter-institutional fragmentation and conflict of interests that the desired unity of response.

---

5 European Council, *Internal Security Strategy for the European Union: Towards a European Security model*. Brussels, March 2010, p. 7.
6 European Council, *Internal Security Strategy for the European Union: Towards a European Security model*. Brussels, March 2010, p. 12.
7 Home Office, *European Agenda on Security*. (36829), 8293/15, to the attention of the Home Affairs Committee, and European Committee B, House of Commons, 2015.

Towards a European (Global) Security Strategy 2015/16 (EGSS)

It is therefore anticipated that the EU currently finds itself in the process of reflection and development of a new ESS, this time aiming to foster an integrated (cross-institutional and cross-thematic) global vision on European security. Not only is this driven by the changing global environment (especially in the neighbourhood and the implications for the EU's internal security), this also involves a much needed reflection of (i) possible synergies between external and internal aspects of security, (ii) existing incoherence between the multitude of instruments and agencies; and (iii) the limited leverage over the external environment, which prevents the EU to punch its weight and act as a globally effective player.[8]

The High Representative's (HR) report (2015) offers a comprehensive overview of the achieved, but also of challenges ahead. Notably, it identifies five specific geographic regions – a broader European neighbourhood (Western Balkans, EaP region, and Turkey), MENA, Africa, Atlantic partnerships and Asia – where it believes the EU could make a difference. To do so, it requires the EU's external action instruments to be fit for purpose and become more focused in their strategic vision; more flexible; and better coordinated to exert leverage and strengthen EU internal capabilities.

At the same time, while acknowledging the availability of multiple instruments and policies[9] – i.e. CFSP, CSDP, counter-terrorism (CT), cyber issues, humanitarian assistance, trade, migration policy, climate policy, ENP and enlargement – the HR's report underscores the need not for their proliferation, but rather, for their more effective, better integrated and coordinated use. The report suggests this could be achieved by way of fostering; a joined-up approach which would (i) connect the above policy instruments "not only in conflicts and crises, but across all fields of EU external action"[10], and (ii)

---

8 *The European Union in a Changing Global Enviornment: a More Connected, Contested and Complex World.* EEAS report. Brussels, June 2015, pp. 1-2.
9 *The European Union in a Changing Global Enviornment: a More Connected, Contested and Complex World.* EEAS report. Brussels, June 2015, pp. 14-15.
10 *The European Union in a Changing Global Enviornment: a More Connected, Contested and Complex World.* EEAS report. Brussels, June 2015, p. 20.

overcome geographical silos, and vertical and horizontal inter- and intra-institutional divisions; a sharper definition of 'strategic partnerships' for maximising the EU's global influence.[11]

This call for reflection, however, instead of synergising the internal and external dimensions of security, shifts the emphasis back on to the latter (the external aspect), and the development of capabilities, which would not succeed without the proper partnership-building approach and the EU's decentring from its own agenda. A 'global' (and more comprehensive) vision is essentially missing from the discussion. The above overview of the EU strategic objectives and actions explicitly highlights the following 'disconnects' in the EU's security thinking:

1. there is a definitive need to develop an integrated approach to European security which would merge external and internal aspects into a comprehensive and global strategy;

2. there is an urgent need for a joined-up approach, which would draw on cross-institutional, cross-governmental and cross-policy thematic perspectives – for the purpose of building a comprehensive EU security model, which could be applied across the board;

3. there is an urgency to understand and connect with the EU external environment, especially by way of defining the meaning of partnerships (including of strategic interest), and developing greater awareness about the recipient side. We will explore and offer recommendations for each of the three priorities below.

---

11 *The European Union in a Changing Global Enviornment: a More Connected, Contested and Complex World.* EEAS report. Brussels, June 2015, p. 15.

Towards a comprehensive and global strategy

While a joined-up strategy is envisaged for the developed of the EGSS across institutions, government agencies and thematic policies, there is no integrated vision and understanding between the main EU institutions as to how to achieve this objective and drive it forward.

The European Council is tasked by the treaties to offer a strategic direction for the EU's development, especially at the time of crises. While realising the importance of developing a "common, comprehensive and consistent EU global strategy", it nevertheless narrows its concerns to the capability-building initiatives (by way of empowering COSI to coordinate and monitor implementation actions) and to renewing the EISS for 2015-20, with a particular responsibility for fostering systematic EU defence cooperation, mobilising EU instruments, ensuring a sufficient defence budget in support of EU defence actions and monitoring the progress of the implementation of the Internal Security strategy.[12] The external dimension of security is circumscribed to an area of intensifying partnerships with the UN, NATO, OSCE and AU,[13] the kind of multilateralism which so far has not proved effective. This 'micro-management' and a circumscribed view of multilateralism (while ignoring new and emergent regional and global players – BRICS, Eurasian Union etc.), may hinder EU leverage, and hamper its positioning (2020+) as a global leader.

The EEAS has offered an apt and reflective report outlining the need to radically rethink the EU's security strategy. It believes that traditional multilateralism is no longer responsive to new challenges, and the EU needs a more inclusive strategy forward. At the same time, the report shows a limited understanding, on the one hand, of how synergies between the external and internal dimensions of security could be achieved (still placing more salience on the internal aspects of security); and on the other, how to foster

---

12 Council of the European Union, *Draft Council Conclusions on the Renewed EU Internal Security startegy 2015-20.* Brussels 9798/15, 10 June 2015, pp. 10-11.
13 Council of the European Union, *Council Directive on the coordination and cooperation measures to facilitate consular protection for unrepresented citizens of the Union in third countries.* Brussels 2015/637, 20 April 2015, pp. 5-6.

a joined-up approach to overcome "horizontal and vertical silos which hamper the EU's potential global role".[14]

Conversely, ***the Commission***, while also advocating for the development of a shared European Security Agenda on Security between the Union and member states, places more emphasis on forging "a global perspective with security as one of our main external priorities."[15] At the same time, like the Council and the EEAS, it prioritises the reconfiguration of EU instruments and policies, rather than developing a full understanding of the external environment, e.g. by way of defining the meaning and objectives of a partnership-building approach.

The ***European Parliament***, in turn, believes the main priorities should lie in developing mechanisms of legitimising security strategy (via the EU Security Consultative Forum) and establishing performance indicators for key EU instruments (including benchmarks and road mapping, and their regular monitoring).[16] Therefore, while there is an understanding of the need for a joined-up approach to security which would synergise its external and internal dimensions and would define common priorities to advance the EU's global potential, there is a limited inter-institutional vision for the shared agenda and for the need to develop a more 'outside-in' perspective – via strategic partnerships and joint interests.

Institutional architecture and capabilities: tensions and opportunities

Stemming from the above, there is also a number of tensions emerging from the envisaged institutional operationalisation of the forthcoming European Security Model. While the Council believes that empowering COSI should be a priority, to facilitate its closer cooperation with the Commission, EEAS and JHA agencies; its remit and capability are seriously questioned by the European and national agencies. The Commission, on the other hand, insists on

---

14 *The European Union in a Changing Global Enviornment: a More Connected, Contested and Complex World.* EEAS report. Brussels, June 2015, p. 20.
15 European Commission, *The European Agenda on Security.* COM (2015) 185 final. Strasbourg, 28 April 2015, p. 20.
16 European Parliament, *Draft Motion for a resolution on European Agenda Security.* 2015, PE557.263v01-00

empowering EU delegations and their better integration into decision-making processes in Brussels. The EEAS, conversely, is more concerned with a top-down re-building of the cross-sectoral architecture of the external action policies, which may cause further intra- and inter-institutional tensions. Consequently, the institutional re-mapping may require a system overhaul and some unification under the EEAS roof, if a genuine 'joined-up approach to all EU fields of EU external action' were to be forged.

Overall, there is no vision or understanding of what the ESM should be, institutionally and thematically, and whether (and how) it should pursue an all-encompassing security style over the targeted set of policy priorities. In relation to the individual thematic policies – enlargement, neighbourhood, migration, energy, CT and Security and defence – the EEAS calls for the dismantlement of policy and geographical silos. At the same time, the conclusions of the inter-parliamentary conference[17] suggest that a more differentiated approach to individual policy's contents and objectives should be the priority. The best way forward would be indeed to prioritise individual policies - the ENP, migration, trade, border management and energy – with the view to expand their impact and connectivity, before considering blurring their operational and geographical silos.

Towards more effective and sustainable strategic partnerships

To enable the successful development and implementation of the EGSS, the EU needs to radically rethink the meaning of 'partnership' (including of strategic interest). While the notion of partnership has been extensively used in EU external discourse, it avails no proper meaning.[18] As one EU senior official commented: "It is true the EU has an evolving meaning of "partnership". The EU has developed strategic partnerships and special relations with substan-

---

17 *Inter-Parliamentary Conference for the CFSP and CSDP.* Draft Conclusions. Luxembourg, 3 August 2015.
18 For detailed discussion see Korosteleva, E (2014) *The EU and its Eastern Neighbours: Towards a more Ambitious Partnership?* Routledge

tial partners, whom the EU takes seriously...whereas, [for example] partnership under the ENP is [aimed] for smaller countries."[19] This differentiation also infers whether partnership-building should be driven by mutual interests (as in strategic partnerships) or solely by EU norms (known as a conditionality approach). As practice shows, even if it is driven by reciprocity in strategic partnerships, the EU tends to dominate and behave as a norm-maker, in trying to 'socialise' its partners into the EU's way of thinking.[20] This is problematic as it violates the very nature of partnership, and prevents the EU from learning about its external environment, as EU-Russian relations have recently attested to.

Conclusions

This paper contends that in order for the EU to develop an effective and sustainable global security strategy, it first has to reconcile its vision and understanding of strategic priorities within its inter- and intra-institutional settings. Second, a serious effort is required to develop an integrated view on European security, which will not only focus on the internal dimensions of the EU Security Strategy (capabilities), but will equally draw on its external aspects - a genuine inclusive approach that would blur internal and external dimensions of security. For this to succeed a deeper understanding of a partnership-building process (especially of strategic partnership) is needed. Finally, while legitimation of the new security vision is essential within the EU (by way of security consultative forums), a greater emphasis should be placed on its external environment, which must not only include a cross-cutting approach to multiple policy instruments as suggested by the EEAs, but more essentially, their connection with the interests and needs of third parties. Case-studies in appendices elaborate further on some specific aspects of EU security within the eastern neighbourhood context.

---

19 Interview with a senior official, DG RELEX, College of Europe, 6 September 2010
20 This has been especially noted and openly resisted by Chinese and Russian officials. For more details see Korosteleva (2014)

The Impact Of The Refugee Crisis On The European Union

Andris Piebalgs

The recent history of the EU is full of situations of crisis as EU leaders devote a lot of their time in emergency summits. The previous President of the European Council has even called his book "Europe in the storm" due to him spending a lot of his time dealing with the financial crisis in the euro zone. In the foreword of his book, written in early 2014, whilst being satisfied with actions taken to mitigate the crisis, he warns that "...perhaps it is just a calm before a new storm some day - in politics we are never completely masters of our fate".

Now in 2015, we are in a new storm. This time it is the refugee crisis and it seems to be a perfect storm, currently drawing deep dividing lines into European society. The EU has always championed human rights as a basis for European unity. All EU member states are party to the 1951 Geneva Convention and have accepted refugees into their borders. In recent years, there have been around 300,000 asylum applications every year with most of these people fleeing from war zones. About 100,000 have been granted protection. In the two first years of the Syrian war, EU member states have granted protection for 75,000 Syrian refugees. Although the EU has been able to cope with the issue, there have been some indications that business as usual is not an option. This is partly due to an increase in the number of people drowning in the Mediterranean Sea and to strong migratory flow putting pressure on Italy and Greece.

The beginning of the year 2015 has been relatively calm. But then the numbers of people trying to reach Europe have increased significantly on all migratory routes. At first, it was the Central Mediterranean route, then Greece saw the already high number of migrants growing exponentially. This year according to the UN, 500,000 people have already reached Europe. With the number of refugees at the EU border growing, there could be more than 1 mil-

lion asylum seekers this year, with this number increasing in years to come. As some member states have been more affected than others, the call for European solidarity has grown even louder. Some member states have been criticized by others for their implementation of border controls. There have been serious concerns about the continuation of the free movement of people in the Schengen area. The tensions inside the EU have grown to levels never before experienced. The constructive approach by the European Commission announced by the President Juncker in the State of the Union address in the European parliament on 9 September 2015 has helped. Now there is more of a constructive spirit inside the EU.

What are the main pillars of the European response?

First, the decision on the resettlement of 160,000 refugees from Italy and Greece. Actually there have been two decisions: one in May about the resettlement of 40,000 and one in September for 120,000. These decisions have been taken after a very difficult debate with a qualified majority voting and four countries were out voted. It is regretful that a consensus has not been achieved, but at least the outvoted countries continue to be constructively engaged. Sometimes there has been criticism that resettlement doesn't address the root causes of the challenge. This is true, but to get the real engagement of member states, solidarity is the necessary precondition.

Second is the lifesaving operations performed in the Mediterranean Sea. Since the start of the operation, Europeans have saved 122,000 lives. A particularly important role in these efforts was played by Italy with the search-and-rescue operation Mare Nostrum. But it is important that more and more member states participate in the saving of lives.

Third, regaining and strengthening control of the EU's external border. It is an essential precondition for the continuation of the "Schengen zone". There will be new investments in border infrastructure. Frontex, an EU border protection agency, will be strengthened. The current yearly budget of €90 million is no longer

sufficient. The European Commission has the ambition of creating a common border and coastguard agency. But for this to be successful, a lot of compromises will be necessary by the member states that share the EU's external boarder.

Fourth, the acceleration of the creation of the Common European Asylum system. There is already the legislation adopted for common asylum standards like common criteria for the justice systems of member states to decide on international protection and how to proceed applications for international protection. Five pieces of legislation form the core of the Common European Asylum System (the Dublin Regulation, the recast Asylum Procedures Directive, the recast Qualification Directive, the recast Reception Conditions Directive, and the EURODAC rules on fingerprinting). Unfortunately the transposition and application of these procedures have been slow. The European Commission has taken more than seventy infringement decisions against member states in 2015. In the best case scenario we could expect that by the end of the year the European legislation will be suitably implemented. The European Commission's President Juncker in his State of the Union speech mentioned that the European Commission has the intention to also propose a common list of safe countries of origin. It is true that a huge part of refugees come from Western Balkan countries. Some of them are EU candidate countries who fulfill the Copenhagen criteria and others have a very particular relationship with the EU. Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia and Kosovo should be regarded as safe countries of origin. It will allow member states to focus more on asylum seekers running away from war and persecution.

Fifth, strengthening the fight against smugglers. In Turkey alone it is estimated that 30,000 people are involved in smuggling. The price to get to Europe from North Africa or the Middle East is in the thousands of dollars (USD) range. There are sources that say the price has recently decreased from $6000 (USD) to $2000 (USD). This means that now more people can afford to pay for travel. Destroying smuggler rings is an essential precondition for nor-

malizing refugee flow into Europe. That would require a new level of cooperation between the respective services of the EU MS.

Sixth, increase support for refugees sheltered in Turkey, Lebanon and Jordan. These three countries have accommodated around 4 million refugees. Although the EU has already provided substantial humanitarian support, more money is needed as the war continues. Therefore, in September, the EU decided to provide an additional €1 billion in funds. The EU's relationship with Turkey will play an especially important role in this crisis situation. Although Turkey is an EU candidate country, the negotiation process has been very slow and political relations are tense. An improved diplomatic relationship with Turkey will help in getting the refugee crisis under control.

Seventh, looking for peace in Syria. The war in Syria is already in its fifth year and has resulted in the displacement of around 8 million people and the deaths of hundreds of thousands. Peace efforts haven't been successful and opposition to the incumbent Syrian government is divided. It is time to change strategy. Some MS have increased their engagement in military operations against ISIL. The German chancellor expressed a readiness to get involved in negotiations with Bashir al-Assad to find peace in Syria.

Eighth, to increase support to Africa. A substantial portion of the refugees, particularly ones using the most dangerous Central Mediterranean route, come from African countries such as Eritrea, Somalia, Nigeria, Niger and Mali. Eritreans are fleeing the dictatorship, Somalis are running away from Al-Shabab's terror, and a lot of Africans are trying to escape the misery and hopelessness in their countries. Europe has been a longstanding development partner in Africa. The results have been mixed but we shouldn't forget that there hasn't been potential for development after the colonial period. In the 1980s and 1990s, there has been a lot of disappointment. But this has changed. As a result of a lot of African countries implementing necessary reforms, there has been economic growth in Africa, even during the global economic crisis. Regional cooperation has also improved. The African Union plays an important role in the development of the continent. Democracy and the rule of law has

strengthened. A lot of African countries have made serious progress towards the Millennium Development Goals process. Africa is a fast growing continent that is prone to natural and manmade disasters. Climate change in particular is making a substantial impact on the African continent. The weather patterns have changed and droughts are more frequent. During the United Nations Summit in September, 193 states agreed by consensus on the outcome document "Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development". This is a plan of action for ending poverty in all forms and dimensions as an indispensable requirement for sustainable development. The 17 goals range from fighting hunger to good governance, and are expressed in 169 targets to be achieved. The new global agenda also provides a good basis for the reinvigorated cooperation between Africa and the EU. The ambitious implementation of this agenda could provide the necessary optimism for encouraging the African population to stay on African soil. Each year, the EU, through the European Commission, provides around €4 billion in grants. In the new cooperation cycle it will be used as leverage to achieve more shared wealth in Africa. But it is important that all development partners synchronize their support for African countries. There is an immense need for more financial investment, both public and private. Without development at home a lot of young Africans will be ready to take the substantial risks involved in coming to Europe. The European Commission has proposed to create a new EU Trust fund for dealing with the challenges in Africa. The amount proposed is €1.8 billion and it will help to react quickly to a changing environment. The focus should be peace, resilience and creating economic opportunities. There is another serious challenge in the African continent: the situation in Libya. Since the Arab Spring revolution, security and the political situation in this country has deteriorated. In order to provide perspective for Libyan people to fight against smugglers on the coast, and end the export of instability from Libya to other African countries, a strong democratically elected Libyan government will be indispensable. The EU should work closely with the African Union to achieve this goal.

Ninth, finding a new common approach for acting fast when dealing with refugees. The agreement to create so-called hotspots could accelerate the procedures. Hotspots are teams of legal and asylum experts at the European border who help identify those in need of international protection among the thousands of people arriving in Greece and Italy. These teams will involve experts from the Frontex border agency, the European Asylum Support Office, the EU's police and justice agencies (Europol and Eurojust) and the experts in fighting smuggling. Hotspots are crucial for a fast and effective implementation of relocations and returns.

Tenth, the creation of opportunities for legal migration to the EU. Today the focus is rightly on the refugees. But a substantial number of people trying to reach Europe will not qualify for international protection and should return to their respective country. Some of them will try to stay illegally in the EU. Europe is a rich and socially engaged continent and it could provide career opportunities for young people. It would be logical to create a window for legal migration. The European Commission has promised to come up with proposals, but it will be difficult to convince the member states.

Are all these measures enough? There clearly isn't a silver bullet. It is important not to just focus on the short-term issues such as relocation but also to deal with the root causes of the refugee crisis. The idea behind the EU's Neighborhood policy has been to create a belt of peace and stability around the EU. The first attempt hasn't been successful. But the revision of the Neighborhood policy could give the opportunity to improve its efficiency and focus more on the issue of migration. As long as there will be war and poverty at the doorsteps of the EU, there will be migration issues.

The current refugee crisis has also brought security worries. There are risks that organized Islamic militants will try to get terrorists in the EU using people-smuggling networks or refugee routes. Although security officials say they have found no evidence that jihadist militants are among the refugees, vigilance is still needed. The security challenge could also come from the extreme right movements or their members in the EU's member states. Norway got this tragic experience with Breivik.

Still the solutions to the refugee crisis can only be achieved if there exists mutual trust and solidarity in Europe. The President of the European Council after the September Council said, "We need to end the cycle of mutual recriminations and misunderstandings." It seems that there is a more mutual understanding and willingness to find a common response. The misunderstanding between leaders reflects the divisions in European society. Europeans are divided on how to address the refugee crisis. A lot of misperceptions have surfaced. Some are easier to deal with while others are more difficult. European societies have been built on mutual trust but the large number of refugees increase doubts about the ability of their integration. The track record of integration from previous waves of refugees is mixed. Clearly there is a need for a greater opening of the European society. Europe needs to accept the fact that at least in the short term there will continue to be a lot of refugees. They need support, they need shelter, they need schools, they need healthcare and they need work. In the medium term, the EU will benefit economically, but with tight budgets it will demand a lot of effort and goodwill. Europe needs not only a legal framework – the Common European Asylum System and a proper management and control of the external borders - but also strong support from the European citizen. They expect refugees to respect the values and the laws of their countries and to integrate on this basis. They also expect that asylum speakers will study and speak the language of the host country. The success could only be measured by successful integration of refugees in European society.

The refugee crisis has had a similar impact on the euro area as the financial crisis. Member states need to agree to share more sovereignty to preserve the European construction. More common policies are needed and in more sensitive areas. Although few governments are content in sharing more sovereignty, none of them desire the failure of the EU.

Still there are two difficult issues to deal with. At the current moment, in order for the refugee to make his plea for international protection, they need to come to the border of the European Union. That gives an incentive for the continuation of the flow of refugees despite all the risks they will face.

The game changer could be the EU run asylum offices outside the EU. This would allow for the processing of asylum applications or humanitarian visas on the spot. But for this system to be implemented, member states would need to guarantee a quota. Seeing how difficult it was to agree on the redistribution of asylum seekers from Greece and Italy, it's hard to imagine that such a decision could be taken. Another difficulty stems from the letter of the Dublin regulation. The refugee should register in the country where they arrive. There the fingerprinting is done and registration as an asylum seeker takes place. This regulation puts a particular pressure on countries that share an external EU border. At the current moment, this predominately occurs at the southern border, but with the escalation of the situation in Ukraine or the change of direction in the refugee flow, it could be the eastern border as well. Taking into account the opinion of the refugee could help enhance the distribution of the EU's efforts and strengthen the willingness of integration. The downside of this approach would be that refugees would choose to reside in the richest EU member states. However, this is already happening now. The quota system could help to overcome this difficulty. Changing EU legislation in such an especially sensitive area will take time, but the refugee issue will stay with the EU for a long time and it would be advisable to change the system sooner rather than later.

The refugee crisis is one of the most complex and sensitive issues the EU has had to deal with in the twenty first century. There have been signs of it coming for a long time. But only now does it seem there is enough political will to deal with it. To continue to be a continent based on common values, to fight the root causes of the displacement of people, to have full control over external borders, to create decent conditions for refugees in reception centers, to quickly proceed with applications for asylum, to give protection to the ones in need of it and integrate them into European society - these are the challenges currently facing the EU. And in confronting them, Europe will also be changing. And there will be more calls for a more integrated European construction and for treaty changes.

The Refugee's Crisis – Yet another 'Achilles' Heel' of the European Integration Project?

Aldis Austers

The proverb says "it never rains but it pours". The European Union has lately been besieged by problems: it all started with the global financial crash of 2008, which sewed deep discord between the northern (creditor) and southern (debtor) member states, endangering the existence of the European common currency. Next was Russia's military led aggression against Ukraine, testing the joint foreign and security capacities of the EU. Recently, the unprecedented influx of asylum seekers from the conflict torn states of sub-Saharan Africa has presented another 'severe distress' situation to EU cohesion, this time, to the integrated area of border-control free travel among European countries.

The incomplete transfer of competences to European level stands at the centre of European problems. The common currency and Schengen rules were conceived during good times, and have served mostly political goals (e.g. the provision of tangible integration benefits to the European public). Under stress, the 'beggar-thy-neighbour' attitude tends to prevail over solidarity feelings among member states, with 'blackmailing' being another strategy. Meantime, the action capacity of EU centralised institutions remains restricted by Treaty provisions. Thus, while Germany's chancellor has promised a shelter to everyone in need, the German and Austrian authorities have reintroduced border controls. Hungary has completely sealed its southern borders with Serbia and Croatia to stop refugee crowds passing through its territory, while Slovenia has introduced restrictions on the number of people crossing its borders. This development risks leaving many thousands of asylum seekers stranded on their route to their desired destination countries, cold and wet in Croatia.

In this paper I argue that indeed the refugee crisis presents another serious examination to European unity, and warrants considerable improvements if an effective and just Common European Asylum Policy is to be achieved. However, the perceived scale of the crisis is over blown, and the absorption of refugees from the sub-Saharan region should not be problematic, if proper integration policies are devised. In fact, Europe's future growth will depend on foreign labour supply.

How many are they and where do they come from?

Around 710,000 irregular migrants have crossed the EU's external border during the first nine months of 2015, according to Frontex, the EU's external border agency.[1] This represents a significant increase compared to 2013, when 283,000 illegal border crossings were registered during the whole year. One hundred and ninety thousand asylum seekers arrived in the EU in August of 2015 alone. Yet, the fact is that these 710,000 crossings represent only a very small fraction of the annual number of all EU external border crossings by third country nationals (less than one percentage point of around 90 million cases annually).[2] Moreover, Frontex has detected the bulk of irregular migrants (be they asylum- seekers or other illegal migrants) enter the EU using European airports, that is, they enter the EU by legal means.

Actually, it has been this high concentration of asylum seekers in remote EU areas, e.g. in Italian and Greek mini-islands in the Mediterranean Sea, unprepared for such an influx, and their subsequent uncoordinated march through central and eastern EU member states towards the West, that has irritated authorities and captured the attention of the public. Besides, the cruelty of human traffickers and high number of mortal accidents during the passage of those asylum seekers over the sea has been another but not least important issue at stake.

---

1 Frontex's full name is the European Agency for the Management of Operation Cooperation at the External Borders of the Member States of the European Union.
2 Guild, Elspeth, and Sergio Carrera. *EU Borders and Their Controls: Preventing unwanted movement of people in Europe?*, CEPS Essey, no. 6/14, November 2013, p. 5.

The most popular route used by asylum seekers is the *East Mediterranean route* which leads from Turkey to either Greek islands of Lesbos and Kos, or Bulgaria, and further to Hungary and Austria, with Germany being one of the end destinations. On this route, 359,000 EU external border crossings were detected during the first nine months of 2015. This route is preferred by Afghanis and Iraqis, although two thirds detected were Syrians in 2015. Most Syrians have arrived from displaced person camps in Turkey. Turkey has lodged around 2.2 million out of 4 million Syrian refugees since the outbreak of civil war in 2011. With the erection of fences and closure of the Hungarian southern border this year, the flow of asylum seekers has diverted towards Croatia and Slovenia using them as transit states to Austria and Germany.

Another relevant route, the *Central Mediterranean route*, leads straight over the Mediterranean Sea, from Libya to Italy. The toppling of Muammar Qaddafi and the ensuing political chaos has permitted human trafficking networks to thrive. Despite extremely dangerous travel conditions, with many thousands of casualties, more than 129,000 asylum seekers have used this route during the first nine months of 2015. Syrians and Eritreans were the top two nationalities using this route, albeit numerous Africans coming from other Sub-Saharan regions also use this route. Recently there has been a drop in the number of people using this route which is explained by the lack of vessels and worsening weather conditions.

The winter season may deter some asylum seekers from the life-threatening voyage, however, growing violence and prolonged political limbo will make more and more people desperate for safe shelter. Since the beginning of the civil war in Syria in 2011, more than 7 million people have become internally displaced, and another 4 million have fled this 22 million people large state (before the war). The potential of more asylum seekers heading towards Europe is huge. Now it is the unaffordable price for a smuggler's service (according to some accounts €1000-1300 per boat seat) and Turkish authorities that inhibit more people from rolling over the Turkish border towards Europe.

Who are those people who arrive in the EU as asylum seekers? What are their true aims and what is their social background? Are jihadists from the Islamic State hiding among these "immigrants"? These and similar questions torment the European public. Many believe the majority of those people are poor and low-educated, willing to seize the long-awaited opportunity to leave for better life in Europe. Many also believe that, contrary to the US, the EU has failed to develop programmes for attracting the talented people and is forced to accept low quality labour from third countries. However, this perception is problematic from two perspectives. First, people often forget that it is a moral obligation to provide a safe shelter to people in need. The modern system of asylum rights originates in Europe, from post-Second World War displaced person camps in Western Europe, which lodged millions of people seeking refuge from prosecution. Hence, before the true obstacles of departure are established, European states have an obligation to provide safe and decent shelter to resettling people from the south.

Second, it seems that attitudes towards the recent asylum seekers is grounded in the experience of the 1960's and 1970's when vast guest-worker programmes were introduced by many western European governments. Indeed, within the framework of these programmes, hundreds of thousands of low-educated people from rural areas of southern and eastern countries moved to Western Europe to fill the void of cheap labour. Many of those people resettled permanently, and, in the absence of proper integration programmes in place, formed ethnic ghettos without developing closer affiliation with the culture of the receiving country.

However, there are considerable differences between the social profiles of earlier guest-workers and recent asylum seekers. The costs of border-crossing are unaffordable to the majority of displaced persons from the Sub-Saharan region. Those who can pay smugglers are rather affluent people (to African standards) presumably with a good education and moderate religious views. Moreover, as the voyage to Europe is also dangerous, there should be little surprise that displaced families at first choose to send abroad

their strongest members. This explains the prevalence of young males among asylum seekers.

How ready is the European Union to deal with an "unprecedented influx" of migrants?

No doubt, the EU's response has been belated, timid and temporary in nature. With the outbreak of unrest and toppling of dictators in sub-Saharan Africa in 2011, Europe had to prepare for a fresh wave of immigration from this region. However, despite broadly televised images of drenched people landing in hundreds on the Italian island of Lampedusa and the rising scores of drowned people in the Mediterranean Sea (reportedly 3500 in 2013 alone), the habitual "pretend and delay" attitude prevailed over Italy's repeated calls for EU support. As noted by CEPS, the primary focus of the EU's initial response was to prevent migrants reaching Europe at all, hence increased efforts at improvement of management and surveillance of the EU's external borders and strive for closer cooperation with the states of North Africa asking them to act as "substitute border guards" for the EU.[3]

Keeping asylum seekers away from Europe is still the preferred option of the EU. From this perspective, with multimillion Syrian refugee camps on its territory, Turkey has turned out to be a vital partner for the EU. In exchange for cooperation on refugees' issues, the EU has pledged financial assistance to Turkey, and has included Turkey in the list of safe countries of origin.[4] It will boost long yearned for human rights credentials of Turkey's increasingly authoritarian government; yet, it will deliver a backlash to Turkish opposition activists and political rebels at the same time. In addition, the EU has also promised to speed up accession negotiations and visa liberalisation with Turkey. What's more, in order to tackle the root causes of current migratory and refugee flows, and keep

---

3 Guild, Elspeth, and Sergio Carrera. *EU Borders and Their Controls: Preventing unwanted movement of people in Europe?*, CEPS Essay, No. 6/14, November 2013, pp. 2-3.
4 Other countries included in this list along Turkey are Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, the FYROM, Kosovo, Montenegro and Serbia.

people in camps in Syria, Lebanon and Jordan, the EU has set up financial trust funds for Syria (€500 million) and Africa (€1.8 billion). Interestingly, recently there has been a shift not only in relations with Turkey, but also towards softening the stance against Bashar al-Assad, the loathed dictator of Syria.

According to CEPS analysis, the Common European Asylum System, despite recent improvements, still fails on two major accounts. First, member states have shown profound weaknesses in delivering sound and appropriate reception conditions and administrative capacities (apparently EU states have not implemented the common standards enshrined in the EU reception conditions directive of 2006; the European Commission has become bellicose – it has initiated 40 new infringement procedures against 19 member states on top of 34 cases already open[5]). Second, the recently agreed upon intra-EU relocation system covering 160,000 asylum seekers from Italy, Greece and Hungary is intended to provide temporary relief to the huge backlog of unprocessed asylum applications. The fundamental Dublin rule according to which the people applying for asylum in an EU country other than the one they first entered should be returned to that first country is still standing, as the relocation system still "frames the protection of refugees as a border/burden sharing issue rather than a collective EU-wide obligation"[6] and does not properly address either personal or family circumstances of asylum seekers. Under such rules, arbitrary resettlement undertaken by asylum seekers themselves can be expected. Indeed, recent research on people's migration shows social and kinship ties are the strongest motives behind people's decision to migrate. Once underway, they will search for every means to reach their intended final destination. Ignoring refugees' preferences will inevitably lead to conflicts, especially in designated destination countries with strong anti-immigrant sentiment.

---

5 European Commission. *Managing the Refugee Crisis: State of Play of the implementation of the Priority Actions under the European Agenda on Migration,* 15 October 2015.
6 Carrera, Sergio, and Elspeth Guild. *Can the new refugee relocation system work? Perils in the Dublin logic and flawed reception conditions in the EU,* CEPS Policy Brief, no. 332, October 2015, p. 9.

The extent to which the relocation plan can be successfully implemented remains to be tested. On 21 October 2015, only 19 Eritrean asylum seekers, who were flown from Italy to Sweden on 9 October, have been relocated under the relocation plan, and another 100 asylum seekers from Italy have been prepared for relocation. At the same time, the good news is the EU has committed €10 billion funding for the refugee crisis in 2015 and 2016. This includes lump sums to member states of €6000 per each relocated asylum seeker. This money can be spent on integration measures like retraining and language teaching, on more efficient processing of asylum applications, and other purposes.

Are immigrants necessarily a bad thing for the EU in general and Latvia in particular?

No, immigrants are not necessarily a bad thing. On the contrary, Europe needs refugees and economic migrants. Despite high unemployment in some parts of Europe, the old continent in general needs fresh labour reserves. The demographic decline has already started to bite economically. There are studies linking sleazy investment performance in developed economies like Germany with their shrinking populations (under conditions of diminishing labour the capital ratio per labour continues to increase without fresh capital). According to population growth projections, under the scenario of no migration, the population of the EU would shrink by 8 million people between 2015 and 2030. The member states having the most negative dynamic would be Bulgaria (-8 percent), Germany (-6 percent) and Latvia (-6 percent). If migration is taken into account, the projections for central and eastern EU member states are even more worrisome: in the case of Latvia the population could shrink by 17 percent, while Lithuania's by 24 percent.

What's more, studies on the economic impact of migration agree that immigration does provide a positive boost to economic growth (the economic impact of emigration is more controversial and depends on the scale of labour remittances and repatriated hu-

man capital). This impact, though, would not be equally distributed among all groups of recipient society. Those who tend to lose most to newcomers are immigrants from earlier waves. Yet even these losses can be transient if these people become well-adapted to local customs and have to try their luck in other areas of occupancy.

The relocation of 160,000 asylum seekers under the EU scheme shall take place within two years. Every member state is assigned a quota which is calculated based on a country's population, GDP, unemployment and historical record of reception of asylum seekers. The largest quota of 31,000 is assigned to Germany, while Latvia is supposed to accommodate 776 persons. The existing experience suggests that close to 75 percent of applications will be accepted. Syrians (94 percent), Eritreans (89 percent), Afghanis (71 percent) and Iraqis (82 percent) stand to have the greatest chance of confirmative response. At the same time, asylum seekers from the former Yugoslavian countries have the least chance to obtain asylum, in particular because most of these countries have been recently included in the list of safe countries of origin. Judging from the Finnish experience, several hundred immigrants today will result in several thousand in a dozen years. Family reunification and higher fertility rates will help immigrant communities to grow.

Beyond the relocation lies the biggest task of all is about integration. How easily member states will absorb refugees depends on how the absorption is done. The least efficient and most costly approach would be to house immigrants in isolated refugee centres. Instead, giving immigrants the chance to work would reduce the public costs and help them to learn the local language much faster.

The rise of populist anti-immigration sentiment across Europe has made the reception of asylum seekers difficult. However, interestingly, according to the Eurobarometer public opinion poll, immigration is considered the third most pressing issue at a European level, next to crime and the economic situation. At the same time, European people do not consider immigration to be among top problematic issues neither at national or their personal level. In fact, EU countries whose societies feel most stressed about immigration

are Malta (76 percent), the United Kingdom (35 percent), Denmark (35 percent) and Germany (46 percent). Among the Baltic States, the most concerned about immigration are Estonians (24 percent) with Lithuanians (13 percent) and Latvians (10 percent) following.

The people's security concerns are legitimate. It is natural for people to be afraid of strangers. Latvia, like other Baltic and central European member states of the EU, have had little contact with Arabic people in general and the Islamic religion in particular. These countries have had no colonial experience, and, as such, cannot exhibit any camaraderie with people from post-colonial states in Africa and Middle East. What's more, these countries have been subjected to foreign rule for most of their existence, hence a more eager defence of their imagined nationalistic particularities. Latvians still have fresh in their memory the deportations of the 1940s and Russification of the 1970s and 1980s; however, like in other post-Soviet societies, prolonged life under a closed and totalitarian regime presents the greatest challenge to a warm reception of immigrants today. Call it post-Soviet syndrome.

So, some patience will be required. On the other hand, the refugee debate is a good measure of acceptance and care of other people in general, be they strangers or locals. Latvia's example is telling. It is a widespread concern here that refugees would receive social allowances many times exceeding benefits entitled to local people (e.g. a refugee child will get €76 per month, while the monthly allowance for local kids is only €8)[7]. Yet, no one has questioned how it is possible that local people in need are entitled to such degradingly low levels of governmental support. The refugee debate will provide a right occasion to raise this issue. Good for all Latvians.

───────

7 This is the effect of the EU's directive on reception conditions.

Should Baltic Countries Fence Their Borders Europe's Refugee Crisis and Security Threats from the Baltic Perspective

Viljar Veebel

Introduction

After regaining their independence from the Soviet Union in 1991, the three Baltic countries have closely linked security of the region with a full integration with European and Transatlantic security networks, including political and economic integration with the European Union (EU) and military partnership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). Baltic countries have considered membership in both organizations and solidarity among the member states as the main guarantee against possible threats from Russia. Indeed, almost all considerable security threats have been associated with their eastern neighbour. For almost 25 years, international co-operation and integration have provided these countries with efficient "shelter" from the pressure Russia has come to impose on the independent states of the former Soviet Union.

However, in the light of the current refugee crisis and the opposition of Baltic countries to the compulsory EU-migrant quotas, this concept of security has been called into question. Although Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania together with the Visegrád-countries have fulfilled their obligations set out in the Treaties of the European Union, the eastern European countries have been criticized particularly by Germany and France for not understanding the meaning and working of European solidarity when not being ready to share the burden of the growing influx of refugees into Europe. As a possible penalty, reduction of EU subsidies to member states that oppose EU-migrant quotas has been suggested by the German

interior minister, Thomas de Maizière.[1] In addition, financial penalties on member states unwilling to resettle refugees who arrived initially in Italy and Greece, are being considered.

Paradoxically, statements of EU-politicians have been "amplified" by the local political elite in Baltic countries, particularly in Latvia and Estonia. On the one hand, local politicians have warned the public that Baltic countries could end up in international isolation if people do not support refugee quotas. On the other hand, at least in Estonia, the leading part of the local political class has associated people's willingness to accept refugees with the country's responsibilities towards NATO partners, using a very broad argument of "if you want to be protected by the allies, you have to accept refugees". Thus, the refugee crisis has been presented locally as a securitization, meaning that opposition to compulsory migrant quotas has been described as an existential threat because it could lead to isolation of Baltic countries from the international community, to the loss of the NATO security network and thereby to the countries' exposure to the security threats from Russia. Following the logic of the securitization theory,[2] the migration quotas are justified and should be considered as a priority, since extraordinary countermeasures should be used to handle existential threats.

However, as the author sees it, from the perspective of the Baltic countries the "existential threat" associated with the current refugee crisis lies elsewhere. On the one hand, this conviction is based on recent statements by principal figures of NATO, e.g. Sir Adrian Bradshaw that a different approach of the allies as regards the refugee crisis does not reduce the contributions of NATO allies in collective security measures.[3] On the other hand, since Visegrad countries – Poland, the Czech Republic, Hungary and Slovakia –

---

1 The Economist, Europe starts putting up walls. Published on September 19, 2015, available: http://www.economist.com/news/europe/21665032-germany-and-other-countries-reimpose-border-controls-europe-starts-putting-up-walls
2 See, e.g. Šulovic, V. *Meaning of Security and Theory of Securitization*. Belgrade Centre for Security Policy. 5 October 2010, available: http://www.bezbednost.org/upload/document/sulovic_%282010%29_meaning_of_secu.pdf; van Munster, R. (2009). *Securitizing Immigration*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.

3 Postimees. *NATO: erimeelsused rändekriisi osas ei mõjuta kollektiivkaitset* (in Estonian). 20 September 2015, http://maailm.postimees.ee/3334497/nato-erimeelsused-randekriisi-osas-ei-mojuta-kollektiivkaitset

have opposed the mandatory migrant quotas in an even rougher manner than the Baltic countries by clearly and unanimously stating that "any proposal leading to the introduction of mandatory and permanent quota for solidarity measures would be unacceptable",[4] the Baltic countries do not represent the "extreme" case and should not expect to be treated in terms of an "international pariah". As the author of the current article sees it, in real terms the security threat associated with the current refugee crisis is linked both to the loss of credibility of the EU in the international arena and to the loss of credibility of governmental structures in Baltic countries at a local level in the eyes of their citizens.

How unexpected and complicated is the current refugee situation for Europe and for the Baltic States?

The first signs of the emerging migrant crisis in Europe could already be seen in 2013 and 2014 when the number of first time asylum applications to EU countries increased substantially compared to previous years). However, during the first eight months of 2015, the number of asylum applicants has increased drastically – whereas in 2008 close to 150,000 first-time asylum applications had been received annually, within a single month of June 2015 close to 90,000 first-time asylum applications have been handed in). On the basis of the partial data from Eurostat, the number of applications of a similar category received during the first eight months of 2015 in EU member states has exceeded 530,000 persons.[5] For more than 70 years European countries haven't seen such a drastic number of refugees seeking asylum.

About one half of the asylum seekers come from Syria, Iraq, Afghanistan and Albania), and the main destinations of the asylum seekers were Germany and Sweden). Next to Germany and Sweden, the burden has been extremely high for Hungary, Greece, Italy,

4 EurActive. *Visegrad summit rejects migrant quotas*. 7 September 2015, http://www.euractiv.com/sections/justice-home-affairs/visegrad-summit-rejects-migrant-quotas-317388
5 In real terms, the number of first-time asylum applicants is likely to be higher for the eight months of 2015, since the most recent data from July and August include statistics for only seven countries (Belgium, Germany, Lithuania, Hungary, Poland, Slovenia and Sweden).

Austria, Croatia and Finland, who had to face massive inflows of refugees wishing to go to Germany and Sweden. To get the situation under control, Hungary has closed its main border with Serbia, and Germany has introduced temporary border controls on the southern border with Austria, followed by temporary border controls introduced by Austria, Slovakia and the Netherlands. Next to the border control, Hungary has used even more severe measures by classifying unauthorized entry into the country as a criminal offence. Finland has also started border checks on its northern border with Sweden. The current migrant situation in Europe is quite obviously on the verge of getting out of control.

Migrant pressure on Baltic countries has been relatively modest compared to their Nordic neighbors, Germany, Hungary or Austria. However, considering the semi-annual data on first-time asylum applicants, the number of applications has been constantly increasing in Estonia from 54 in the first half of 2014 to 115 applicants in the first half of 2015). The pressure has somewhat weakened in Latvia and Lithuania in the first half of 2015 compared to the second half of 2014. According to the country of origin, Ukrainians, Syrians and Sudanese have dominated among the first-time asylum applicants in Estonia from January 2014 to June 2015, whereas Georgians, Ukrainians and Vietnamese were dominant in Latvia, and Georgians, Ukrainians and Afghans were dominant in Lithuania during the above-mentioned period (author's calculations based on Eurostat 2015[6]).

To conclude: as can be seen from the actual data, when the problems in Southern Europe and Germany are fast becoming complicating, the actual impact of refugee flows and their proportion to the population in the Baltic States are far from being drastic or posing a dramatic security threat. Thus, actual problems tend rather to be dependent on poor strategic communication of the national governments in this matter and insufficient preparedness to receive and integrate arriving refugees.

---

6 Eurostat. *Data category: Population and social conditions – Asylum and managed migration*, 2015, http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/data/database

Can the Baltic States maintain their good reputation in the eyes of voters and international actors during the refugee crisis?

Europe's refugee crisis has revealed numerous challenges to European integration that could lead to some loss of credibility of the EU in the international arena and pose, thereby, a threat to the Baltic States having linked the security of the region with a full integration to European and Transatlantic security networks. As the author sees it, at the EU level the risks could stem from the following sources.

First, the growing influx of refugees into the EU refers to the fact the EU has lost control over its external borders. This poses a direct security threat to the region. After the establishment of the Schengen area without internal border controls in 1995, it was expected that member countries develop a common policy on external border management.[7] However, as the current crisis has revealed, some countries like Greece or Croatia, intentionally or unintentionally, do not comply with this obligation. This has led to a situation where other EU member states are facing serious difficulties too. A large number of unregistered refugees are passing through the EU with the purpose of arriving at countries which attract refugees with the fact of having better financial and social conditions. Paradoxically, the current situation is to some extent similar to circumstances in 2011 when Italy granted visas in the Schengen framework to tens of thousands of migrants from North Africa, including Tunisians who wanted to join their families in France, and allowed them to travel across the Schengen area.[8] Now, five years later the Schengen countries are facing the same problem but on a much larger scale. Accordingly, what the EU needs is not only solidarity but also responsibility for trustworthy borders and trust among each other.

Secondly, and rather indirectly, concerns are rising with regard to the growing fragmentation of member states' national interests in terms of refugees and the tendency to protect their own interests.

---

7 See, *Fact Sheets on the European Union. Management of the external borders.* European Parliament, 2015,
http://www.europarl.europa.eu/atyourservice/en/displayFtu.html?ftuId=FTU_5.12.4.html
8 BBC News. France and Italy push for reform of Schengen treaty. 26 April 2011,
http://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-13189682

Whether justifiably or not, this often causes additional costs to other member states. Tensions among the member states of the EU are particularly high due to the refugee crisis and they have often accused each other of not following the initial commitments. To bring a recent example, the Hungarian government has accused Croatia for "violating Hungary's sovereignty" and, putting a rhetorical pressure, has asked about the kind of solidarity that allows Croatia to send asylum seekers directly to Hungary instead of honestly making provision for them.[9] However, in a wider perspective, decrease in the solidarity of EU member states poses a serious security threat both to the region and to the Baltic countries, since it sends a signal to Russia that the EU is not as unified as it pretends to be.

Thirdly, the refugee crisis has also revealed the vulnerability of the EU in economic terms, which also impacts its security capabilities. More precisely, EU countries have to dedicate significant financial resources to the administration costs of processing asylum applications and offering social guarantees and integration services to a remarkable numbers of refugees. The costs related to the EU-quota migrants from Italy and Greece will be partially covered from the EU budget. However, next to the common budget, the majority of costs are expected to be covered from member states' own resources. Whereas the "rich" and more advanced EU countries can afford it as a big proportion of the costs are not country-specific, the "less prosperous" member states like the Baltic ones find themselves discussing with justified skepticism of how to cover the relevant costs from their own limited resources, simultaneously facing worsening demographics and the needs of the local population. Higher spending for the increasing number of asylum applicants automatically means it has to be taken from elsewhere in the countries' own and severely restricted budgets. If the resources are redirected from those ordinary local services to services for refugees, it could create frustration at the national level. This is imaginable especially to-

---

9 Reuters. *Hungary accuses "lying" Croatia of sovereignty violation.* 19 September 2015, http://www.reuters.com/article/2015/09/19/us-europe-migrants-hungary-sovereignty-idUSKCN0RJ0KD20150919

wards the major political figures of the EU who in their speeches stress the need to support refugees, but in real terms do rather relatively little for finding a sustainable and broadly accepted solution to the problem and to control immigration flows into the EU. As the author sees it, in that regard the European Union together with national governments are risking the loss of credibility in the eyes of their own citizens. Particularly, since another intra-EU redistribution of refugees suggested by the European Commission does not represent a sustainable, reasoned and efficient solution to the refugee crisis.

Fourthly, the asylum seekers accepted by peripheral states would presumably wish to leave for the more prosperous western member states (like Sweden and Germany) and thus cause the infrastructure be relatively over-sized. What is more, and perhaps controversially, the costs for accommodating and integrating asylum seekers in countries which they will emigrate on the first occasion, arising for the absence of well-paid jobs or sufficient social benefits, tends not only to see costs wasted but also to benefit old member states by adding to their labor ranks. Thus, the economic inequality between old and new member states will not merely be stressed but made wider once again. This tendency is bound to make the Union weaker, in spirit and in tangible terms.

In the long run the current refugee policy will also impact social and economic conditions in the countries of origin. If some EU countries encourage asylum seekers to come to the EU, they basically pull out the productive labor force from the home countries of asylum seekers. To illustrate the situation, Germany, France and Sweden have welcomed refugees from Albania since 2012. This has encouraged Albanians to leave the country mostly for economic reasons due to the overall instability, but not because of direct military conflicts in the region. Although emotionally there is perhaps no big difference whether people are dying of hunger or from a bullet. During the first eight months of 2015, more than 42,000 Albanians applied for a first time for the asylum in the EU, which makes about 1.5 percent of the total population of the country. More than 60 percent of asylum seekers were males, two thirds of them were aged 18

to 64 years old. Thus, the most productive part of the labor force has left the country which, in turn, leaves fewer opportunities for recovery and improving lives for those people who have stayed in Albania. In this context, part of the responsibility for the consequences of the growing immigration into the EU should be taken by the EU itself, and the Union should now imply measures to diminish any possible financial and security risks. In this sense the lack of long-term visions could cause the loss of credibility in the international arena in the same way the lack of direct financial resources does.

To sum up, activities that harm the uniformity of the EU should be avoided and any actions that reduce tensions between EU member states should be supported. This is vital for the EU to regain its self-confidence in the international arena and to guarantee that existing commitments among EU member states are respected. As the author sees it, in the context of the current refugee crisis in the EU, the call of the European Commission President Jean-Claude Juncker to impose mandatory migrant quotas, and the most recent decision based on the qualified majority to impose quotas despite the resistance of some EU member states, while effective in the short run, could be rather counter-productive in a longer term since the countries that have opposed the quotas are still forced to implement the majority decision without essentially supporting it. Additionally, linking existing commitments like the Schengen treaty or subsidies of structural funds with the readiness to accept new obligations is lowering international and intra-union trust towards EU institutions and treaties.

In a long term perspective this makes them question whether European integration in its current shape could cause more harm than good. Since the EU migrant relocation program is, in principle, based on the "push" factor (i.e. refugees are "forced" to resettle to countries they are not interested in), the measure *per se* constitutes another security risk to those countries that agreed to allocate migrants, since neither migrants nor permanent residents of the country are interested in integration. Moreover, despite the statements that EU mandatory refugee quotas are needed to stop "asylum

shopping" (for example by the Dutch Prime Minister Mark Rutte), it is difficult to see any logic in migrant quotas. On the one hand, the "voluntary" national migrant quotas apply to the relocation of refugees who have reached Greece and Italy; however, it does not include the main destination countries of the asylum seekers such as Germany and Sweden. Thus, the asylum seekers are still motivated to come to Germany and Sweden to apply for better financial and social conditions. On the other hand, no reliable mechanism exists that actually guarantees migrants will stay in the countries to which they were relocated.

The risk to lose credibility in the eyes of citizens

Next to the risk of EU institutions of losing their credibility, the loss of credibility of governmental structures could also pose additional threats to national security in EU countries, including Baltic ones. This is particularly relevant in the light of the current migration crisis in the EU, which has, at least in Estonia, clearly revealed the dissatisfaction of the majority of the population with decisions the government has made as regards relocation of refugees to Estonia. According to the most recent survey from September 2015, only 7 percent of the Estonian population trusts the Prime Minister, Taavi Rõivas, as regards issues related to the refugee crisis, and only 27 percent of the Estonian population considers the government credible on these matters.[10] According to another survey from May 2015 that assessed the work of the government,[11] support for the Estonian government and Prime Minister was the lowest among people living in the eastern part of Estonia, in the Ida-Viru County, where a large Russian community in Estonia is located. During turbulent times acceptance of not-so "voluntary" EU-migration quotas could constitute a trigger that could lead to a serious security crisis in the country.

10 Pealinn. *Uuring: Peaministrit usaldab vaid seitse protsenti rahvast* (in Estonian). 24 September 2015, http://www.pealinn.ee/uudised/uuring-peaministrit-usaldab-vaid-seitse-protsenti-rahvast-n153192
11 Turu-uuringute AS/Market research in Baltics (2015). *Eesti elanikud annavad peaminister Rõivase tööle hinde 2+* (in Estonian). 19 May 2015, http://www.turu-uuringute.eu/eesti-elanikud-annavad-peaminister-roivase-toole-hinde-2/

Paradoxically, in Estonia security threats are mainly pegged to the failure of the government's communication strategy, rather than previous negative experiences with refugees. In other words, one could argue that people are afraid of the government's actions rather than refugees. Due to the lack of communication, the people of Estonia – the voters – have already started to show some doubts about the long-term sustainability of the process. In the long term, it cannot be excluded that the people's dissatisfaction with management of the current migration crisis at a national level could, at a certain point, be transferred to reluctance among citizens against government policies in general. This poses a clear security risk.

To avoid the loss of credibility at a national level, it would be justified to follow the legitimate logic of the process. The immigration of third-country nationals has, until now, clearly been within the competence of the EU member states and not of the EU itself. However, the refugee crisis in the EU has suddenly been defined by EU-politicians as a matter of common interest and common concern. EU migration quotas present a major step in transferring the respective competence to the EU in this area. However, as the author sees it, since people have not directly given national governments a mandate to agree with the relocation of refugees from other EU countries, national governments should not delegate the "non-existent" mandate to the European Commission.

Conclusions

Recent developments starting with the Russia-Ukraine conflict and ending with the economic and political instability in Greece have given rise to instability in Europe. Yet, none of the previous "crises" could be compared with the crisis concerning the current massive influx of refugees into the EU that challenges both the solidarity and responsibility of member states. In this context, it is extremely important to understand the actual security threats related to the refugee crisis, particularly for Baltic countries that have linked their security with the European Union and the NATO. Particularly in

Estonia and Latvia, the refugee crisis has been presented as a securitization, meaning that opposition to the EU-migrant quotas has been described as an existential threat to the country, since it could lead to the country's isolation from the international community, the loss of the NATO security network and its exposure to the security threats from Russia.

The current refugee crisis has clearly revealed the EU has no control over its external border and that some EU member states are unable to comply with their obligations or tend to protect their own interests, whether justifiably or not. The most striking examples of this are fences built by some EU member states on their borders to stop migration flows. Since no long-term vision exists at an EU level on how to cope with the migrant crisis, it would be fully justified to ask whether the Baltic countries should also start building fences on their border to avoid security threats. However, as the author of the current article sees it, in real terms the "existential security threat" should not be associated with the acceptance or non-acceptance of EU-migration quotas, but with the overall loss of credibility for the EU in the international arena and with the loss of credibility of the governmental structures at local levels.

In practice, as the author sees it, the dangers that arise from the loss of credibility of the EU and local governments cannot be combated with EU-migration quotas and building fences. To restore confidence in the EU, any activities that harm the uniformity of the EU should be avoided and any actions that reduce tensions between EU member states should be supported. In this light, the most recent decision based on the qualified majority to impose refugee quotas despite the resistance of some EU member states could be rather counter-productive, since this makes them question whether European integration in its current form could do more harm than good. In addition, it difficult to see any logic of how the migration quotas should stop "asylum shopping" since the relocation of migrants does not include the main destination countries of the asylum seekers, such as Germany and Sweden, and asylum seekers are still motivated to come to Germany and Sweden to enjoy better financial and

social conditions. To restore confidence at a national level, it would be justified to follow the legitimate logic of processes. As the author sees it, since people have not directly given national governments the mandate to agree with the relocation of refugees from other EU countries, the national governments should not delegate the "non-existent" mandate to the European Commission.

APPROACHING NEIGHBOURHOOD DILEMMAS

A Cheer for the Capitals! Member States are an Asset, not an Impediment for EU Eastern Policies

Kai-Olaf Lang

Member states are often blamed for the shortcomings and failures of EU eastern policies. They are seen as egotistic spoilers, complicating the emergence of a cohesive policy toward Russia and they are accused of productive cooperation with countries in the EU's direct neighborhood. On the other hand, it is the "EU proper", its policies, instruments and institutions, especially the Commission, the High Representative with the still young European External Action Service and, to a lesser degree due to limited competencies in foreign affairs, the European Parliament, which are considered the representatives and executors of propulsive policies vis-à-vis Russia and countries in the eastern part of the continent. No doubt, particularistic national interests, special relations with Russia and indifference towards the eastern neighborhoods have been real impediments for progress in EU's neighborhoods policies. Conflicts among member states have been neutralising EU efforts to project stability. The old East vs. South cleavage has not led to a creative competition between proponents of boosting cooperation with the broader Mediterranean neighborhoods of the EU and the "eastern caucus". It has rather, evoked a situation where both groups have enviously tried to secure sufficient attention for their respective priority area of interest and to avert other regions from getting too much political attention. The EU's dimensionalism in its neighborhoods has not brought about mutually reinforcing efforts for adjacent regions, but it turned out to be an additional aspect of intra-Union compromising with little or no positive effects for neighborhood policies. Finally, member states have been problematic, since domestic political factors have frequently pushed national governments to take reluctant positions in designing offers and incentives for eastern

partners. Visa liberalization is certainly the most prominent, but not the only example, where domestic reluctance in member states has translated into EU deceleration. All in all, member states seem to be the root cause for the EU's diluted, lukewarm and fragmented action in the regions beyond its eastern flank. And, internal diversity caused by divergent national priorities appears to be the main reason, why there is not one single and well-tuned eastern policy of the EU, but rather different eastern policies.

Despite this long list of problems and limitations to an effective eastern policy, obviously co-generated by member state particularism, a closer look at what member states and the EU have done in their relations with Russia and Eastern Partnership countries, reveals that the pictures is more nuanced.

What have been roles of member states in EU cooperation with eastern partners and which functions have member states assumed? There are at least six basic functions, member states have fulfilled in EU eastern policies. First, they have launched concepts and ideas, how to shape and structure relations with eastern partners. There is a broad variety of programs and guidelines member states have launched - mirroring their specific strategic and political circumstances. They range from rather Russia-sceptical approaches aiming at the containment and hedging of alleged neo-imperial tendencies to "pragmatic" concepts, centring their efforts on boosting cooperation with Russia and marginalizing the relevance of other states in the "post-Soviet area". The two best-known and most recent examples for more palpable strategies and concepts initially developed by member states are the Partnership for Modernization (PfM) between the EU and Russia and the Eastern Partnership (EaP). The former had been originally shaped by Germany as a bilateral initiative with Russia, the latter was modelled by Poland and Sweden (especially after Poland had tried to develop a sort of eastern dimension of the EU). In both cases, member states were able to "upload" their ideas to the European level, i.e. to convince other members to accept their projects and related policy goals as European affairs.

A second function of member states is their ability to pro-

vide political processes with dynamics and the necessary backing. EU eastern policies, particularly the eastern part of the European Neighborhood Policy (ENP) have often lacked appropriate political buttressing. Therefore, there has been much debate and also some activity in order to create support groups for particular partner countries (e.g. friends of Ukraine, friends of Moldova) or to set up joint initiatives by various member states (common non-papers, declarations, conceptual proposals). "EU-only" action has usually lacked sustainability and clout. Even though programs like the ENP or EaP, and more practically the association process and free trade agreements are offered, managed, negotiated and carried out by or together with the EU, member states are important background factors, being present in EU relations with neighboring countries during various stages of talks and in different sectors. This also means they have a considerable say in defining offers and incentives. Member states for example have to agree on the scope of the long-term offer for direct neighbors, i.e. if there is a membership prospect or not. They also have a crucial role in most policy areas, which are part of bilateral cooperation with third countries. Association agreements, for instance, are so-called mixed agreements, i.e. contractual arrangements, which comprise matters that are at least partially subject to national competencies. This means that without consent by all member states, an agreement cannot be ratified. Also in other important policy areas like energy or justice and home affairs, member states are directly or indirectly involved. In this sense member states are the indispensable engines, but also possible veto-players of the EU's eastern policies.

Thirdly, as mentioned above, member states have an important role in the politics of eastern policies. Difference and internal gaps are often called main obstacles for a more powerful EU in external relations. Whereas internal squabbles and conflicting interests among member states have indeed been a hallmark of eastern policies, it has rather not been Brussels and its representatives, who have been a clearing-house for overcoming such kind of friction. With the important exception of energy policy, where the EU, and

particularly the European Commission, has achieved considerable success in overcoming national particularisms (e.g. by pushing through energy market regulations with effects for third-party engagement in the EU), it has rather been a process among member states or a process lead by one or some member states to find a sort of consensus in eastern policies. Germany has played a particular role in various moments, as it was able to reconcile more Moscow-leaning attitudes with rather pro-Ukrainian or pro-EaP views. Berlin was also instrumental in balancing southern and eastern "caucuses" in the EU's neighborhood policies. Both situations were relevant in the context of the German EU council presidency in the first half of 2007, when Berlin brokered between the different sides in order to launch an enhanced ENP and a comprehensive Eastern policy agenda (which were to consist of more substantial EU-Russia relations, an ENP plus for eastern partners, a new central Asia strategy and additional efforts for Black Sea regional cooperation). After periods of stronger unilateralism (e.g. during the Iraq-crisis and privileged cooperation with France and Russia) Germany has also tried to better involve smaller and medium-sized partners in its eastern policy activities - however, not endangering its close economic ties with Russia. So, especially after 2007 (when pragmatic governments with a cooperative posture toward Germany ruled in Warsaw) an intensive German-Polish dialogue on Russia and Ukraine/EaP was established. The Russia-Ukraine-crisis since 2013/2014 has shown the ambivalent role member states, and particularly a "central power" like Germany plays: Critical member states have guaranteed the EU was able to follow a common course. Germany was the main engine to define a consistent sanctions policy targeted at Russia to support Ukraine, but it also kept the door open for talks to Moscow. Thus, in the Russia-Ukraine crisis, Germany delivered the glue, which, for the time being has held the EU together.

Fourthly, in a more practical way, member states can and do provide important contributions in implementing EU cooperation with eastern partners. Once bilateral treaties (like Association Agreements) are signed or new partnership initiatives are

launched, they have to be put into effect. Again it is the Commission (or to some extent the External Action Service), which has to do the practical work, like writing progress reports, assisting or monitoring the implementation of mutually agreed objectives and projects. But also in this context, there are substantial limitations. The EU often lacks resources to reinforce reform or to simply be present in all the "sites of reform", ranging from the central government over sectorial branches of public administration and the regional and self-government levels in partner countries. This is way the EU (certainly as a lesson from the enlargement policies) has created channels of inclusion for member state activities. One well-known example is TWINNING, a support scheme, which enables the use of practitioners from EU countries for reform processes in partner countries. Member states, which want to contribute have to set up internal mechanisms for generating a pool of interested experts. Then they can apply for pertinent projects.

Fifthly, member states are key in security and foreign policy. "Hard security", crisis management and classic diplomacy have never been strong sides of the anyway feeble EU foreign and security policy. Not only since the Russia-Ukraine crisis in 2013/2014 have security and conflict management played an important role in Eastern Europe and the Southern Caucasus. But the events since early 2014 have clearly demonstrated that in a conflict, which includes the use of force and hard power, the post-modern instruments of the EU have only secondary influence and it is traditional negotiations and "statist" politics that are a precondition for containing or deescalating the conflict. It is certainly worthwhile to debate the pros and cons of pursuing dialogue with Russia in the "Normandy four format" (Germany, France, Russia, Ukraine). It is true that having the "quartet" as the main site for talks of the West with Russia, gives EU heavyweights a privileged position. It poses also the risk that with a more "individualist" and less European Germany in some point of the future a return to a new "concert of Europe" and great power politics will be more likely. However, the Normandy approach has given the EU some efficiency, since European heavy-

weights have used their political power and the relevance of their relations with Russia.

This also opens up the question of bilateral relations of EU members with Russia, but also with other eastern partners. Looking back to the crisis and rainy-weather-periods in EU-Russia relations during the last two decades, it is legitimate to criticize some member states for their supple and indulgent positions toward Russia. There is no doubt that business interests, economic ties and energy cooperation, but also historic bonds have nudged member states toward a pragmatic and "elastic" dealing with Moscow. On the other hand, these bonds have sometimes been instrumental in different situation. When at the end of 2004, what was later called the Orange Revolution was at the brink of turning into a cruel conflict in Kiev, it was obviously two elements which calmed down the events. On the one hand, the then Polish and Lithuanian presidents held talks in Kiev with both sides of the conflict. At the same time the German chancellor tried to temper the mood of the Russian leadership. Without speculating too much, it is possible to say that this efforts had some success since there was no bloody scenario in Kiev at that time. In a certain way there was a sort of complementarity between Germany's special relationship with Russia and Polish (and Lithuanian) expertise on Ukraine. Looking at EU-relations with Russia more generally, apart from the justified criticism of "flexible bilateralism" of member states as an obstacle for EU unity, another question has also to be asked: Where would relations stand without these strong bilateral relations? In other words: For the EU the main problem is not that member states have strong and even cooperative relations with Russia. The main problem is that there is no experience and indifference with Russia at all or that these relations are not transparent and that there is no readiness to discuss bilateral relations as part of a broader political and European framework.

The bottom line of this all is that EU eastern policies do not suffer due to exaggerated member state activities, which side line the force of Brussels institutions. In other words: It is not too much, but too little member states' engagement that has prevented the EU from

more proactive and effective policies. This does not mean to advocate eastern policies bypassing the EU or a "coalitionesque" approach, which would delegate relations with Russia and with other eastern partners to groups of those who have a special interest in this part of the world. What is necessary is rather a sort of "embedded mini-lateralism", where member states would bilaterally or via groupings advance policies, which have been agreed and pre-consulted in the framework of 27, include key EU institutions. In the past, observers from inside and outside the EU could have the impression that EU relations with major third countries in general and with Russia in particular are rather the result of mistrustful rivalry or friendly co-existence between "Brussels" and the member states. Therefore, the EU and member states should try to alter this constellation toward a proactive and complementary cooperation. Brussels actors and the member states should be aware that they are both integrated elements of a *sui generis* two-level foreign policy system. Each level has particular capabilities and deficits. The EU has the expertise how to organize and catalyse comprehensive and systematic change or even transformation of economies, administrations and even societies. And it has the promise of granting support, solidarity and access to its markets. Member states have a strategic outlook, personal and political channels to partners, civil society networks and a variety of hard and soft tools of cooperation. In this context, the EU sanctions policy in the wake of the Russia-Ukraine-policy is an instructive example. It is a policy which is implemented as a common action, agreed by all member states and part of the EU foreign and security policy framework. The sanctions policy, which is a core demand of those calling for a "tough" stance toward Russia, has contributed to creating the acceptance for simultaneously talking to Moscow, including the Normandy format. The picture which has come out of this is not one of a desperately split EU, but of a differentiated organization able to define and implement a common position. *Divided, we stand!* Is the signal the EU and its member states have sent in the most recent chapter of its eastern policies. This message gives a hint how the EU can take advantage of its diversity.

Learning from Crisis: The Challenge for the Euro-Atlantic States

Maxine David

Events since 2014 and continuing until today leave few in doubt that Russia has set itself on a collision course with the West. So far, broadly speaking, the Euro-Atlantic states have agreed on the threat presented by Russia and that its actions in Crimea and eastern Ukraine cannot go unremarked and unpunished. Such agreement is all too rare in Euro-Atlantic relations; the European states more commonly divided by an affinity with or skepticism of the United States of America (USA). Russia's increased and more transparent actions in Syria, however, threaten to tear this fragile concord apart. Obama's policy in Syria received the most criticism at home, where the GOP in particular is focused almost exclusively on shows of strength, regardless of whether such shows represent good policy that can achieve a better outcome for Syrian people and the region more widely. As long as Obama's refusal to engage in a proxy war with Russia in Syria holds, so too will the concord; events in Syria may, however, yet push the USA off this course. An additional strain on this rare agreement is that while the USA remains focused on Russia, European states' attention is more divided. Many are preoccupied with the refugee crisis, the consequences of a failure to respond to it in a unified manner, and how to cope with increasingly divided public opinion at home.[1]

Whether in relation to Ukraine or Syria, Russia is watching the Euro-Atlantic states through its rear view mirror, relentlessly pushing forward, leaving others to deal with the consequences of its actions. The West, in turn, will experience what is likely to become an all-too familiar feeling of impotence - as long as it allows Russia to set the foreign policy agenda and push it into hasty, ill-considered responses. Instead,

---

1 See, for instance, reports of the turn in Germany where Merkel is facing more criticism over her open doors policy, http://www.dw.com/en/new-facet-of-violence-in-germany/a-18791153

Euro-Atlantic states must, despite the severity and multiplicity of the challenges they face, find the time to take stock and consider the learning opportunities presented. This article focuses on precisely this task.

Assessing risk in a changing world

Ukraine's conflict has naturally captured a good number of headlines since its outbreak in early 2014. Despite Ukraine's size and its location on the borders of the EU and Russia, and despite even the annexation of part of its sovereign territory by Russia, one could not help but notice that in the early stages not everyone considered events in Ukraine to be their affair. Interest became more sustained however after the downing of Malaysian Airlines flight MH17 in July 2014 in which 298 crew and passengers, citizens of ten countries, lost their lives. As the state with by far the largest number of victims, the Netherlands took responsibility for conducting an independent international aviation investigation that was authorised by the United Nations Security Council just four days after the crash.

In October 2015, the Dutch Safety Board published its report into flight MH17. While the report is essentially about whether and how the civil aviation sector can do better in terms of risk assessment and safety measures, it is analogous to the wider state of affairs in international relations and therefore warrants attention in the context of this article. It should probably be noted that of the seven states involved in the investigation,[2] Russia quickly dissented from some of its conclusions, especially in relation to the nature of the missile used. A detailed reading of the report however, suggests no reason to doubt the thoroughness, transparency and independence of the investigation. This section will therefore consider the approach adopted by the Dutch, with a view to arguing that same approach offers a way out from the "what aboutism" that Russia (and many western states) have so far engaged in when discussing Ukraine's conflict. This first report[3] offered little new in terms

2 Australia, Malaysia, the Netherlands, Russia, Ukraine, UK, USA all participated in the investigation, while other states who lost nationals in the crash were given the opportunity to view the wreckage recovered.
3 A later report on the criminal investigation will follow.

of our understanding of who ultimately bears responsibility for the loss of 298 innocent lives. Rather, it focused on identifying who might be considered to have some form of responsibility and, crucially, on what each of the actors involved might have done differently. Thus, it began from the premise that all actors involved may bear some responsibility and that a vital first step must be to consider all possibilities - and therefore remedies. This emphasis on solution versus blame is instructive in relation to lessons to be learned and, while written in respect of civil aviation, offers more widely applicable counsel.

The Dutch began by identifying a gap between the nature of the world and the policies in play in respect of it, arguing also that policy is currently predicated on the basis of what has happened rather than on what might happen. Thus, the report argues: "Risk assessments should not only focus on phenomena that have threatened civil aviation in the past but also devote attention to new and thus unfamiliar threats in a changing world. The challenge is to stimulate the imagination of the parties concerned in such a way that improbable scenarios are also at the forefront of their minds and receive sufficient attention."[4]

The need to theorise about change, to anticipate its effects and consider alternative courses of action extends to some of the basic underpinning principles of the international system, especially to how we conceive sovereignty. Underlying the Dutch report is a factual view that the world is interconnected and that parcelling territory into discrete entities, each one the responsibility of the state which is recognised as the sovereign authority over it, does not reflect the effects of those connections, nor the overlapping responsibilities that result. Revision of the modern state system in the short to mid-term is an unlikely prospect, of course; however the report also offers a narrower, more concrete avenue for reform which, again, is applicable not only for civil aviation authorities but for the "international community" more widely.

---

4 Dutch Safety Board, *Crash of Malaysia Airlines flight MH17. Hrabove, Ukraine, 17 July 2014,* October 2015, http://cdn. onderzoeksraad.nl/documents/report-mh17-crash-en.pdf, p. 8.

In its early pages, the report speaks of the changing nature of conflict, of the increased occurrence of intra-state conflict and the need to build policy that reflects those changes. In the case of the downing of MH17, the nature of the conflict results in a lack of clarity over who has responsibility for what occurred in Ukrainian airspace; if the missile was launched from an area under separatist control, as evidence suggests, Kiev cannot be deemed responsible. At the same time, the government could have prevented flight over part or all of its territory, even that under separatist control. In a masterful understatement in relation to risk, the report said: "The reality is that states involved in an armed conflict rarely close their airspace. This means that the principle of sovereignty related to airspace management can give rise to vulnerability".[5] Further, state sovereignty was identified as an active obstacle to the building of better, internationally-applicable security measures, for, while a state has the power to close its airspace for safety reasons, "...due to its sovereignty, however, a state cannot be compelled to do so".[6] The report therefore leaves open the question of whether our understanding and operation of the principle of state sovereignty, and by extension state responsibility, should be adjusted to reflect the changing nature of threat.

Therefore, the Dutch report concludes that more attention must be paid to the changing nature of conflict and thus threat; that risk assessments must take account not only of probable scenarios based on past experience but of "improbable scenarios" based on a changing world. Implicitly, it establishes the principle that blame should not be assumed but must be investigated. It also shows respect for the complexity and difficulty underlying policy-making and, in identifying failure, does so in a manner consistent with seeking to understand and resolve problems rather than blame and vilify certain actors. It is an approach from which politicians and bureaucrats could safely learn.

5 Dutch Safety Board, *Crash of Malaysia Airlines flight MH17. Hrabove, Ukraine, 17 July 2014,* October 2015, http://cdn.onderzoeksraad.nl/documents/report-mh17-crash-en.pdf, p. 11.
6 Dutch Safety Board, *Crash of Malaysia Airlines flight MH17. Hrabove, Ukraine, 17 July 2014,* October 2015, http://cdn.onderzoeksraad.nl/documents/report-mh17-crash-en.pdf, p. 172.

The Euro-Atlantic states reflect

Ukraine's conflict has had the positive effect of inducing others to reflect on the need for change and in this section, a little focus will be placed on the nature of the reflections undertaken by the EU and the USA and the quality of those reflections contrasted with those of the Dutch Safety Board.

In early 2015, the EU announced it would undertake a review of its Neighbourhood Policy (ENP) opening a consultation that ran from March until June. At the time of writing, we are awaiting conclusions. The Consultation Paper[7] itself, however, gives evidence of the EU's ability to at least recognise that problems exist and changes must be implemented, beginning with a statement about the need for the EU to strengthen Europe, and therefore its foreign policy relationships across its neighbourhood. It delivers clear acknowledgement of the overarching problem, growing instability in the EU neighbourhood to the East and the South; and of the consequences of that instability for European states, including the migration and refugee flows that have resulted; threats to security; economic and social stress; and "diverging aspirations".[8] It acknowledges too that the ENP has not always offered an adequate response to problems experienced in the Neighbourhood and asks specifically whether greater integration of the CFSP and CSDP into the ENP framework can be achieved; and most interestingly, it finally acknowledges the limited attraction of what the ENP offers, not least in the context of the EU's financial crisis. The consultation is in and of itself an important step forward for the ENP, the imperative neatly and accurately summed up by the Latvian Minister for Foreign Affairs prior to the Riga Summit on the Eastern Partnership (EaP), who described it as a "survival summit".[9]

7 *Joint Consultation Paper. Towards a new European Neighbourhood Policy,* March 2015, http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/ neighbourhood/consultation/consultation.pdf

8 *Joint Consultation Paper. Towards a new European Neighbourhood Policy,* March 2015, http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/ neighbourhood/consultation/consultation.pdf, p. 2.

9 euractiv.com, *Riga to host "Eastern Partnership Survival Summit",* 26 February 2015, http://www.euractiv.com/sections/europes-east/riga-host-eastern-partnership-survival-summit-312466

Two aspects of the Consultation Paper are particularly worth noting. First is the explicit recognition that the EU must do more to consider the ripple effects of what it does in its neighbourhood: "...many of the challenges that need to be tackled by the EU and its neighbours together, cannot be adequately addressed without taking into account, or in some cases co-operating with, the neighbours of the neighbours".[10] Undoubtedly, this is an admission that insufficient attention was given to the potential nature of Russia's response to what it interpreted as the loss of Ukraine from its "sphere of influence". While it is absolutely the case that Russia should not have a say over Ukraine's sovereign choices, the EU did lose a valuable opportunity to consider in advance what was not in fact such an "improbable scenario", specifically the challenges presented when one regional trading arrangement meets another, in this case the Eurasian Economic Community. It is this apparent inability to recognise the nature of change in the world and to anticipate likely effects that is sorely in need of redress, at both regional and international levels.

The second aspect relates solely to the European Union itself: "...the EU needs to define more clearly its own aims and interests, while promoting the values on which it is based".[11] The scenes and protests that we have witnessed in EU member states in relation to refugees fleeing conflict bear testament to the need to articulate persistently and consistently precisely what it means to be European in order to avoid looking as if self-interest is the sole motivating factor in policy. While important in relation to the ENP, the EU's values base should also undoubtedly be part of a wider conversation within Brussels and the EU member states themselves if the EU is to avoid falling into the trap of complacency yet again; for few watching member states building walls on the territory of the European Union can maintain any illusion of a post-modern Europe in which "the most dangerous elements of international relationships

10 *Joint Consultation Paper. Towards a new European Neighbourhood Policy,* March 2015, http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/neighbourhood/consultation/consultation.pdf, p. 4.

11 *Joint Consultation Paper. Towards a new European Neighbourhood Policy,* March 2015, http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/neighbourhood/consultation/consultation.pdf, p. 3.

appear to have been suspended for the duration".[12] The signing of an Association Agreement with Ukraine in the summer of 2015 was suggestive of a continued commitment to the EU's value base and the likely implementation of the Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Agreement (DCFTA) in January 2016 is a further positive step in this regard. However, more needs to be done to convince all EU member states that such action is also consistent with the common interest, particularly those with borders to the south whose perception of threat is understandably different to those located further north and to the east.

To return to the Consultation Paper, in many ways it constitutes a laudable commitment on the part of the European Commission to contemplate the EU's failures in respect of its neighbouring partners. In one significant aspect, however, it contrasts unfavourably with the approach taken by the Dutch Safety Board. Where the Dutch were interested in this first report identifying all the parties who could be considered to hold responsibility and in avoiding any semblance of blame-laying, the Commission's Paper instead adopts from the outset an attitude of blame, attributing the instability in the Eastern Partnership (EaP) countries to Russia's door. This early framing[13] of the problem brings three difficulties with it. The first is that it inevitably steers responses in a certain direction, potentially constraining the consultation process by narrowing the scope of the responses received. Connected to this is the unfortunate perception that the Commission at least has already determined the causes of the problem and will not consider other possibilities, including its own failures and those of the Partner countries.[14] The third difficulty is that it undermines later recognition within the document of the necessity to work with "the neighbours of the neighbours", arguably the singularly most important statement in the paper given Ukraine's situation and the current state of EU relations with Russia.

12 Christopher Hill and Michael Smith, *International Relations and the European Union*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011, 2nd ed., p. 9.
13 For a broad discussion of framing theory, see Dennis Chong and James N. Druckman, 'A Theory of Framing and Opinion Formation in Competitive Elite Environments', *Journal of Communication*, 57 (2007): pp. 99-118
14 For an incisive account of what happens when bureaucracies consult, see *Bureaucracy Keeps Doing Its Thing*, 30 December 2014, http://20committee.com/2014/12/30/bureaucracy-keeps-doing-its-thing/

What the outcome of the review, both in terms of rhetoric and action, will be remains to be seen but there is room for optimism. The same cannot be said for the other side of the Atlantic, where President Obama's foreign policy approach towards Russia, which latterly might be safely described as giving President Putin sufficient room to hang himself, has come under intense criticism from fellow Democrats such as Hillary Clinton, as well of course from the GOP. Given that Obama is most likely to be succeeded by either Clinton or one of the Republican candidates for President, we can currently expect that a more punitive, less dialogue-driven relationship with Russia will follow, which would seem to constitute a step backwards rather than forwards in relation to reflections on imperatives for change.

The reset in US-Russian relations that characterised Obama's first term in office was itself recognition that US foreign policy choices, especially in Afghanistan and Iraq, bore at least some responsibility for the deterioration in the relationship under George W. Bush and so moved closer to the type of reflection that can move relations in a positive forward direction. However, Obama's three-pronged approach to foreign policy divides opinion at home. A willingness to admit fault; to avoid action where that action might cause more harm than that behaviour which it seeks to address; and to engage in dialogue with a view to cooperating on shared problems continue, for many within the USA, to be seen as signs of weakness rather than strength. It was this tendency - and others - that Obama addressed in his speech to the United Nations General Assembly in September 2015.[15] The speech was notable for not sparing the USA any less than other actors and for attempting to deliver a balanced assessment in relation to who bore responsibility for what. Iraq was singled out as having delivered a "hard lesson" for the USA. Nevertheless, Obama acknowledged that not all had internalised that message. In speaking of political debates at home, he identified "a notion of strength that is defined by opposition to old enemies, per-

15 The White House, *Remarks by President Obama to the United Nations General Assembly,* September 28, 2015
https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2015/09/28/remarks-president-obama-united-nations-general-assembly

ceived adversaries ...", going on to say, "...we see an argument made that the only strength that matters for the United States is bellicose words, and shows of military force; that cooperation and diplomacy will not work". Rejecting this, Obama said, "... we, the nations of the world, cannot return to the old ways of conflict and coercion. We cannot look backwards. We live in an integrated world ... we cannot turn those forces of integration."

A desirable balance was further achieved by a determination to single out and show appreciation for those examples of successful cooperative efforts, specifically the role of Russia and China in cooperating with the USA and others to deliver the Iranian nuclear deal. At the same time, Obama did not shy away from reference of the need to visibly punish breaches of international law. In respect, for instance, of Russia's actions in Crimea and eastern Ukraine, he argued that, "We recognise the deep and complex history between Russia and Ukraine but we cannot stand by when the sovereignty and territorial integrity of a nation is flagrantly violated. If that happens without consequence in Ukraine, it could happen to any nation..."

The positives from Obama's speech and his foreign policy more generally are undermined severely, however, by the lack of support at home and therefore a perception externally that little has really changed in US foreign policy. That sooner rather than later it will repeat the mistakes of old. In that respect, despite a less than ideal set of reflections on the EU's part, we can expect in the middle to longer term to have to rely on the EU to provide a more measured analysis of Russian actions, possible effects and responses. In short, as things stand, EU-Russia relations stand more hostage to fortune than one would like.

Conclusions

Foreign policy is of course about a series of interactions, analysts usually falling into a circular trap in trying to determine the role of chicken versus egg. Nevertheless, it is all too easy to conclude today that the EU and the White House have, in recent years, been forced

by Russia to ponder their own actions and reactions, their successes and failures, and to investigate the scope for change accordingly. Sitting in the back seat, however, has its advantages. Russia, the biggest critic of the West's international interventions, whether in Kosovo or Iraq, has seemingly not learned the lessons of those interventions, particularly in relation to the lengthy commitment to problem-solving that ensues and the difficulty of devising exit strategies. That said, Russia has an advantage in that it is unencumbered by any credible commitment to normative behaviour or, indeed by loyalties to historical allies, as Ukraine has shown. The same is not true for the Euro-Atlantic states. It is vital now that they do not forget these lessons and allow themselves to be pulled into a military confrontation that they can ill-afford, economically or politically. To date, NATO has provided the security guarantees that the Baltic States and others require and the EU has moved forward in deepening relations with Ukraine. Meanwhile, no state has yet provided a sensible and convincing plan for the resolution of Syria's terrible conflict. Until such a plan is forthcoming, a lack of further military intervention will be better than one that is prompted most by a desire to stymie Russia's ambitions rather than with regard for the security of the Syrian people.

The Dutch argued persuasively of a need to look backwards as well as forwards; so far, there is evidence of the Euro-Atlantic states looking back in order to project forward, but all too little evidence they are paying attention to improbable as well as probable scenarios. Obama's foreign policy thinking reflects a capacity to share responsibility, the EU's less so, and other significant players in the USA even less than that. While Russia's demands and perceptions of how it has been treated in the post-Cold War period are sometimes unreasonable and/or inaccurate, it is certainly the case that it is not responsible for all current ills. It is true too that it has the capacity to act constructively as part of a collective. This means that however improbable the scenario the door must be left open for dialogue with whomever resides in the Kremlin, even while not flinching from levelling appropriate sanctions against Russia when necessary.

A Multipolar World from a Russian View

Andis Kudors

The ideas of a multipolar world have been discussed extensively in the international political community. The multipolar order is usually understood by a distribution of power in the international system where more than two countries have approximately equal military, economic and cultural resources, as well as influence. The Cold War era featured an explicit bipolar system, but in the nineties, after the collapse of the USSR and dissolution of the Warsaw Pact, the idea about the United States (US) as the sole real global centre of power was frequently raised. What was official Russia's stance toward the global order and balance of power?

Straight after the disintegration of the USSR, Russia was busy finding its identity and role in the international system, while by the end of the first and beginning of the second presidential term of Vladimir Putin, Moscow started to criticise more loudly the conduct of the USA in the international arena and appealed to create a multipolar order where Russia would have more weight.

In the first decade of the twenty first century a number of North-American and Western European experts and politicians thought Russia was a 'declining power' judging more from economic parameters than public sentiments and the ambitions of its politicians. Putin and the Kremlin propagandists skilfully used the nostalgia of a certain part of the population for the previous might of the state, stating that even if the Soviet Union was not as respected during the Cold War era, the world was at least afraid of it. Different to the Baltic States and other former Soviet republics, many people in Russia consider their country the successor of the USSR not just in legal terms, but also emotionally. The collective memory, nurtured by Soviet age movies and songs, maintains an emotional link for Russia's senior generation recalling the time when "the sky was blue and the grass was green".

Russian TV propagandists follow the judgement expressed by Vladimir Putin in 2005 saying the disintegration of the USSR was a catastrophe and try to not remind them about the disregard towards the rights of an individual, empty shops, shortages, alcoholism and other social problems of the Soviet era. The global weight of Moscow comes out in front as the main achievement of the epoch. The modern Russian power elite and propagandists who serve it recall that despite poor living standards and significant economic problems the USSR could become one of the major global power centres – mostly thanks to its military capacities. So with the know-how already in place, construction of new roads and investments in the social field can be postponed if the main focus can be turned to regional, and potentially global, dominance...

After the collapse of the USSR some Sovietologists quit further research of Russia thus ignoring the revanchist trends in Russian internal discourse. The fact the West is not quite ready psychologically for an ambitious return of Russia to the negotiating table (kicking aside the rest) derives from the strategic miscalculation by North America and Europe who believed that a 'declining power' would not be able to create any global problems. The concerns of experts and politicians from neighbouring countries, including the Baltic States were widely ignored in Western Europe and as a result we have the wars in Georgia and Ukraine, as well as Russia's unhelpful involvement in Syria. The same people who have been in power in Russia for many years decided upon the occupation and annexation of Crimea in 2014, their political position and goals were evident beforehand, but were left without due attention. In any case, 'Russia is back' and it is impossible not to notice the elephant in the room.

The foreign policy makers of Russia formulate their goals utilising the terms and notions common in democratic societies; the same applies when talking about multipolarity. Nevertheless, specific understanding of the official Russia regarding what 'multipolar' means, is clearly visible. Several theory masters of international policy (for instance, the classic realists Hans Morgenthau and E. H. Carr) be-

lieve that a multipolar world order is more stable than a bipolar one. Does the Russian perception of a multipolar balance of power also give hope for a more secure international security environment?

Global centres (poles) of power – on moral grounds

Despite the fact that Russia's understanding about international policy is firmly anchored in the theory of realism, Russian foreign policy makers actively use a regulatory wording in search of a higher moral substantiation while achieving the goals of its *realpolitik*. The need for a multipolar world order is motivated with the democratic pluralism and existence of different cultures.

The foreign minister of the Russian Federation, Sergei Lavrov, pointed out at the Orthodox Easter reception in 2009 that a polycentric system of ruling he world is best suited for civilization diversity.[1] When ruminating about the reasons of the global economy crisis the minister stated *inter alia*, there was an untrue opinion about the existence of only one Western 'real' civilization.[2] A year later addressing the 'XIV Congress of the Russian People' Lavrov continued the topic of the new world order declaring that a new, more just and democratic polycentric international system which is being brought about today will inevitably embody in itself the richness of the world's cultures and civilizations.[3]

Multipolarity as the correct world order does not appear just in the speeches of Russian politicians and diplomats, but is recorded in concept papers. In its foreign policy concept paper of 2008 Russia offers a world order where together the leading great powers steer the global processes. In such a model the great powers must be represented in the sense of geography and civilization, maintain-

1 Transcript of Remarks by Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs Sergey Lavrov at the Foreign Ministry's Reception on the Occasion of Orthodox Easter, 22 April 2009, http://www.mid.ru/brp_4.nsf/0/3E6860616E4FA4F6C32575A2001CAFAC
2 Transcript of Remarks by Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs Sergey Lavrov at the Foreign Ministry's Reception on the Occasion of Orthodox Easter, 22 April 2009, http://www.mid.ru/brp_4.nsf/0/3E6860616E4FA4F6C32575A2001CAFAC
3 Transcript of Speech by Minister of Foreign Affairs Sergey Lavrov at the XIV World Russian People's Council, Moscow, 25 May 2010, http://www.mid.ru/brp_4.nsf/english/8B9923C5CBC35FB5C325772F0022FCE0

ing the leading role of UN.[4] In fact, Russia offers a new type of actor in international policy – civilization. The question remains open – how serious are Russian foreign policy makers about the ideas and ideological concepts they use for the substantiation of their foreign policy? Russia's foreign policy concept paper of 2013 also determines that one objective of Russia's foreign policy is "facilitating the development of a constructive dialogue and partnership relations between civilizations in the interests of enhancing accord among various cultures and confessions and ensuring their mutual enrichment…"[5] At the same time the concept paper uses the terminology of Samuel P. Huntington, pointing out that one of the priorities of global politics is to avoid 'fractures between civilizations' and the creation of 'civilization partnerships'.[6]

When we analyse Russian foreign policy documents and statements by politicians, we can distinguish two dominating ideas: 1) global centres or poles of power should not be perceived just in geographical and political terms but also in the sense of civilizations; 2) Russia should obtain exclusive rights to not just influence but even determine the political and economic processes in its neighbouring countries – the former Soviet republics.

In the shadow of the power centre, or practical objectives of the normative rhetoric

It may seem the ideas of Samuel P. Huntington that provoked a great stir a time ago are topical only in academic circles, but the main Russian foreign policy document displays an attempt to implement these ideas in the country's normative foreign policy. The objectives to use them however are different. It can well be a normative counter-attack against the West showing that no prescriptions from the US and Europe are acceptable for Russia, because Moscow as the

4 The Foreign Policy Concept of the Russian Federation, July 12, 2008,
http://archive.kremlin.ru/eng/text/docs/2008/07/204750.shtml.
5 Concept of the Foreign Policy of the Russian Federation,
http://archive.mid.ru//brp_4.nsf/0/76389FEC168189ED44257B2E0039B16D.
6 Concept of the Foreign Policy of the Russian Federation,
http://archive.mid.ru//brp_4.nsf/0/76389FEC168189ED44257B2E0039B16D.

centre of the Eastern Orthodox civilization has its own understanding about human rights and fundamental freedoms according to its cultural traditions. This is the reasoning where upon Moscow seeks ways around how to diminish the influence of EU and US over Russia's neighbours and Russia itself.

Another objective is Russia's desire to legitimise interference in the domestic affairs of its neighbouring states. This context logically explains why the ideas of Huntington were met with great enthusiasm in Russia. According to Huntington all civilizations consisting of several countries have 'core states', where the sources of the given civilization are concentrated.[7] The theoretical mastermind of the clash of civilizations pronounces that 'core states' in their relationship to other states of the same civilization have a role of parents in a family who both "support and discipline the rest."[8] Huntington's ideas fit well in the vision of official Russia about the relations between the global centres of power. It is worth remembering that Huntington speaks not just about the potential clashes of civilizations but also about the steps necessary to prevent them. He states the dominant or 'core state' of each civilization must secure order inside and communicate with 'core states' of other civilizations, because belligerent countries on the edge cannot solve conflicts on their own.[9]

There is not much harm while Huntington's ideas are a mere element of an academic discussion, but as soon as these ideas are implemented practically in a literal or altered manner, the consequences are negative – as we are witness to in Ukraine.   It has become rather popular in Russia to talk about 'state sovereignty' and 'independent foreign policy' meaning by that, Russia itself, in the first place. As soon as Ukraine, Moldova or Georgia are in question, former notions are substituted with paternal expressions about 'ancient cultural ties', 'brother nations', 'Ukrainians – younger brothers

7 Samuel P. Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order.* NY: Simon & Schuster Paperbacks, 2003, 157.
8 Samuel P. Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order.* NY: Simon & Schuster Paperbacks, 2003, 157.
9 Samuel P. Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order.* NY: Simon & Schuster Paperbacks, 2003, 157.

of Russians' etc. A forced love is not love at all – the Kremlin is well aware of it and has no illusions about the real attitude of Ukrainians towards Russian aggression. The stories about 'younger brothers' and the 'Russian world' are created for internal Russia's consumption, thus gaining support for Putin's policies in Ukraine and other neighbouring countries. Russia has demonstrated twice already that it is ready to go to war to maintain its influence in neighbouring states. Active steps by Ukraine and Georgia in the direction of Western integration were promptly stopped with military force. Although the *Normandy format* gave Russia the opportunity to sit around the table next to France and Germany, it is obvious that the importance and scale of this negotiating table does not fully correspond to the ambitions of the Kremlin's master.

Back to the negotiating table where the fate of the world is decided

The third presidential term of Vladimir Putin began against the background of the Arab spring and protests at Moscow's Bolotnaya Square. Besides that, the stagnating economy and preoccupation with the declining ratings of Putin urged the president of Russia to activate 'patriotic mobilization' and a 'turn towards conservatism' in the political discourse of the country from 2012 - 2014. The annexation of Crimea was the culmination of this 'patriotic mobilization', the ratings of the 'nation's leader' skyrocketed but simultaneously it lead Putin and the whole of Russia with him into partial international isolation. How can a way be made out of the deadlock which is guaranteed by the label 'aggressor' that is attached to Russia?

It is not surprising that at the UN Assembly General on 28 September 2015 Putin compared Islamic State terrorists with the German Nazis of the last century. The representatives of Russia have been calling for the formation of a coalition of several states to fight ISIS, including the leader of Syria Al-Assad. The drawing of historical parallels was not a coincidence. What helped the USSR get rid of the label 'aggressor', attached to it by the League of Nations straight

after the Soviet aggression against Finland in 1939? It was the fight against a 'greater evil' – Nazi Germany. Today, likewise, Russia wants to be part of the solution for big international challenges; being indispensable when fighting the great evil – ISIS. The goal of Putin is to be present around the negotiating table where regional and global problems are being solved.

Right after the annexation of Crimea in the spring of 2014 the implementers of Russia's foreign policy and public diplomacy began to talk actively about the necessity to sit down around the table and negotiate 'new rules of the game'. In February 2015 the world marked the 70th anniversary of the Yalta conference. The Russian ambassador to the UN, Vitaly Churkin, when asked about the necessity of Yalta 2.0 in a TV interview, answered affirmatively. According to a number of Russian politicians and experts international law is not observed, the world has changed a good deal after the USSR ceased to exist and one must consider a new global order.

What shall be done if no one invites you to the negotiating table? The Russian recipe is – to push rivals apart with their elbows. Russian involvement in the Syrian conflict and the fight against ISIS provides Putin with the opportunity to meet Barak Obama who would not otherwise agree to see him because of Russia's aggression against Ukraine. The Kremlin hopes for an alleviation of the sanctions against Russia and the opportunity for its business to access Western financial resources. A risky period is approaching with the upcoming parliamentary (2016) and presidential elections (2018) in Russia. Inflation, a dropping GDP, low oil prices, financial and brain drains are not a promising background for probable turbulences during the election period.

Conclusion

What are the objectives of Russia's political elite when it talks about the negative consequences of a single existent dominating power and the necessity of a multipolar balance? The main goal is not of a global or regional nature; it is a local one respectively – the stability of pow-

er in Russia itself. The existing mode in the Russian political system gives the power elite control of both political process and financial flows. The value of villas and jewellery owned by representatives of the elite are many times higher than their officially declared income. The system of corruption, which exists alongside official institutions and authorities leads to a close intertwining between political elite and businesses. The sales of the energy resources provides an income which rises the number of multi-millionaires in a short term without much concern about sustainable development and the Gini coefficient which displays a deep divide between rich and poor. The residents of Moscow's 'Mount Olympus' – the Kremlin – view Russia's neighbourhood as a buffer zone that must protect Russia from western influence which theoretically could provoke political changes in Russia, too. The 'Arab spring' and 'coloured' revolutions before it is a scenario which the Kremlin is afraid of. Therefore, regional domination as well as the desire to be a party to the solution for Middle East problems are the means to assure Russia is 'left in peace' and can implement an 'independent foreign policy'. This leads to a major problem however – neither Ukrainians nor other freedom loving neighbouring nations will accept the dictate from Moscow, be it in any form of morally ethical terms.

Russia's rhetoric about the Orthodox civilization has not prevented it from war with Orthodox Ukrainians and Georgians. It just proves the fact that the topic of civilizations is another ideological camouflage for attaining the Kremlin's objectives of realpolitik. Even authoritarian states need popular support for the implementation of certain foreign policy. Thus, the argument of differences between civilizations that requires a multipolar world order is used to legitimise the internal and external policies of Vladimir Putin.

Words by Russian foreign policy and public diplomacy representatives about the necessity for Yalta 2.0 or Helsinki 2.0, are tended to put in doubt the functioning of international law. Mistakes made by the West encourage Russia in this respect. But the free world should think more about strengthening international law and return to the negotiations of UN reform. It is essential that

an enlarged UN Security Council with limitations on veto rights could effectively keep peace in the world. We should prevent Russia from igniting the Syrian conflict so much that some sort of Yalta 2.0 would be required. In any case the US and EU, when dealing with problems of Syria, should keep in mind the partner of negotiations is the same official Russia, which a relatively short time ago launched aggression against its neighbour Ukraine.

Russia's Challenge to International Order

Balkan Devlen

Russia is a revisionist state.[1] It does not get more revisionist than invading and then annexing a chunk of your neighbour's territory while engaging in subversion in other parts of the same country. The key question is the nature of Russia's revisionism. Is it a limited aim, targeted to one particular territory revisionism or is it an unlimited, revolutionary revisionism that aims to alter the basic structure of international order after the Cold War? This fundamental disagreement (limited vs unlimited/revolutionary revisionism) is at the core of Western indecisiveness in dealing with Russia since the annexation of Crimea. If Russia is a limited-aim revisionist (i.e. seeking just the return of Crimea to Russia after what it perceives to be a historical injustice inflicted by Soviet leadership) then appeasement and accommodation by the West are prudent strategies, however much they are unpleasant and unjust for Ukraine. However Russian actions before and after the invasion and annexation of Crimea clearly demonstrate that such a reading of Russia as a limited-aim revisionist is wrong. Attempting subversion in Eastern Ukraine by creating, arming, and funding local proxies, sending special forces, heavy weapons, and eventually regular troops after the annexation of Crimea are not signs of a satisfied, limited-aim revisionist. Nor intimidation of Baltic and Nordic states via cyberwarfare[2], kidnappings[3], unannounced military drills, and flights by nuclear bombers[4] can be considered as such. These tactics and strategies are not new and have a long pedigree dating back to the

1 Andrei Piontkovski, "Putin's Russia as a revisionist power", *Journal of Baltic Security, Vol. 1:1, 2015,* pp. 6 - 14; Carolina Vendil Pallin, "Russia challenges the West in Ukraine", Journal of Baltic Security, Vol. 1:1, 2015, pp. 14 - 26.
2 "Russia accused of unleashing cyberwar to disable Estonia", *The Guardian,* 17 May 2007, http://www.theguardian.com/world/2007/may/17/topstories3.russia
3 "Russians open new front after Estonian official is captured in 'cross-border raid'", *The Guardian,* 7 September 2014, http://www.theguardian.com/world/2014/sep/07/russia-parades-detained-estonian-police-officer
4 Luke Coffey and Daniel Kohis, "Russia's Provocations in the Nordic-Baltic States: The U.S. Needs a Strategy to Support the Region", *The Heritage Foundation Issue Brief #4310,* 2 December 2014, http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2014/12/russias-provocations-in-the-nordic-baltic-states-the-us-needs-a-strategy-to-support-the-region

founding of the Soviet Union.[5] One can observe a similar pattern in the Russo-Georgian war of 2008 and the subsequent de-facto integration of break-away regions into Russia. Russia's actions and subversive activities are not limited to its so-called "near abroad" either. The Kremlin funds extreme leftwing *and* rightwing movements across Europe[6], engages in a sustained disinformation campaign against Western audiences[7], and most recently reasserted itself in the Middle East by airstrikes in Syria against rebel groups to prop-up its client regime of Bashar al-Assad.[8] In short, Russia today is not, as some in the West would like to believe, a revisionist state with limited, well-specified grievances. It is a revolutionary state that seeks to dismantle the foundations of a Post-Cold War liberal order.[9]

There are two dimensions to Russia's revisionism:

1. Against its neighbours in the so-called "near abroad". Hybrid warfare, which is an updated form of Soviet "active measures" that includes massive disinformation operations, political subversion, the use of paramilitary and proxy groups, special forces, economic coercion, cyberattacks, and when necessary the use of overt military force is the defining feature in this dimension. The purpose is to establish a system of neo-suzerainty in which, while Russia has absolute sovereignty, the other former Soviet Republics defer to Russia in varying degrees and accept its primacy and its right to interfere with their domestic affairs.

5 Victor Madeira, "Russian Subversion - Haven't we been here before?", *Institute for Statecraft,* July 30th, 2014. Available at http://www.statecraft.org.uk/research/russian-subversion-havent-we-been-here

6 Peter Keko, "Putin's far right and far left friends in Europe." *Political Capital Institute,* July 2014. http://www.wilsoncenter.org/sites/default/files/pc_prezi_wilsoncentre.pdf; "In the Kremlin's pocket", *The Economist,* 14 February 2015, http://www.economist.com/news/briefing/21643222-who-backs-putin-and-why-kremlins-pocket; Anna Beitane, "Examining the Kremlin's and Far-Right Parties Cooperation: Should the EU be Worried?", *Latvian Institute of International Affairs,* http://www.lai.lv/lv/blogs/examining-the-kremlins-and-far-right-parties-coope/
7 Peter Pomerantsev and Michael Weiss, "The Menace of Unreality: How the Kremlin Weaponizes Information, Culture and Money", *The Interpreter* Magazine, 22 November 2014. http://www.interpretermag.com/the-menace-of-unreality-how-the-kremlin-weaponizes-information-culture-and-money/
8 Igor Sutyagin, "Russia's War Plan in Syria", *Royal United Services Institute,* 2 October 2015. https://www.rusi.org/analysis/commentary/ref:C560E9A3D1FCD8/
9 For an excellent overview of the different dimensions of Russian challenge to the West see: Kier Giles at. al. "The Russian Challenge", *Chatham House Report,* 4 June 2015. https://www.chathamhouse.org/sites/files/chathamhouse/field/field_document/20150605RussianChallengeGilesHansonLyneNixeySherrWoodUpdate.pdf; Also see Viatcheslav Morozov, "Aimed for the better, ended up with the worst: Russia and international order", *Journal of Baltic Security, Vol 1:1, 2015,* pp. 26 - 37.

2. Against the West. Challenging the foundations of the post-Cold War international order when the opportunity presents itself to create a "spheres of influence" system is the central dynamic in this aspect of Russian revisionism.

These two dimensions are deeply intertwined. Creating a neo-suzerainty depends on successfully challenging the post-Cold War order. That challenge is only successful when a neo-suzerainty is established. In other words, one cannot understand Putin's policies in Russia's neighbourhood without understanding his beliefs in what the international order should look like.

Hybrid warfare attracted a lot of attention lately and Russia's subversion against its neighbours has been analyzed extensively.[10] Therefore, I will focus on the second dimension of Russian revisionism that is the challenge to the West. There are two crucial aspects of Russia's strategy. The first is the articulation of an alternative international ideology that challenges the political and normative foundations of the liberal world order. The second is inhibiting Western reactions to Russian strategy by targeting its society and political will.

The post-Cold War liberal international order is a rule-based, open order that rests on democracy, rule of law, and free markets. Putin's international ideology rests on the idea that there are two types of states in the world; those that deserve full sovereignty and the rest. Russia, along with other great powers, such as the US, China, and Germany are the ones who are "true" sovereigns. The other countries, including the former Eastern Bloc states, are not "true" sovereigns and their interests and will should not have much bearing upon how international politics is conducted. Therefore, the West should recognise the primacy of Russia in the former Soviet Union space, should not interfere with Russian designs regarding

---

10 On hybrid warfare in Ukraine see, *inter alia*, Maria Snegovaya, "Putin's Information Warfare in Ukraine: Soviet Origins of Russia's Hybrid Warfare", *Institute for the Study of War*, September 2015, http://understandingwar.org/sites/default/files/Russian%20Report%201%20Putin's%20Information%20Warfare%20in%20Ukraine-%20Soviet%20Origins%20of%20Russias%20Hybrid%20Warfare.pdf; Michael Kofman and Matthew Rojansky, "A Closer look at Russia's "Hybrid War"", *The Kennan Cable No:7*, April 2015, https://www.wilsoncenter.org/sites/default/files/7-KENNAN%20CABLE-ROJANSKY%20KOFMAN.pdf; On Russian doctrine of information warfare see the excellent overview by Ulrik Franke, "War by non-military means: Understanding Russian information warfare", *Swedish Defence Research Agency (FOI)*, March 2015, http://www.foi.se/Global/Press%20och%20nyheter/War%20by%20non-military%20means.pdf

these countries, and pay due respect to Russia regarding major global decisions. Naturally, the West should also refrain from criticising the Kremlin's conduct in Russian domestic politics, which is seen as interference with Russian sovereignty and political independence. In a nutshell, the West should agree to a "spheres of influence" division of the world and treat Russia as an equal power in "running the globe". If this two-tiered world smacks of nineteenth century *realpolitik*, it is because it is based on such a worldview, adapted in terms of tactics to the twenty first century.

The Kremlin's international ideology matters.[11] Although Russia lost its superpower status after the Cold War and faces many demographic and economic challenges, it is still a major, nuclear power at the borders of the European Union and NATO. It has reach beyond its immediate neighbourhood as ongoing Russian military operations in Syria demonstrate. Putin, emboldened by high energy prices and his perception of the EU as a weak and ineffective actor, embarked on a quest to alter the rules of the game in the last decade or so. The recent decline in oil prices slowed down but did not stop this trend. The Kremlin recognised it has a relatively limited window of opportunity, perhaps another decade or two due to declining demographics and energy prices, to re-establish Russia as a great power and alter the international system to its liking. Since the Russo-Georgian war of 2008 this strategy is on full speed, taking advantage of European weaknesses, waning American interest in the region, and the global financial crisis.

An important component of Putin's strategy is to discourage and inhibit Western, particularly European, reactions to his policies. Russia uses European dependence on Russian natural gas as well as banking and commercial links with German and British businesses as economic leverages against the EU. It funds and supports both leftwing *and* rightwing anti-EU parties to further weaken the European project and use them as Trojan horses within the EU. Starting

---

11 On Russian state ideology see Andrei Kolesnikov, "Russian Ideology after Crimea", *Carnegie Moscow Center,* September 2015, http://carnegie.ru/2015/09/22/russian-ideology-after-crimea/ihzq; S.R. Covington, "Putin's Choice for Russia", *Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs Harvard Kennedy School,* September 2015. Available at http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/files/Putins%20Choice%20web%203.pdf

with the rebranding of the *Russia Today* TV channel as *RT* in 2009 and picking up speed with Euromaidan protests in Ukraine in 2013, the Kremlin also engages in a sustained (dis)information campaign against Western audiences. This is distinct from the synchronicity with Russian-language propaganda towards Russian-speaking audiences, both at home and abroad.[12] *RT* and the *Sputnik News Agency* spearhead the traditional media offensive, while an army of internet trolls floods social media with pro-Kremlin messages, disinformation, fake news, hoaxes, and outright conspiracy theories.[13] The purpose of Russian information operations is not to persuade or convince but to disorient, confuse, and overwhelm the average member of the public to the point that she gives up finding the truth in exasperation. The intended effect is psychological, aiming to convince the Western public that there is a real debate, for example about Russian aggression in Ukraine or the downing of MH-17, that we do not know the facts, therefore one should not assign blame to one party or the other. This relativisation of truth is meant to create apathy and distrust in Western societies towards their own institutions, experts, media, and government.

Economic and political leverages that are discussed above, together with the Russian information campaign against the West, translates into reluctance and indecisiveness of Western governments to confront Russian revisionism. There are three arguments in favour of such a reluctant and circumspect Western reaction to Russian revisionism. The first one, which was discussed in the beginning, is that Russia is a limited-aim revisionist and can be appeased/satisfied if the West is willing to sacrifice Ukrainian territorial integrity and political independence. The second argument is that Putin acts the way he does because he is weak domestically, wants to direct the attention of the Russian public elsewhere, and this has nothing to do with revising the international order. This "diversionary war" argument has two problems. First it assumes

12 "Analysis of Russia's Information Campaign Against Ukraine", *NATO Strategic Communications Centre of Excellence*, 2014, http://www.stratcomcoe.org/analysis-russias-information-campaign-against-ukraine-0

13 For an excellent source of tracking Kremlin's social media activities see http://kremlintrolls.com

a domestic-international distinction that does not really exist in Putin's worldview. Putin perceives democratisation in the former Soviet Union as a direct threat to his rule in Russia. Reasserting Russia's status as a great power is one of the major pillars of the Kremlin's ideology. In the case of the "near abroad", the affairs of those countries are not foreign affairs but part of domestic politics, as places such as Ukraine are "not really a foreign country" in Putin's thinking. Second, such an argument ignores the fact that even if Putin's actions are only about Russian domestic politics, they have serious international repercussions that must be dealt with. The last argument in favour of not confronting Russian revisionism is that even if Russia has revisionist aims, it is a declining power that does not have the resources to upend the international system. Therefore, the argument goes, the West should just sit back and wait until Putin's regime implodes due to overstretching. Putting aside the morally questionable implications of leaving the countries of the former Soviet Union to the whims of Putin's regime, proponents of this view underestimate Russia's ability to disrupt the international order. Russia demonstrated that it has enough political, economic, military, and intelligence tools to change boundaries in Europe by force, engage in political subversion against the European Union, and prop-up its client regimes in the Middle East. Putin does not need to establish and maintain a new international order to achieve his aims. All he needs to do is to play the spoiler, to weaken and damage the liberal international order that would enable him to re-establish Russia as a great power with its own sphere of influence. Just because Putin is unlikely to cause WWIII, does not mean that his policies will not have serious consequences for the West and the post-Cold War international order.

What should the West do? Revisionism requires intent, capability, and opportunity. The West cannot do much regarding Putin's intentions but we can limit his capabilities and deny him new opportunities. In order to do this the West should be vigilant at home and abroad. A new strategy of containment requires, like the old one, pressuring the adversary while strengthening one's own in-

stitutions and society. We should make our societies more resilient against information warfare and political subversion. We should defend and promote Western values and norms at home and abroad. We should also stand with the countries that are at the frontline of Russian aggression. The West should send lethal aid to Ukraine to counter the Russian proxy war in Donbas. NATO should enhance deterrence by establishing permanent bases in the Baltic countries and Poland. Stationing American, Canadian, and European troops as trip-wires will make it harder for Putin to conduct hybrid war against these countries. The West should increase its economic and political pressure on Putin. Harsher sanctions targeting key sectors and people should be put in place and maintained. The purpose should be to make it costly for Putin to wage war and stretch his resources to the limit. Only the Russian people themselves can fundamentally alter Russia's international behaviour. The West could only limit the damage Russian revisionism causes and deny it new opportunities until such change occurs.

Russia's "Hybrid War": Geographic and Operational Limitations

András Rácz[1]

The new type of warfare, often called hybrid war, which Russia conducted in Ukraine has attracted widespread political, public and academic attention, particularly following the illegal annexation of the Crimean peninsula. However, by reading media reports one may have the impression that the real potential of Russia's hybrid warfare is often overestimated and is perceived as a universal, invincible form of warfare that may threaten basically any country.

Hence, this short analysis intends to identify the strategic and operative requirements of hybrid warfare, based on studying the field experiences gained in Ukraine. The concrete aim of this research is to define, where, and against, which countries Russia may be able to use this new form of warfare in its full spectrum.

As since the breakout of the war in Ukraine hybrid war, or "new generation war" as Russian experts call it, received extensive scholarly attention, hereby a brief conceptual description is satisfactory. Contemporary Russian experts[2] and practitioners[3] of hybrid/new generation warfare, as well as Western scholars[4] describe it as a concentrated, combined use of diplomatic, economic, political and other non-military methods with direct military force, instead of waging open war. According to them, the importance of

---

1 The views presented here are of the authors own, and they do not represent the position of the Finnish Institute of International Affairs. The present paper is derived from a FIIA Report published by the Finnish Institute of International Affairs: Andras Racz, *Russia´s Hybrid War in Ukraine: Breaking the Enemy´s Ability to Resist.* FIIA Report No. 43. [Helsinki: The Finnish Institute of International Affairs, 2015], http://www.fiia.fi/assets/publications/FIIAReport43.pdf
2 Sergey Chekinov and Sergey Bogdanov, "The Nature and Content of a New-Generation War", *Military Thought,* October-December 2013, 12-23, http://www.eastviewpress.com/Files/MT_FROM%20THE%20CURRENT%20ISSUE_No.4_2013.pdf
3 Valery Gerasimov, "Tsennost' nauki v predvideniye", *Voyenno-promishlenniy kurier,* 27 February 2013, http://www.vpk-news.ru/articles/14632
4 Jānis Bērziņš, "Russia's New Generation Warfare in Ukraine: Implications for Latvian Defense Policy", *Policy Paper,* No. 2. National Defense Academy of Latvia Centre for Security and Strategic Research, (2014), http://www.naa.mil.lv/~/media/NAA/AZPC/Publikacijas/PP%2002-2014.ashx ; Johan Norberg – Fredrik Westerlund, "Russia and Ukraine: Military-strategic options, and possible risks, for Moscow", *RUFS Briefing*, No. 22, (April 2014), http://www.foi.se/Global/V%C3%A5r%20kunskap/S%C3%A4kerhetspolitiska%20studier/Ryssland/Briefings/RUFS%20Briefing%20No.22.pdf; Merle Maigre, "Nothing New in Hybrid Warfare: The Estonian Experience and Recommendation for NATO", *Policy Brief* (February 2015), The German Marshall Fund of the United States, http://blog.gmfus.org/wp-content/blogs.dir/1/files_mf/1423169222Maigre_HybridWarEstonia_Feb15.pdf

non-military means has radically increased in reaching political and strategic goals; moreover, they are often more efficient than only armed violence.

Russian experts of hybrid war prefer the concealed, non-open use of forces, such as paramilitary and civilian insurgent units, and emphasize the need to rely on asymmetric, indirect methods. They urge that besides the physical reality, war should include the information space as well, where the real-time coordination of the means and tools used is possible. Great emphasis is put on targeted strikes conducted well behind enemy lines and on the destruction of enemy critical infrastructure, as well as on the massive use of Special Forces and also of robotized weapons, such as drones. Meanwhile, regular forces should be put into action only in the late phases of the conflict, often under the disguise of peacekeeper or crisis-management forces.

Prerequisites of the full spectrum of the hybrid war

In order to identify the prerequisites of the use of hybrid war, one needs to remember the earlier, non-violent phases of this form of warfare do not constitute anything either particularly illegal or violent. In fact, in many cases they do not differ much from the conventional tools of Russian diplomacy, such as gathering information, establishing contacts with decision-makers, setting up media outlets, supporting cultural project and pro-Moscow NGOs, etc. Hence, below the prerequisites of the full spectrum of hybrid war are analyzed, i.e. when overt and covert physical attacks and territorial takeovers take place as well.

Military superiority

Clearly the most important prerequisite of the full spectrum of hybrid war is that Russia needs to be militarily stronger than the target country. This, in the European context, means the target country must not be a member of either NATO, or any military alliance which owns a significant military potential when compared to Russia.

The importance of this prerequisite has been clearly demonstrated by the fact the Kyiv government could not use force against either the "polite green men" or violent protestors due to the danger of an overwhelming conventional attack from Russia. One needs to remember that during the Crimean events and the beginning of the crisis in Eastern Ukraine massive Russian forces were lined up along the border with Ukraine. Though the official Kremlin justified their presence by claiming they were participating only in snap exercises, in reality they posed an imminent military threat to Ukraine. Taking into account that Russia maintains the right to defend Russian-speakers abroad even by the use of force if necessary, the Ukrainian leadership could hardly risk the use of force against the invaders, because it could have easily induced a full-fledged attack from Russia.[5]

In other words, the danger of a massive Russian conventional military attack on Ukraine functioned as a deterrence factor, thus seriously hampering the freedom of action by Kyiv. However, as stated above, this deterrence factor functions only if the target country is militarily weaker than Russia and has no allies either able to guarantee its defense, or to possess a military force comparable to the one of Russia. Otherwise, if the deterrence element can be negated, either by credible national defense capabilities or by the help of NATO collective defense, "polite green men" and their local armed allies can be arrested – and, if police means are not sufficient, neutralized by military force – in the very first moment when they show up.

Weak central power and armed forces in the target country

As was described above, hybrid war is largely built on taking use of the inherent weaknesses of the target country. Weak central leadership, badly functioning state administration and underpaid, corruption-infected police and armed forces all increase the vulnerability, particularly against infiltration and bribing actions. A well-functioning, strong state administration together with its police and secret services is able to quickly uncover and suppress subversion activities coming from abroad.

---

5 Pointed out, for example, by James Appathurai in the Riga Conference in September 2014.

However, the Ukrainian state was unable to do so during the Crimean crisis, due to many reasons. First, the whole state has been infected by an extremely high level of corruption, including the highest levels of state administration. According to the 2013 survey of e Transparency International, the Ukraine of President Yanukovich was the third most corrupted state of Europe, following Belarus and Russia.[6] These structural weaknesses of the state administration obviously did not disappear with the February 2014 political turn. Besides, oligarchs have had a strong influence not only on the political elite, but also on the police, border guards and secret service structures, particularly in Eastern Ukraine.[7]

Low and/or questionable legitimacy of the government is an additional factor that may weaken the resistance potential of the target country. This was particularly the case during the Crimean crisis, when the new Kyiv leadership was faced with serious problems of legitimacy and also everyday functioning. Though the election of Petro Poroshenko to President on 25 May 2014 helped to address legitimacy problems, functional hardships still persist. Russia and its local proxies were highly successful in utilizing the weak legitimacy of the new Kyiv government in Crimea by using propaganda and false news, thus significantly lowering the morale of Ukrainian forces stationed in the peninsula. Low-level local Ukrainian commanders, isolated from any alternative source of information often decided to surrender under the combined pressure of Russian information warfare and the presence of Russian troops.

Another component of the weakness of the Ukrainian state was that in the armed forces, police and security services, there was a high number of officials and officers loyal to Moscow instead of Kyiv. A remarkable moment was when Rear-Admiral Denis Berezovsky, commander (!) of the Ukrainian fleet tried to call the

---

6 Transparency International, *Corruption Perceptions Index 2013,* http://cpi.transparency.org/cpi2013/results/
7 Sławomir Matuszak, "The Oligarchic Democracy. The Influence of Business Groups on Ukrainian Politics", *OSW Studies* No. 42, Centre for Eastern Studies (2012), www.osw.waw.pl/sites/default/files/prace_42_en.pdf

whole fleet to change side and swear allegiance to Moscow.[8] Finally, following the illegal Russian annexation of the peninsula, more than 5000 Ukrainian soldiers and navy personnel decided to continue serving in the Russian armed forces.

Lasting, regionally concentrated dissatisfaction with the central government

In order to successfully destabilize the target country, there has to be a lasting, regionally concentrated dissatisfaction with the central government, preferably with an ethnic or separatism-related element involved. This dissatisfaction may serve as a ground for organizing first political, then armed opposition, against the central power, as well as demands of autonomy and independence.

Such a dissatisfaction strengthened by ethnic and language-related elements has been present in Crimea and Eastern Ukraine. Though a detailed description of its causes would far exceed the framework of the present paper, one needs to note that this dissatisfaction was closely connected to the overall corruption and dysfunctionality of earlier Ukrainian governments from the previous two decades. Hence, it was not hard for activists organizing pro-Russian civil society networks, and later also for Russian agents and special forces coordinating demonstrations, riots and the takeover of administrative buildings to find like-minded people among the locals.

Massive presence of Russian-speaking minority

Another important prerequisite is the massive presence of Russian, or Russian-speaking minority in the target country, due to multiple reasons. Among the ethnic minorities it is probably easier to find people dissatisfied with the central power and recruit them for the purposes of the attacking country. They may serve not only as sources of tactical and operational intelligence, but may also pro-

---

8 Shaun Walker, "Ukraine Navy officers reject plea to defect to Russian-backed Crimea", *The Guardian,* 3 March 2014, accessed 19 October 2015, http://www.theguardian.com/world/2014/mar/03/ukraine-navy-officers-defect-russian-crimea-berezovsky

vide shelter and guidance to infiltrating Special Forces, and participate in organized anti-government protest and riots.

The presence of Russian-speakers enables Special Forces of the attacking country to disguise themselves as locals, and act as civil society activists, local opposition members, etc. Besides, it also allows the attacking country to formally deny its involvement and to frame all violent actions as only "actions of the local population." Moreover, disguising infiltrating Special Forces as locals also limits the potential of the target country to use force against the ones taking illegal action.

Strong media presence both in the target country and abroad

An additional prerequisite is that the attacking country has to possess a strong media presence in the target country. Well-established, properly functioning media enables attackers to generate and strengthen distrust vis-à-vis central government, isolate the attacked region from any information coming from the capital, as well as mislead and misinform the majority of society in the target country and the international community.

In Ukraine the Russian media has traditionally had strong positions, partially due to the high ratio of Russian-speaking populations and also to the important share of Russian-owned companies in the Ukrainian media market. In addition to all these, Russian-speakers in Ukraine frequently watch, most even prefer, Russian television channels and read local versions of Russian newspapers. All these together empower Moscow with strong media positions in Ukraine.[9]

Besides, as pointed out by Keir Giles[10], Russia has also invested considerable time and resources to set up strong media positions in the Western world. The well-coordinated information offensives conducted by Russia-operated TV and news channels operating in

9 Joanna Szostek, "Russia and the News Media in Ukraine. A Case of "Soft Power"?", *East European Politics and Societies and Cultures*. Vol. 28. No. 3. (August 2014), 463-486.
10 Keir Giles, "Russia's Hybrid Warfare: A Success in Propaganda", Working Papers on Security Policy, 2015/1. Bundesakademie für Sicherheitspolitik, https://www.baks.bund.de/en/news/working-paper-russias-hybrid-warfare-a-success-in-propaganda

Western languages, together with a whole army of internet trolls, enabled Russia to cause confusion and mislead Western public with a set of conflicting narratives and *"obscure the truth with a thicket of falsehoods."*[11] Western media proved to be particularly vulnerable to Russian information warfare operations because alongside the principle of providing balanced opinions, enough room had to be provided to Russian narratives as well, even if they were blatant and obvious, often self-conflicting lies.

Logistical requirements

In addition to the factors mentioned above, implementation of the full spectrum of hybrid war also has certain logistical requirements. Though this element cannot be reconstructed from available Russian public sources, certain conclusions may still be drawn from the events in Ukraine.

The full spectrum of hybrid war requires that either there has to be a Russian military presence in the targeted region, like was the case in Crimea, or the given region has to have a common border with Russia with border guards service either weak or non-existent, as it is in Eastern Ukraine. Direct proximity either to Russia, or to Russian military bases is required in order to provide the attackers – including Special Forces and their local allies – with shelter, food, drink, weapons, ammunition, fuel and equipment. Sending replacements and evacuation of the wounded also make it necessary to maintain constant, uninterrupted contacts with the hinterland. All in all, the full spectrum of the hybrid war cannot operate in isolation. While individual agents may work independently, and so may small Special Forces units for a short while, the massive use of armed forces still requires constant logistical support.

---

11 Keir Giles, "Russia's Hybrid Warfare: A Success in Propaganda", *Working Papers on Security Policy*, 2015/1. Bundesakademie für Sicherheitspolitik, https://www.baks.bund.de/en/news/working-paper-russias-hybrid-warfare-a-success-in-propaganda

Conclusions

Instead of relying on direct military force, hybrid warfare, or "new generation war", as it is called by Russian military thinkers, uses political, economic, diplomatic, social and information measures together with Special Forces' operations in order to break the potential of the target country to resist. Hybrid warfare is not a universal military tool though. In fact, there are a number of strategic and operational requirements which need to be fulfilled in order to successfully employ hybrid warfare.

The most important prerequisite is that Russia needs to be militarily stronger than the target country. The danger of a massive, overwhelming conventional attack from the side of Russia is the factor that prevents the target country to use force against the often unmarked warriors of hybrid warfare. This leads to the conclusion that hybrid warfare is not a substitute for conventional military force, but rather a new way of using it, i.e. mainly as a deterrence factor with no or very limited kinetic violence involved.

Weakness of the central government and of the system of administration in general is another key element, which allows the hybrid attacker to weaken the resistance potential of the target country via corrupting, blackmailing and turning over officials as well as army and police personnel. Lasting, regionally centered dissatisfaction is also an important element that an adversary employing hybrid warfare may try to utilize. Besides, Russian or Russian-speaking minorities need to be present in the target country in order to make it possible for infiltrating Special Forces to disguise themselves as locals, serve on an informational, intelligence and recruitment basis, and also provide reference points for Moscow's action. In addition to all these, Russian media has to have strong influence in the target country enabling the Kremlin to use the full spectrum of its information warfare potential. In terms of logistics, there either has to be an established Russian military presence in the target country already before the operation, or the target country has to have a long and weakly controlled border with Russia through which logistical support can be provided.

Taking into account these preconditions, one may conclude that the number of countries where Russia would be able to employ the full spectrum of hybrid war - i.e. not only preparations and non-military measures aimed at exercising pressure, but also an attack - is actually very limited. At present, all preconditions of a hybrid war are met in Ukraine (still) and in Georgia. In Belarus and Kazakhstan almost all preconditions are met, except the weakness of the state: in fact, these countries have firm, centralized, presidential regimes. The vulnerability of Moldova and Armenia is much less serious, as they do not share a direct border with Russia, thus small Russian bases isolated from mainland Russia are clearly not suitable for anything involving a military component.

Hence, one may conclude that hybrid warfare is indeed far from constituting an invincible, universal threat, or being some kind of a "Wunderwaffe". Instead, the full implementation of it, i.e. the way it was conducted in Ukraine, is tied to a number of strategic and operational conditions which are met only in a few countries of the post-Soviet region. However, the fact that a full-scale hybrid war poses an acute threat only to a small number of countries does not mean Russia could not employ its hybrid toolbox, i.e. the perfectly coordinated use of political, diplomatic, economic, information and other measures against other countries, while pursuing a limited, dominantly non-military agenda.

Besides, researching the Russian hybrid war is also important, because one cannot exclude that other major powers may learn and adopt the methods Russia developed and use them in their own perceived zones of influence, for example, in East Asia. All in all, though the war in Ukraine seems to have calmed down, the importance of studying hybrid warfare is highly likely to prevail.

Facing the Kremlin: Better Brave, than Sorry!

Anke Schmidt-Felzmann

Much has been said about what 'the West' has done wrong in its dealings with Russia, what the Russian President may (or may not) be thinking and planning, where Russia is engaged (or not) and why. This contribution will develop its argument around the need for European decision-makers to deal with the Russia they are faced with, and not the Russia they wish to see. In short, they must learn their lessons from past mistakes and become both braver and wiser to fulfill their mandate and the solidarity pledge they made towards their European neighbors and partners. European leaders must do all they can to increase their resilience, to strengthen the European security order and to stand up for and defend the fundamental European values that have made the European continent attractive and prosperous since the end of the Second World War until today.

Learning lessons

Russia's aggressive response to developments in Ukraine during 2013 and onwards constituted a wake-up call for European decision-makers who had believed in the Russian leadership's commitment to realizing the 'shared vision' of a 'common European home'. The annexation of Crimea, the intrusion into Eastern Ukraine, and the propaganda warfare in and against 'the West' have made it clear President Putin really does not 'mean well' and that an approximation and gradual conversion of Russia's political system with the European Union is not on the cards. Still, in June 2013, Russia had been held in very high esteem as "a strategic partner with whom [European countries] had been building a solid and mutually beneficial relationship".[1] At the last ever EU-Russia Summit meeting in late

---

1 European Commission, *EU-Russia Summit (Yekaterinburg, 3-4 June)*, Press Release IP/13/490, 31 May 2013, http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-13-490_en.pdf .

January 2014, just a couple of weeks before a decision by the Kremlin would be taken - and implemented - to occupy and annex parts of Ukraine, President Putin had solemnly declared that Russia would always and fully respect Ukraine's sovereignty and had insisted that "Russia has no intention of ever intervening" in Ukraine's affairs.[2]

The Russian President's words, as well as actions that have been ordered by the Kremlin, give a clear indication the current Russian leadership is ruthless and deceitful, exploiting European weaknesses and capitalizing on the fact that European leaders are caught between the old vision of Russia as a friendly nation keen to modernize its economy and eager to reform its political, legal and economic structures and the new reality of being faced with a deceitful and conniving adversary who is in the process of reasserting its dominance at regional and global levels in direct opposition to the European project. Following the precedent of Russian troop's occupation of parts of Georgia and recognition of these "breakaway republics" as sovereign states, the occupation and annexation of Crimea and subsequent intrusion of Russian troops and influx of Russian military equipment into Eastern Ukraine provided overwhelming evidence of the deliberate and systematic expansion of Russia's "droit de regard" - by military force, violating state boundaries and fundamental international legal principles. The aggression against Ukraine confirmed also, beyond any reasonable doubt, that previous, smaller scale and lower intensity hostile acts were not one-off occurrences, but formed part of a larger pattern.

With evidence in hand of the systematic Russian challenge to the established regional and global security order, there can hardly be any doubt about the determination with which the current Russian leadership pursues its interests abroad and at home. Nor can there be any doubt about the extent to which its activist foreign and security policy is posing a threat to European security. Neither can there be any doubt after the start of Russia's military intervention in Syria that the Kremlin's engagement in international affairs is

---

2 President of Russia, Russia-EU Summit, Vladimir Putin took part in the Russia-EU summit meeting, 28 January 2014, http://en.kremlin.ru/events/president/news/20113

having a much more profound effect on Europe than many European leaders previously were ready to acknowledge. That the current Russian leadership is determined in the pursuit of its interests, and unwilling to compromise these, is important to acknowledge and necessary to address.[3] Lithuanian Foreign Minister Linkevicius had evidence on his side when he argued that "...we restored normal relations with Russia too quickly after the war in Georgia in 2008. We made a mistake, which has led to events in Ukraine and to Russia's creeping occupations."[4]

The European Union member states' decision, supported by their allies, to impose and maintain sanctions on Russia for its annexation of Crimea, along with the invasion and sustained military aggression against Ukraine, represented a significant shift away from the policy of "gradual change through ever closer engagement" with Russia that had characterized European leader's approach towards Russia during the preceding twenty-five years or so. It is crucial to remember that Russian actions strongly contradicted Russian statements and clearly demonstrated to European leaders that "Russia has [...] become an unpredictable power, and in addition one whose threshold for using military power [...] is lower than most observers had assumed."[5] If any lessons are to be learned from developments during the 2000s and until present, it is that the Russian regime must be treated as a rogue actor that has proven itself to be a serious threat to global peace, to regional stability, and to the territorial integrity of its neighbours.

3 Schmidt-Felzmann, A. The EU's relations with Russia: off balance and beyond repair?, in Antonina Bakardjieva-Engelbrekt, Lars Oxelheim, Thomas Persson and Moa Mårtensson (eds) The EU's Role in Fighting Global Imbalances. Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar, 2015, http://www.e-elgar.com/shop/the-eu-s-role-in-fighting-global-imbalances
4 Lithuanian Foreign Ministry, "L. Linkevicius: we need to strongly support Ukraine and to take a principled stance on Russia", 22 June 2015, https://www.urm.lt/default/en/news/l-linkevicius-we-need-to-strongly-support-ukraine-and-to-take-a-principled-stance-on-russia
5 NB: authors own translation, original: "Ryssland har nu blivit en oberäknelig makt, och dessutom med en tröskel för användning av militär makt i sitt närområde som är lägre än vad de flesta tidigare hade utgått från.", see Carl Bildt, 'Ett oberäkneligt Ryssland', 18 March 2014, Blog: Carl Bildt - Alla dessa dagar, https://carlbildt.wordpress.com/2014/03/18/ett-oberakneligt-ryssland/

Regroup and rethink: no illusions!

The evident deterioration of the principles and rather questionable morals displayed by the current Russian regime require a strong, united and unequivocal response by European leaders. The Kremlin and its representatives have to be left in no doubt whatsoever that European countries 'mean business', and that there will be consequences for any and every further and future transgression. European states and their allies will be taken more seriously by the Kremlin when they present a 'united front' signalling strong resolve – and when they back up words with action – in response to every Russian violation of international principles. The maintenance of a unity of purpose, and a common understanding of threats posed by Russia is therefore absolutely vital.

The current instinctive and almost automatic inclination by some European leaders to revert to a 'softer' and reconciliatory approach vis-à-vis the Russian regime is not only misplaced, but also dangerous. Russian political elites have fostered a climate of mistrust through a broad spectrum of antagonistic measures directed at European states which include Russian military actions, the failure to live up to political commitments, the use of trade instruments as a weapon and an aggressive campaign within Russia and in all EU member states aimed at discrediting influential representatives of European states that have publicly voiced their criticism of Russian practices as 'incapable' of addressing the contemporary domestic and international security challenges. As Ukraine's Ambassador to Germany, Andrej Melnyk, explained in October 2015: "Trust-building measures don't need new documents; central is what Russia does, that will rebuild trust".[6] The problem lies exactly in 'what Russia does'.

In this environment, the lessons of the past should serve as a reminder of the dangers associated with a 'normalization' of relations

---

6 See Tweet by @AJCBerlin about #DFS2015, sent on 13 October 2015,
https://twitter.com/AJCBerlin/status/653890618305941504

that some have argued for.[7] The fact, that the Kremlin sends contradictory signals to European leaders must not affect their principled stance on past violations. The lessons learned from Crimea, Eastern Ukraine and Syria are that verbal statements count for very little when they are not matched by the strategic objectives of Russian leadership. At a diplomatic level it should have become clear during 2014 and 2015 that the Kremlin ruthlessly, and in a calculated manner, uses a dual strategy of threatening its European "partners" with retaliation (should they dare to act against Russian interests), while at the same time insisting (although the incriminating evidence to the contrary is overwhelming) that Russia is a good, law-abiding partner and neighbor.

Keeping dialogue going with the Russian side is both necessary and wise. But to place too much faith and hope in continued dialogue that is pursued with Russian representatives, to the extent that dialogue and cooperation in itself are regarded as capable of bringing about the fundamental changes in Russia that would be necessary for European leaders to regain their trust in the Kremlin, is deeply problematic. The idea that "good cooperation" with Russia in a third, far-away country can lead to a more positive development in relations between Brussels and Moscow is equally naïve in light of the experiences and lessons learned in the Mediterranean region. While the Iran Deal has been hailed a success, it does not give any grounds for optimism as a success story of European cooperation with Russia.[8] This is because although Russian and European interests can overlap at certain points in time and on certain issues, they are never identical, and we can now – in hindsight - be quite certain the Kremlin's motivations for engaging with its European counterparts in regional and global conflicts differ quite fundamentally from the European motivation of developing a mutually beneficial, stable and long-term partnership with Russia.

---

7 See e.g. Euractiv, *Juncker: We can't let EU's relations with Russia be dictated by the US*, 2015, http://www.euractiv.com/sections/global-europe/juncker-we-cant-let-eu-relations-russia-be-dictated-us-318504
8 See the discussion in Schmidt-Felzmann, A. "The EU's relations with Russia: off balance and beyond repair?", in Antonina Bakardjieva-Engelbrekt, Lars Oxelheim, Thomas Persson and Moa Mårtensson (eds) The EU's Role in Fighting Global Imbalances. Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar, 2015.

Therefore, to continue speaking and thinking in terms of "we need Russia and Russia needs us" is neither productive nor helpful. Rather, it is necessary for European leaders to figure out how a cautious and ad hoc engagement with Russia on concrete issues can contribute to greater security, stability and prosperity in Europe and beyond - *despite* the fact that the current Russian regime cannot be trusted to live up to the commitments it makes, and in spite of the fact the Russian President cannot be trusted to speak the truth and act upon it.

Responding to Russia with resilience

It was an unprecedented and important step for European leaders to apply the set of sanctions that are in place to mark their disapproval of Russia's annexation of Crimea and the instigation and masterminding of the war in Ukraine that Russian forces are engaged in. But more than sanctions will be required in the medium and long-term to effectively deal with the current Russian regime. The startling readiness to assault sovereign states, their representatives and institutions, to ruthlessly lie and lash out at European partners and their allies and to politically, economically and militarily bully weaker neighbors [9], leaves hardly any doubt about the fact that verbal assurances issued by the Kremlin and its representatives have meant and mean very little in practice. European leaders must draw conclusions from this precarious situation.

While much depends on the Russian regime's ambitions and future choices, one thing that is in the power of European states and their allies is the maintenance of their unity of purpose and their unified response to any Russian transgression. It is certainly understandable that Europe's leaders are fearful of reviving past antagonisms, and wary of the negative consequences that putting pressure on Russia necessarily provokes. It is clear in hindsight, however, that the determination with which European leaders and their allies have pursued their approach of engagement and integration with Russia – at

---

9 See e.g. Schmidt-Felzmann, A. "Sweden-Russia relations: there is no back to 'business as usual'", *The Blog: International Voices,* 5 August 2015, http://www.ui.se/eng/blog/blog/2015/8/5/sweden-russia-relations-there-is-no-back-to-business-as-usual.aspx

almost any cost – has done Europe a great disservice. If European decision-makers are serious about fostering stability, security and prosperity, and defending the principles of democracy, individual human rights and the rule of law in Europe, then the Russian regime must not be allowed to outmanoeuvre EU and NATO members.

Since the Kremlin's approach to European states has always focused explicitly on individual states,[10] rather than the International Organizations they are part of, it hardly comes as a surprise that considerable efforts have been undertaken to carve holes into European and Transatlantic unity, while weakening the EU and NATO - the very pillars upon which the European security order has rested. In order to be able to withstand Russian pressure, European countries must therefore continue to build up their own resilience and defensive capabilities irrespective of the signals the Kremlin sends. In times of uncertainty, there is in fact one thing that stands out as a fundamental truth: it is better to be safe and prepared for all conceivable eventualities than to be sorry after the fact. In hindsight, when it turns out it would have been wiser to invest more and prepare better, it is already too late to address the problems that were side lined in the interest of a (misguided) 'efficient' use of resources, because an investment in other areas was regarded simply as so much more important.

The point is: when national security is concerned, it is better to err on the side of caution than to take risks that can become very costly for the whole country. That this will necessarily require redundancies is a fact. But the awful realization - after the fact - that too little was done, that harm to the population and damage to the state and national security could have been avoided had the necessary measures been taken - that realization invariably comes too late. Short term gains from savings made at the expense of greater resilience, deterrence and by extension security can turn into losses of a much larger dimension in the medium and long term.

---

10 See Schmidt-Felzmann, A., "Is the EU's failed relationship with Russia the member states' fault?" *L'Europe en Formation* n° 374, 40-60, URL: www.cairn.info/revue-l-europe-en-formation-2014-4-page-40.htm; Schmidt-Felzmann, A., "All for One? EU Member States and the Union's Common Policy towards the Russian Federation", *Journal of Contemporary European Studies*, 16 (2), 2008, 169-187, http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/14782800802309771#.Ul2IEFA4G-M

Arguments made about limited resources, and the need to prioritize among a range of important issues tend to gloss over the fact that it is not the lack of resources that is really the problem, but the way in which domestic and international priorities are being set and how the security situation is being assessed. For the foreseeable future, European leaders will have to concentrate on building up their defences, to strengthen their national resilience and to cooperate to reinforce stability within the EU and NATO in order to stand strong in the face of multiple Russian challenges to European and global security. Under the current circumstances, it is necessary to prepare even for the unthinkable.

Time to be brave and to face the unthinkable

Many commentators have dismissed Russian actions as irrational. Indeed, it may be more comforting to think of President Putin as a man who has lost grip of reality and has no clear plan, since this suggests that the current negative spiral may soon come to an end. But it is time to consider the uncomfortable alternatives: what if the Russian President has a clear plan? What if it is wrong to dismiss Russian actions as irrational? Maybe it is time to stop being surprised that the Kremlin, Russian state representatives and state-controlled media are systematically lying and fabricating stories. Perhaps it is time to stop being shocked at Russian aggression in all its different forms, and to face up to the ruthless Russian breaches of international rules – which Russia denies. It is perhaps even necessary to accept the possibility that there are no limits to what the Kremlin is ready to do, and how far the Russian President is willing to go. Past behaviour gives a strong indication that any established parameters will be broken if the Kremlin perceives the necessity to defend its interest abroad and at home by pushing the boundaries even further. Maybe there simply are no taboos for the current Russian leadership. Blatant lies are delivered with a smile. Pride is taken in deception. Assume nothing else from Russia, and start facing the Russian state as it has presented itself, in actions and words, towards its European 'partners' and neighbours.

As Russia's aggression and economic and political bullying tactics against Ukraine continue, while Russian hostility against the EU and NATO is also increasing in intensity, it is absolutely vital for the EU and its member states to embark on the difficult process of dealing with the uncertainties created by the antagonistic regime in Moscow. Only a strong, principled and unified response by European states and their allies to each and every Russian transgression in the regional and global arena - in words and in actions - can make a contribution to helping constrain the regime's actions. Thinking the unthinkable and planning for the unthinkable is therefore absolutely vital in the uncertain environment that the Kremlin's words and actions have created.

The Swedish Foreign Minister Margot Wallström has been both praised and criticized for the pursuit of what the new Swedish government labelled and launched in 2014 as a "feminist foreign policy". Regardless of which side you agree with, her statement that "...it is time to become a little braver in foreign policy" – and that it is necessary to stand up for democracy and human rights, and that it is important not to back down when resistance is encountered from adversaries can indeed be regarded as an important truth that also applies to European relations with Russia.[11] Allowing the Russian regime to continuously push the boundaries of what is acceptable and allowing the Kremlin to engage in rogue behavior is not just undesirable, but dangerous, and confirms the lingering suspicions that European leaders are neither strategic nor sagacious in their approach to contemporary Russia. To make sure the Russian president will not "get away with murder", European leaders and their advisors need to confront head on the probability their Russian counterparts share neither their norms and values nor their wish to develop a mutually beneficial relationship. The Russian regime may not even share the desire of ensuring lasting peace on the continent.

An acceptance that Russian national security interests, the pursuit of power and their own survival, rank above all other con-

---

11 See Nordberg, Jenny, "Who's Afraid of a Feminist Foreign Policy?", New Yorker, 2015, http://www.newyorker.com/news/news-desk/swedens-feminist-foreign-minister

siderations requires that greater investments are made in intellectual and material resources to prepare effective responses for all imaginable and even unthinkable scenarios. Making such an investment requires strong political leadership, a clear vision and bravery on the part of national politicians who will need to stand strong in the face of the aggressor. But when it comes down to it – it is certainly better to be brave and safe, than to be sorry.

Crafting a Dynamic Russia Policy

Janusz Bugajski

Russia presents the most persistent security threat to the West. President Vladimir Putin's neo-imperial goals undermine the stability of several regions from northern Europe to Central Asia, challenge NATO as a security provider, and undercut the EU project. Russia also establishes a dangerous precedent for other ambitious powers that may seek to test NATO and US resolve.

There are two fundamentally contrasting strategies for US and NATO policy toward a resurgent Russia: imperial accommodation or Transatlantic reassertion. In the former approach, a number of Putin appeasers or those urging patience and non-provocation have been proposing another "reset" or even a "détente" with Moscow. They operate on the premise that Russia possesses some distinct special interests toward its numerous neighbors that Washington should acknowledge and encourage these countries to submit to a more aggressive power.

In practice, as evident in Russia's assertive foreign policy since Putin assumed power, Russia's "national interests" include determining its neighbors' foreign and security policies, dominating their economies, deciding on their administrative structures, formulating their constitutions, regulating the extent of their territories, and selecting their international alliances.

An accommodationist approach that concedes some special "national interests" to Russia is not only unacceptable to all independent states that emerged from the Soviet Union and the Soviet bloc, but it also whets Moscow's appetite for further imperial aggrandizement. Paradoxically, consenting to Russia's aggressive and asymmetrical "national interests" toward neighbors is more likely to result in a collision with NATO and the EU than a more dynamic approach. If the Kremlin operates with the conviction it has a relatively free hand to openly and methodically undermine countries along its borders, this can result in miscalculations when it overreaches, provokes a regional crisis, or sparks a direct conflict with neighbors who are Alliance members.

An additional argument used by those favoring accommodation with Moscow's aggressive neighborhood policy is simply to dismiss Russia as a declining power. Such a deterministic approach ignores the prospect that even during a period of economic deterioration Russia can create significant damage to its neighbors and undermine Western security and cohesion. An inadequate policy response to Russia's revanchism simply reinforces Western complacency and encourages further assertiveness by Moscow. Moreover, the most effective way to ensure Russia's decline and retreat from its neo-imperial project is through an activist policy that hastens such a process.

In contrast to an accommodationist approach, Transatlantic assertiveness toward Russia will include both tests and benefits for the future of the NATO alliance and EU structure. For instance, it will impact directly on the role of the EU in its agenda for closer association in the eastern neighborhood. It will test the political unity of the Union in the face of Moscow's aggressive empire building, its growing pressure on vulnerable European capitals, and its blatant disregard of international norms. No one can be certain whether EU member states will bear prolonged sanctions against Russia and mount an effective defense of the EU's and NATO's eastern flank. Conversely, they may succumb to compromises in order to pacify Moscow and inadvertently encourage future Kremlin ambitions.

At the very least, a Transatlantic commitment is needed to strengthen state sovereignty, national institutions, and market economies of all former Soviet bloc countries and republics bordering Russia, particularly NATO partners such as Ukraine, Georgia, Moldova, and Azerbaijan. The strategic standoff with Moscow will also provide an opportunity for Washington to consolidate the defense of key allies in the region, including Poland, Romania, and the three Baltic States. Washington will need to factor in the changing security perceptions of several Central and East European allies since the Ukrainian crisis erupted. A range of measures has already been initiated or implemented to more effectively protect the security of each NATO ally, but much more needs to be accomplished in the coming years.

The overriding question in Tallinn, Riga, and Vilnius is whether NATO can respond adequately and swiftly to defend its most exposed members. In terms of conventional military threats, it is essential to have an effective tripwire by ensuring the presence of soldiers from various NATO members, including the US, on a permanent basis in these countries. Moves in this direction, through air policing units, regular training and military exercises, and the creation of small bases to accommodate the planned NATO Rapid Reaction Force, were taken as the war in Ukraine unfolded during 2014. But there are fears these measures rely more on symbolism than substance and without a more permanent stationing of international NATO forces and equipment among the frontline states they could be quickly overrun by a Russian assault.

NATO has drawn up defense plans for Poland, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, including guarantees of NATO's military response to outside attacks. East Central Europe and the Baltic region have also gained more regular NATO military exercises. Deliberations have also intensified over the potential hosting of US and NATO military infrastructure. However, at the NATO Summit on 4 – 5 September 2014, Alliance leaders did not endorse the positioning of permanent bases in the region despite the urging of Warsaw and the three Baltic governments. Instead, they agreed to create a spearhead contingent within the existing NATO Response Force (NRF) – a Very High Readiness Joint Task Force (VJTF). Once formed, it would be capable of deploying at short notice along NATO's periphery and would consist of land, air, maritime, and Special Operations Force components.

The VJTF is to include 4,000 troops trained to move on 48 hours' notice to hotspots in any NATO member state. Nonetheless, it would be too small to counter the massive military might Russia has deployed along its western frontier. The spearhead force was to be part of a wider NATO response force of 13,000 to 30,000 troops that could take weeks to deploy in a crisis. It will benefit from equipment and logistics facilities pre-positioned in the front line countries, but the troops will not be permanently stationed in the region. The force could evidently be used as a mobile tripwire when

dispatched to a threatened state. However, at this early stage in its planned deployment, it is difficult to estimate the effectiveness of a relatively small VJTF contingent in deterring either the subversion or outright invasion of a NATO member by Russia.

On 5 February 2015, NATO decided to establish six command centers in Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, and Bulgaria. They will plan contingencies and organize exercises, and will be key for connecting national forces with NATO reinforcements. They will be used for logistics, reconnaissance, and planning missions, and contain permanent multinational staff consisting of between 300 and 600 persons in each center. The multinational headquarters for the command and control centers will be located in Szczecin, on Poland's Baltic coast. General Philip Breedlove proposed that Szczecin expand its existing base to help NATO respond faster to any threat posed by Russia. NATO allies backed the general's plans to store weapons, ammunition, and ration packs to enable a sudden influx of thousands of NATO troops in the event of a crisis.

In June 2015, Washington decided to store heavy weapons including tanks and infantry fighting vehicles in Poland that could be used in training exercises and outfit one brigade in the event of war. Up to 5,000 NATO troops could be equipped with the weapons, thus enabling a rapid reaction brigade to deploy at short notice. This decision precipitated a furious response from Russian officials who claimed that NATO was moving closer to Russia's borders, failing to point out that Moscow had provoked the build-up by significantly reinforcing its military presence close to NATO's borders.

US Defense Secretary Ashton Carter announced on a visit to Estonia on 23 June 2015 that the US would deploy heavy weapons, including 250 tanks, armored vehicles, and howitzer artillery guns, in Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Romania. Each set of equipment would be enough for a battalion of 750 soldiers. The equipment would be moved around the region to help in training and improving mobility. The positioning of military hardware without the presence of US troops is premised on the assumption that local armed forces would be capable of defending the country

for a sufficient period of time from a Russian assault to allow for the timely arrival of American and other NATO units.

In the wake of the escalating confrontation between the West and Russia, policy recommendations for Washington and the EU capitals need to focus on consolidating a dynamic Transatlantic alliance, repelling a belligerent Russia, promoting regional stability along Russia's borders, and preparing for a potential implosion of the Russian Federation. These policy proposals can be grouped into the following categories:

Multi-regional policy agenda

Develop a long-term Transatlantic policy toward states bordering Russia that are not currently NATO or EU members. Such an agenda should be based on the following principles: maintaining state independence and territorial integrity; preventing and deterring any single power from dominating the political or economic systems of neighbors or determining their foreign and security policies; pursuing closer political, economic, legal and institutional relations with western states and multi-national organizations; and setting targets for eventual institutional integration into NATO and the EU for all countries that qualify for and seek membership.

Threat monitoring

Anticipate Moscow's actions through enhanced intelligence gathering and information sharing. This requires more intensive monitoring of threats emanating from Russia, especially in the use of its multi-pronged arsenal of subversion against neighboring states. Western intelligence services should also seek to determine to what extent Moscow's operations to destabilize neighbors are controlled and coordinated by the Kremlin's presidential administration and what roles are played by specific individuals. At the same time, map and document Russia's propaganda resources and Moscow-financed media agencies, agents of influence, and political parties throughout Europe that are pro-Kremlin in orientation. Expose and

publicize the links of western organizations, foundations, agencies, NGOs, journalists, politicians, and academics with Russia's various state agencies and Kremlin-connected individuals.

Informational campaigns

Invest in defensive strategic communications in order to expose the Kremlin's false narratives. While Russia's propaganda messages are relatively simple and emotional, the West's are often too complex regarding the conflict with Russia and therefore lack the same broad public appeal. Western policy makers should focus on developing several key themes in their communications approach, such as providing a compelling narrative challenging Russia's disinformation, fostering skepticism toward Russia's media outlets, and exposing the Kremlin-financed support network in the West. The western narrative should focus on the values of individual freedom, democracy and the rule of law.

International ostracism

Isolate the Russian government internationally through diplomatic, institutional, and economic measures. Diplomatically, US and EU leaders must consistently insist that by occupying any part of Ukrainian territory, together with portions of Georgia and Moldova, Russia violates numerous international accords, beginning with the UN Charter, and will not be treated as an equal partner or a credible international interlocutor. The West must focus on Russia's vulnerabilities, including denying access to western capital and assets by the pro-Putin Russian elite. Many more names could be added to the sanctions list, including government ministers, parliamentarians, senior state bureaucrats, regional and municipal leaders, businessmen, journalists, and academicians with ties to the Kremlin.

Economic instruments

Accelerate the development of the European Energy Union in order to reduce Moscow's ability to manipulate oil and gas supplies as leverage against western states. Gazprom and other Russian companies should be competitively pushed out of Europe's energy market, thus seriously depleting Kremlin export earnings and political influences. Additionally, the West must avoid institutional engagement with the Eurasian Economic Union (EEU), as this would lend the organization credibility and legitimize Russia's empire building. Instead, the EU should develop closer bilateral economic and political relations with countries that have been incorporated into the Eurasian Union – Belarus, Kazakhstan, and Armenia – but may seek future alternatives.

NATO enhancement

Underscore that a strong NATO alliance is the backbone of European security and preclude proposals for a European Army, which simply dilutes and distracts from the only capable multi-national Western security organization. A European Army would not only siphon off NATO's already limited assets and resources, but it would also trigger rivalry between Europe and North American over the deployment of military forces. It could also split Europe between countries committed to close security relations with the US and states at a safe distance from Russia that see little need for American security guarantees. Such an outcome would in effect grant Moscow a strategic victory over NATO.

Concurrently, the Washington Treaty needs to be amended, especially Article 5, and the definition of an attack on a NATO member state. This needs to reflect the challenges associated with contemporary warfare to include non-state actors, externally generated insurgencies, cyberattacks, information warfare, and other forms of subversion aimed at undermining state independence or truncating its territory. This must be mirrored in reviving NATO's fundamental mandate and ensuring that capabilities match commitments in defending Alliance members.

NATO's vitality must also be demonstrated by issuing membership invitations to Montenegro and Macedonia during or before the Warsaw Summit in July 2016. In addition, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Georgia, and Ukraine need to obtain NATO Membership Action Plans (MAP) to confirm that they will also join the Alliance at a future date. NATO also needs to pursue closer military cooperation with Moldova, Azerbaijan, and Armenia to prevent their potential capitulation to Russia.

Combating threats

Prepare for a wide assortment of unconventional threats among frontline NATO states. This must include penetrating intelligence; detection, early warnings, and rapid preparations for a foreign assault; effective communications between central and local governments; comprehensive border controls; consolidation of a professional and loyal police force; and capabilities to pursue intensive and prolonged anti-guerrilla operations. There must also be a focus on conventional warfare. According to Adrian Bradshaw, NATO's deputy supreme commander, the Alliance should prepare for a Blitzkrieg-type assault by Russia on east European member states and not be sidetracked by "hybrid" or low intensity attacks.

The defense of front line states must be strengthened. Each NATO state bordering Russia requires three fundamental elements: adequate infrastructure and prepositioned equipment to allow for speedy deployment of indigenous and other NATO forces; early warning of Russian subversion and covert attack; and capable forces that can respond quickly to an assault on a country's territorial integrity. Each state also needs the positioning of US and West European forces on a permanent basis as a tripwire against potential Russian attack.

Ensuring imperial indigestion

Preclude the digestion of any occupied territories by Moscow by making such an operation expensive and painful. This will require

western defense aid to Ukraine, Georgia, and other states threatened by Moscow. Priorities must include intelligence-sharing, technology for cyber defense, and secure military command and control. Ukraine's army needs technical assistance as well as combat equipment to resist Russian military incursions and Kyiv must develop a credible territorial defense force that would make any occupation protracted and costly. Training for Ukraine's recently formed National Guard in territorial defense and in insurgency and counter-insurgency operations remains critical. In all NATO Partnership for Peace states bordering Russia, assistance in constructing more effective territorial defense forces, security services, and law enforcement bodies will improve their resilience to Moscow's subversion.

Western capitals must avoid the political pitfalls of negotiating with Russia over territories that Moscow has carved out of neighboring states, whether through proxies (as in Ukraine's Donbas) or dissatisfied local politicians (as in Georgia's Abkhazia and South Ossetia). Washington and Brussels have been complicit in pushing Kyiv to amend its constitution and provide a special constitutional status to rebel-held areas in the Donbas. Such short-sighted moves to attain a temporary peace will provide credibility to the separatist groups, legitimize Russia's war of aggression against Ukraine, and encourage the Kremlin to prepare subsequent acts of political subversion and territorial partition. It may also stimulate ethno-territorial secession in the broader region, undermine Western security guarantees, and challenge a number of European borders from which Moscow will profit. Simmering conflict in Donbas will preoccupy governments and mediators, enable Moscow to encroach on Ukraine's sovereignty, and threaten to reignite a renewed war similarly to what has been witnessed in Georgia, Azerbaijan, and Moldova.

Systemic transformation

Thwart Russia's expansionist ambitions by undermining the Putinist regime. A strategy needs to be developed to weaken Kremlin control over the Russian Federation, not only through sanctions and

isolation but also by supporting minority rights, regional self-determination, and national independence movements from Kaliningrad to Chukotka and from Karelia to Dagestan. Washington and Brussels must consistently assert that if the current administration is not replaced with a non-imperialist and pro-democratic successor, Russia will increasingly face ethnic and religious conflicts and territorial fracture. Russia's numerous ethnic groups should be encouraged to preserve their culture, language, heritage, and history, while promoting their autonomy and self-determination. This is consistent with western support for individual freedom, democracy, and human rights.

Policy makers need to assess the possible consequences of a chaotic end to the Putinist system and prepare contingencies for the conflicts that this may generate and the opportunities that this will provide for the West. In particular, Russia's neighbors must be shielded from the most destabilizing scenarios of civil conflict and the country's violent disintegration. A peaceful change of leadership or a bloodless dissolution of the Russian Federation would be the preferable alternatives to a civil war that could spill over the country's borders.

Ultimately, the uncertainty over Russia's future may be resolved through two possible scenarios: either Russia transforming itself into a responsible international player without neo-imperial aspirations toward its neighbors or the Russian Federation fracturing with the emergence of a smaller and weaker Russia that can eventually co-exist with Europe's democracies and multi-national institutions. Given the ongoing collision with Ukraine and the Kremlin's extensive imperial aspirations, the first scenario seems highly unlikely for the foreseeable future. In the light of the policies pursued during the Putin presidency at a time of prolonged economic decline, the latter scenario seems more probable, although the timescale and multi-regional impact of a Russia implosion remains highly unpredictable.

Without Hegemony, the Middle East Needs Its Own Concert of Powers

Volker Perthes

There seems to be a persistent, strong belief among Arab think-ers and commentators that somehow the international powers of the day will redefine the geopolitical divisions in the Middle East. A recent Google search in Arabic for the term "new Sykes-Picot" (سايكس بيكو جديد) generated 364,000 hits. But Internet surfers will likely go on to search in vain for a scheme by Western imperi-alists to forge a new order in the Middle East. International powers will still defend what they regard as their vital interests in the re-gion. Given the recent experiences in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Libya though, American and European leaders have adopted a stance of what might be called "defensive geopolitics". These external ac-tors will try to contain risks inside the region, to resolve conflicts with and between regional states, and to enhance the capacities of regional partners. Americans and Europeans must be prepared to nurture diplomatic processes and they will even maintain security guarantees to allies. Still, they will need to tread lightly, hesitating to involve themselves militarily on the ground, refraining from re-gime-change attempts, and not trying to redraw the political or geo-political maps of the region. While Russia has begun to defend its ally in Damascus with military force, it is likely to try to limit its in-volvement to an air campaign. Its goal seems to be treshufflement of the Syrian cards so as to give the government in Damascus a better starting position for eventual negotiations. In short, regional actors will be the key architects of the future shape of the Middle East.

In many respects, this is not the Middle East we have known, or thought we knew, since the formation of what used to be called an Arab or Middle Eastern regional system. On the regional geopo-litical level, weights and balances have shifted significantly. Yet no

stable alliances have emerged, and there is no regional hegemon. Neither do we see a repetition, even with re-distributed roles, of the Arab Cold War of the 1950s and 1960s, in which self-declared revolutionary republics positioned themselves against traditionalist monarchies in an ideological struggle over the shape of the regional order. Today, the post-Ottoman system of states and borders seems to be dissolving, with no one ready to put it together again.

Indeed, for the first time in the contemporary Middle East, neither Syria nor Iraq is among the active players on the regional scene. Instead, these two former champions of Arab nationalism and Ba`thism – Syria more so than Iraq – have become the space where regional conflicts converge and fester. Egypt is largely occupied with itself. Turkey remains a non-Arab outsider whose Ottoman past does not necessarily translate into soft power. Israel may no longer be the main focus of the Arab public's ire, but it has not been able to integrate successfully into the region. Further, it may well miss a final opportunity for a two-state solution and sleepwalk into a one-state reality instead.

In this comparative vacuum, Saudi Arabia and Iran have emerged as the main regional antagonists. But neither has the capacity to become a regional hegemon. Saudi Arabia and other Gulf Arab states fear what they regard as Iran's hegemonic aspirations (which Tehran denies). In fact, Iran simply lacks the potential to attain a regional hegemonic position. Hegemony implies leadership, and leaders need followers. Iran may provide orientation and limited support for parts of the Shiite population in Lebanon, Iraq, or in Arab Gulf countries. In the broader landscape of the Middle East and North Africa, though, Iran – a Shiite, Persian country – is stuck with being a dual minority. Tehran is clearly aware of this limitation. Iran can support specific groups, can lend material or military aid to its allies, or even use sectarian militias to build influence in other Mid-Eastern countries. It can act as a spoiler or decide to support inclusive political solutions. But it can never realistically aspire to lead the region.

Sunni groups and elites in countries like Lebanon, Syria or Iraq doubtlessly regard Saudi Arabia as an ally and a source of support. Yet, with only about 20 million Saudi citizens, Saudi Arabia lacks the demographic weight and the military power (which is not just a matter of hardware) of Egypt (population 82 million) or Iran (population 78 million). Also, in its own way, Saudi Arabia is too minoritarian to assert regional leadership. The country's cultural and socio-political model and its exclusionary Wahhabi version of Islam do not have sufficient appeal in more pluralistic Muslim-majority countries to allow Riyadh a hegemonic position.

Without the active leadership of Riyadh and Tehran, however, the region is unlikely to find a new equilibrium. To start with, both countries have proven that they function, which is no small feat. Iran has increased its potential significantly by concluding the nuclear agreement, which could lead to a normalization of relations with European powers, and perhaps even the United States. Of course, Iran has yet to decide whether it wants to use this new clout in a constructive manner. For its part, contrary to the predictions of many pundits, Saudi Arabia has navigated a successful leadership transition. It has since assumed a more assertive regional role. And while there are legitimate doubts the military campaign in Yemen will help to stabilize that country, Riyadh has demonstrated it will actively counter what it sees as Iranian inroads into the Arab world.

Today, the unfettered antagonism of Riyadh and Tehran and its manifestations on the ground in Yemen, Syria, Iraq and other places is contributing to the fragmentation of the region and the spread of sectarianism. To lead the region into safer waters, Saudi Arabia and Iran would have to significantly alter their attitudes and their postures. Instead of antagonists who clash through proxies, they would need to become the protagonists of a regional concert of powers that would also have to include other relevant states such as Turkey, Egypt, the UAE, and Jordan.

Historical analogies are always difficult; but they can be of heuristic value. So perhaps instead of looking to a period in which European powers imposed a new, enduring order on the Middle East,

we should look to a period in which European powers imposed a new, enduring order on themselves. At the Vienna Congress of 1815, Europe's great, conservative powers reorganized the regional order after the devastation of the Napoleonic wars. They established the Concert of Europe, which lasted for nearly a century and could serve as a model for today's main players in the Middle East.

While such a prospect may seem far-fetched, several factors may enhance the chances for such an exercise in regional-power diplomacy. And Syria may be the proving ground. The United States now seems prepared to accept an Iranian role in a political settlement in Syria. Russia and Western powers would have to agree not to let their differences over Ukraine add further fuel to conflicts in the Middle East. Most players have realized the Syria conflict will not be won militarily by anyone's client. Only an international-cum-regional diplomatic effort and a political settlement will make it possible to rescue Syria as a state, defeat the so-called Islamic State, and prevent a region-wide conflagration that is unlikely to be contained within the Levant.

TOWARDS SECURITY AND RESILIENCE IN THE BALTICS

The Baltic Intelligence War: Hotting Up and Back to the Cold

Mark Galeotti

The exchange on 26 September 2015 of kidnapped Estonian security police (Kapo) officer Eston Kohver for the convicted Russian spy Aleksei Dressen, only served to underline how the Baltic States are now the crucible of an intelligence war reminiscent of the Cold War. Once, it was the Glienicke Bridge west of divided Berlin which was the "bridge of spies", but now the front line is along the Russian border.

Russia has launched a sustained, aggressive and multi-vectored intelligence campaign against the Baltic States – and by extension NATO and the European Union through them – and although the Baltics have displayed unexpectedly effective counter-intelligence capabilities, nonetheless there is a clear disparity in the scale of resources on each side. With Moscow mounting not just traditional intelligence-gathering operations but also active measures designed to divide, destabilise and demoralise the Baltic States, this is also a challenge which requires an equally broad and imaginative response.

The challenge

Russian intelligence operations in the West overall are generally reckoned to be back at Cold War peak levels of scale and operational tempo. Even in 2010, before the current crisis in relations, Britain's Security Service (MI5) was warning that, "The number of Russian intelligence officers in London is at the same level as in Soviet times," such that, in the words of one officer: "The threat from Russian espionage continues to be significant and is similar to the Cold War."[1] This is a multi-agency effort, primarily the responsibility of Russia's Foreign Intelligence Service (SVR), the military Main Intelligence Directorate (GRU) of the General Staff, and increasing-

---

1 *Guardian*, 29 June 2010

ly also the powerful Federal Security Service (FSB). While the FSB is primarily still a domestic security agency, it is increasingly active abroad, especially in political operations and eliminating terrorist or political threats at home (in 2006, for example, it was formally authorized to carry out assassinations outside Russia). The FSB is also Russia's lead cyber espionage agency.

If anything, the Baltic region is experiencing an even more obtrusive and aggressive intelligence campaign, involving everything from conventional information gathering to direct "active measures". Many intelligence officers operate under diplomatic cover; according to Latvian's Constitutional Protection Bureau (SAB), up to 40 percent of Russian diplomatic staff in Riga, for example, are actually spies.[2] However there is also a substantial contingent of undercover "illegals", especially within either ethnic Russian Baltics or the sizeable population of visiting Russians, ranging from those visiting family, and tourists to business people.

First of all, they are seeking intelligence not just on local military capabilities, but wider NATO structures. For instance, in December 2014, two Lithuanians were arrested, charged with working for Belarusian military intelligence and possibly by extension Russia's GRU, and another was arrested near the airbase at Šiauliai, believed to be seeking to collect information on Lithuanian and NATO operations.[3]

Secondly, they are gathering political intelligence, but not simply to inform Moscow but also as the basis for active measures intended to influence, divide and destabilise the Baltic States, in conjunction with state controlled and state influenced media.[4] The latest report from Kapo accuses Moscow of seeking to use covert information operations "aiming to influence public opinion and organisations, as well as the political and economic elite...in line with Russia's foreign-policy interests."[5] In May 2015, for example, Lithuanian prosecutors charged a Russian citizen with being an FSB agent

2 *Baltic News Service,* 6 March 2013
3 *Baltic News Service,* 4 May 2015
4 See Nerijus Maliukevičius, '"Tools of Destabilization": Kremlin's Media Offensive in Lithuania,' *Journal on Baltic Security* 1, no. 1 (2015) and Peter Pomerantsev and Michael Weiss, *The Menace of Unreality: How the Kremlin Weaponizes Information, Culture and Money* (New York: IMR, 2014).
5 *Annual Review of the Internal Security Service, 2014* (Tallinn: Ministry of Internal Affairs, 2014), p. 6

seeking to "penetrate governing institutions, law enforcement, and intelligence services" in a bid to "access information known only to Lithuanian leaders with the aim of manipulating and influencing decision-making processes at the top level."[6] After all, in the words of the 2014 threat assessment from Lithuania's State Security Department (VSD), "SVR officers seek to disseminate views consistent with Russian interests among Lithuanian politicians, experts, journalists and other opinion makers."[7]

Many operations revolve around leveraging the sizeable and often disgruntled local ethnic Russian populations, but others simply involve identifying and supporting divisive local movements. Bodies such as Estonia's Legal Information for Human Rights, the Latvian Human Rights Committee and the so-called People's Republic of Latgale movement have at times been accused of being front organizations supported by Russia — claims they deny. In 2014, the VSD actually went to the extent of publicly warning parents and communities that some Russian-language institutions organize events that are really "paramilitary camps" and those attending "become potential targets of intelligence services of hostile states".[8]

The criminal dimension

While many intelligence agencies sometimes, and selectively, use gangsters for particular purposes, Russia's are relatively distinctive for the breadth and depth of their relationships with organized crime groups, especially those of Russian origin. This was illustrated in especially dramatic form when an FSB snatch squad detained Eston Kohver from crossing the Estonian border in September 2014 while he was investigating smuggling operations, but a much wider trend is also very visible in Ukraine.[9]

On the one hand, Russians use organized crime links to further their intelligence operations by gathering information or even

6 *RFE/RL,* 4 May 2015
7 State Security Department of the Republic of Lithuania, *Annual Threat Assessment 2014* (Vilnius: VSD, 2014), p. 5
8 State Security Department of the Republic of Lithuania, *Annual Review 2014* (Vilnius: VSD, 2014), p. 20
9 Mark Galeotti, 'Crime And Crimea: Criminals As Allies And Agents,' *RFE/RL,* 3 November 2014
@ http://www.rferl.org/content/crimea-crime-criminals-as-agents-allies/26671923.html

engaging in or facilitating criminal activities to raise funds for operational purposes. This allows them to avoid needing to transfer money from government sources, combining frugality and deniability in one amorally efficient exercise. The FSB, for instance, stands accused of partnering with organized crime to smuggle goods across the border, especially unlicensed or counterfeit cigarettes, and using the proceeds for operational uses including, presumably, bankrolling useful organizations or politicians.[10] Indeed, some sources suggest they are involved in the increasing industrial-scale smuggling of counterfeit cigarettes into the region via Belarus.[11]

However, this is a blade that cuts both ways. There are also numerous indications that suggest intelligence organizations do not only make use of their criminal counterparts, they also become used and corrupted by them. Officers involved in facilitating criminal activities often enrich themselves in the process, for example. Furthermore, at local or national levels, the intelligence agencies may find their resources being diverted to criminal uses. Just as Canadian GRU agent Jeffrey Delisle discovered when tasked with the job of finding out how much the police knew about Russian gangsters operating in Canada,[12] so too it is hard to know where espionage ends and simple crime begins.

10 *Guardian*, 18 September 2014
11 'Cargo Trains Smuggle Cigarettes From Belarus Into The European Union,' Belarus Digest, 17 December 2014
@ http://belarusdigest.com/story/cargo-trains-smuggle-cigarettes-belarus-european-union-20830
12 'Brian Stewart: Was Canada's Delisle spying for the Russian mob?', *CBC News*, 7 February 2013
@ http://www.cbc.ca/m/touch/news/story/1.1351173

The response and prospects

The Baltic have a range of strengths, both general and particular. Estonia's Kapo, for example, has a string of successes to its name, and the country has disproportionately effective online intelligence and counter-intelligence capacity. This is perhaps unsurprising given both its commitment to e-government and its experiences of massive Russian-orchestrated cyberattacks in 2007. All three countries in recent years have expelled Russian agents under diplomatic cover and arrested others who lack such protection.

However, they also have numerous vulnerabilities. These are small countries which lack the financial and human capacity to maintain large security agencies. They also all have sizeable ethnic Russian minorities (5.8 percent in Lithuania, 24.8 percent in Estonia, and 26.9 percent in Latvia). Moscow looks to these to recruit assets, but this also makes it easier for Russia to send operatives in the guise of visiting family, and for them to be less obtrusive when in-country. There are also specific issues. Latvia's banking system, for example, while going through serious reform, has for a long time been susceptible to use for money laundering, something which has helped embed criminal connections for Moscow to use.

While there is no question but that they have numerous successes to their name – and their Russian counterparts appear taken aback at how effective they have been – the Baltic States' counter-intelligence community, even with the active support of their allies, cannot prevent the escalation of Russian operations. As NATO and EU members, they are regarded as important not only in their own right, but also as potential conduits into other countries' intelligence complexes and also alliance politics. One of the key aims of the Kremlin, after all, is to sow dismay, discord and division within NATO and the European Union, and minimize their capacity to act in a focused and coherent way against Russia's adventures abroad. As a result, they will continue to be at the front line of the Russo-Western intelligence war, one increasingly coming to resemble that of the old Cold War days.

The Challenges of Hybrid-Warfare and Cyber-Threats: The Role of Self-Defense in a Changing Security Environment

Mārtiņš Daugulis

Introduction

State and regional safety and defense of the twenty first century comes with brand new security challenges. Beyond geopolitical issues that can be linked with ambitions of particular states, and struggling regions where societies are in transition, there is a "challenge umbrella" that interconnects all security agendas on the planet at one particular moment - which is the hybrid-warfare and cyber-issues phenomena. As new phenomena, of course, clear definitions and normative frameworks are still under construction, despite the need of governments and the overall population of the Western society to face cyber and hybrid threats on day-to-day basis. Taking into account the complexity of the issue, the author, using the possibility of a conference paper format will address only one angle of problem which is the role of self-defense in very specific twenty first century security matters.

Hybrid-warfare, "perceptional challenges", and solutions

For clarification of terminology, cyber-threats are seen as a part of hybrid-warfare in the context of this article, following the definition of hybrid-warfare by Daniel van Puyveld.[1] According to the fore mentioned security analyst, the term "hybrid-warfare" which is an active spin since the Ukraine crisis (mainly used for the evaluation

---

1 Daniel Van Puyveld, "Hybrid war – does it even exist?", 2015, http://www.nato.int/docu/review/2015/Also-in-2015/hybrid-modern-future-warfare-russia-ukraine/EN/

and description of Russia's complex strategy and role in that particular crisis) is a useless term. Quoting Puyveld: "Any threat can be hybrid as long as it is not limited to a single form and dimension of warfare. When any threat or use of force is defined as hybrid, the term loses its value and causes confusion instead of clarifying the "reality" of modern warfare".[2] At the same time, more closely associated with hybrid-warfare are the new security challenges which include instruments of a technological progress. According to Brian Fleming[3] and Theodor Frunzetti[4] the infusion of modern technology, information warfare and globalization, increase the ability of hybrid adversaries to mitigate the conventional military superiority of particular actors and their conventional beliefs. Thus it is already on the edge of self-understanding in various analysts' perspectives that hybrid threats will prevail in the future; therefore it is essential for militaries to prepare for them. *The essential question is how to prepare for threats that cannot be even clearly identifiable?*

The answer can be seen from two perspectives: first, a normative and legislative insight – if some phenomena are uneasily definable it does not mean the "definers" should give up. The biggest problem from this perspective is the variety of hybrid-war understandings from a classical perspective. Governments, militarists, general public, and academics – each own and perceive their own understanding about what hybrid-war is, and, logically, see a wide range of solutions which cannot be implemented in a well-organized manner. An exit strategy can be a very strict defining of what hybrid-warfare really is – and definitely initiated by a one actor state. This "initiation" from a state perspective and "strict-definition" is, in fact, a challenge with an easy solution – legislation. The precise definition of hybrid-warfare in state's legislative normative acts is the only proper way for all included actors find "the look" in the proper direction. Putting it

2 Ibid.
3 Fleming, Brian P. "The Hybrid Threat Concept: Contemporary War, Military Planning and the Advent of Unrestricted Operational Art." School of Advanced Military Studies United States Army Command and General Staff College Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, 2011.p.37.
4 Frunzetti, Theodor. "Asymmetric, Unconventional and Hybrid Actions in 21st Century Warfare." Strategic Impact 1, no. 46 (2013): p.9.

into a simpler manner – from the wide range of "definitions of what hybrid-warfare really is", the state should take the initiative to fix the pole of understanding. This will opt-out several bonuses: first, a strict definition of hybrid-warfare allows an explanation to the general public about the motivation of a state, military sector, etc. – we do what we do because according to these and these regulations we are at the stage of hybrid-war. Secondly, it is drawing red lines for a potential aggressor with a clear message not to cross. Thirdly, within the state all included actors and sectors have a clearer understanding about how to act under pressure in hybrid-war activities. Of course, a harmonized legislation on new modes of war would be ideal in the current security challenges, but the same time we have to understand the utopian character of this ideal.

Second, a practical approach through a narrowing understanding of hybrid-warfare. This means a very practical de-construction of what hybrid-warfare is, and de-constructing it to practical activities, as well as diminishing risks of hybrid-warfare. Through narrowing, focusing and targeting threats from hybrid-warfare activity, it is possible a) to eliminate the threat and, b) prevent repetition of a particular threat and, c) do all the previous in a cost-effective manner (because a bunch of threats are not treatable in an effective manner and, perhaps, should just be ignored; or other capacities should be developed for prevention). A visible example for this perspective is understanding cyber-threats under hybrid-war conditions. Cyber-threats, as a part of hybrid-warfare are also outside classical regulation, including understanding what is the most effective way to cope with them. So, the first step for dealing with cyber situations is "understanding what we understand" with a cyber threat. From academics' and analysts' perspectives it is possible to divide very distinct directions when focusing on cyber-threats:

1. Infrastructure threats - all cyber activities with the purpose to harm other state's infrastructure, starting from governmental home page attacks and ending with threats to solid data and its security. Maybe it is cynical to recognize the fact

that cyber-threats to infrastructure are the "easiest" part in state defense maintenance, but it is also close to reality. The capabilities of state defense from cyberattack infrastructure threats strongly depends on investment in ICT within state military budgets, and ICT as a distinct branch on its own. Under current geopolitical challenges, at least in those countries which are under the influence of hybrid-threats, a financial background for defense and security needs is broadly recognized. So, concluding on this, "technically solvable" issues can be "technically solved". And, aggressive attacks on cyber infrastructure only serve as a "motivator for development" for infrastructure's development.[5]

2. Cyber-threats as psychological operations. With an enormously fast growth of internet information flow the role in the media space during the last decade means cyberattacks can be (and are) largely used for the maintenance of psychological operations of various modes - propaganda, disinformation, trolling, manipulations, etc.[6] Because of the variety of psy-ops implementations there are several challenges - firstly, it is hard to deal with psy-ops in an *en masse* style. It is not hard to track down the precise roots of single threat (single IP address or other parameters of identification); the main issue is - it is not possible to shut down actors on the internet if they are changing their IP, identification, and, more than this, there are thousands of minor activities which have a multiplying effect. A typical example of this issue is the ISIS twitter platform activities, which are so flexible that coping with them it is near to shutting down the whole network.[7] In fact, cyber threats on the psy-ops side has the same nature as every psy-op which is implemented in guerilla style in large numbers of carriers - with the only advancement that

5 Bachmann, Sascha-Dominik. "Hybrid Threats, Cyber Warfare and NATO's Comprehensive Approach for Countering 21st Century Threats – Mapping the New Frontier of Global Risk and Security Management." Amicus Curiae, no. 88 (Winter 2011): 24–27.
6 Elkjer Nissen, Thomas. "Social Media, Strategic Narratives and Stratcom." The Three Swords Magazine, 2015.
7 J.M. Berger, Jonathon Morgan, "The ISIS Twitter Census: Defining and describing the population of ISIS supporters on Twitter", The Brookings Project on U.S. Relations with the Islamic World Analysis Paper | No. 20, March 2015.

nowadays technologies allows a single person's propaganda to multiply and effect areas even thousands of times.[8] The second challenge is that considering such dis-information or mental attack threats as trolling, it is nearly impossible for a state to check all platforms where those threats are popping up.[9] In fact, we should then talk about absolute state, with "big brother" being so intense most talented novelists could not even imagine it. And from this angle, internet users are indeed unprotected in the internet media from attacks of such nature, but even from definition, the state is not able to be "so deep in details" on the web to protect them.

Knowing both previous factors, such solutions as self-defense on the internet, gains a very heavy argument behind implementation. This idea comes from a private sector – where private security online is evaluated as important as infrastructural.[10] Which means self-defense of the general public on networks from psy-ops are "probably" the widest and most cost-effective solution against dispersed, undefined, and always in transformation threats. The state can ensure this self-defense of the general public in various manners. From a larger picture it is not something original or unique – it is just a relocation of resources or a re-focusing of attention – depending on your choice of words. Strengthening awareness of threats, together with a self-protection capacity on the net serves in various manners: firstly, psy-ops through cyber are losing their meaning (several political analysts compare it with a spamming mail situation – victims of spam mail radically decreased: a) after increased knowledge in society that there is a phenomena like "spam", b) after understanding there is no need to analyze each email, but spam *en masse* can be recognized according to a chain of characteristics – and here we speak about a rational approach within a user's experience, not specially designed spam filter algorithms).[11]

8 Ibid.
9 Hochwald, Thorsten. "How Do Social Media Affect Intra-State Conflicts Other Than War?"
The Quarterly Journal 12, no. 3 (2013): 9–37.
10 Bowers, Christopher O. "Identifying Emerging Hybrid Adversaries." Parameters 42, no. 1 (Spring 2012): 39–50.
11 Meizhen Wang, "Research on Behavior Statistic Based Spam Filter",
Education Technology and Computer Science, 2009. ETCS '09. First International Workshop on (Volume:2).

Concluding on self-defense

Self-defense on the web from a state perspective can be implemented in the general public only through various sector coordination and cooperation:

Education is primary. The twenty first century comes with the need to educate people of all ages in hybrid-war and cyber-war challenges. Like "duck-and-cover" was a norm in the early Cold War years, "hybrid-threat education" is a necessity of nowadays. From this perspective the budgets of military sectors should be formed in a coordinated manner with educational budgets (including life-long education).

Media transparency and objectivity is second. The ability of media not to "bite" values planted by psy-ops, and through this to do "legalization" of those values in the general public, is an equally important issue.

Thirdly, the government needs to have open dialogue with society on threats. This is an absolute part of self-defense awareness building. Threats, methods and ways of hybrid-attacks that are recognized by intelligence should be given to the general public as a "warning bell", to motivate and take seriously the skills and abilities for self-defense.

Thus, it is visible that by helping deconstruct the problem, normatively regulating it, and understanding the need to relocate resources under challenges of the twenty first century, clear politics and clear steps for solutions are reachable. Of course, wider discussion on hybrid-threats are obligatory, because maybe the only real difference this century brings – safety and defense – it is not enough to just keep it to state, militaries and intelligence: public, education, and media are all part of the game. And to play the game successfully all gamers have to play in a team.

Societal Resilience as a Deterrent in 'Hybrid War'

Tomas Jermalavičius

Introduction

Russia's contemporary way of war has already been dubbed 'hybrid war' as it combines a broad range of tools in order to weaken and co-erce target countries with conventional military means being just a small part of an overall mix. Russia's Chief of the General Staff, Gen-eral Valery Gerasimov, explained this way of war as follows: "The focus of applied methods of conflict has altered in the direction of the broad use of political, economic, informational, humanitarian, and other non-military measures — applied in coordination with the protest potential of the population. All this is supplemented by military means of a concealed character, including carrying out ac-tions of informational conflict and the actions of special-operations forces. The open use of forces — often under the guise of peace-keeping and crisis regulation — is resorted to only at a certain stage, primarily for the achievement of final success in the conflict."[1]

It is only natural and inevitable that our strategic thought about how to respond to this doctrine stumbled upon the concept of resilience which is, in essence, the antonym of vulnerability.[2] The problem is that, in security and defence policy circles, resilience in general and societal resilience in particular are not very thoroughly understood and risk becoming yet another fad which falls out of favour the moment someone comes up with another popular buzz-word. The aim of this article is to explain the concept of resilience as well as relate it to the strategic concept of deterrence. This will

---

1 Valery Gerasimov, "Tsennost nauki v predvidenii" ("The value of science in prediction"), *Voyenno-Promyshlennyj Kury-er*, No. 8 (476), 2013, http://vpk-news.ru/sites/default/files/pdf/VPK_08_476.pdf
2 See Olga Oliker, Michael J. McNerney and Lynn E. Davis, "NATO needs a comprehensive strategy for Russia", Per-spectives, RAND Corporation, 2015, p. 3, http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/perspectives/PE100/PE143/RAND_PE143.pdf

provide for a more enlightened way of understanding resilience and how it could be achieved, thus promoting it as a long-term approach in building comprehensive security rather than just as a momentary vogue inspired by Russia's way of war.

Resilience in general

The term 'resilience' is used in many contexts. It originates from the field of ecology, where it was initially understood as "the measure of the ability of an ecosystem to absorb changes and still persist".[3] The concept appeared attractive to other fields, especially those involving the management of complex interlinked systems, and therefore it spread beyond its original uses in ecology. It is now employed at different levels (individual, community, state) and in different fields such as psychology, physical infrastructure management, economy, organisational management, community studies, etc. So far, its most popular use in the field of security has pertained to disaster preparedness and anti-terrorism, with cybersecurity and critical infrastructure protection being late adopters.[4]

In generic terms, resilience has been defined as a "process linking a set of adaptive capacities to a positive trajectory of functioning and adaptation after a disturbance."[5] This definition implies that resilience is a process, although it can also be seen as a strategy, a theory or a metaphor[6] or as the "capability of a system to maintain its functions and structure in the face of internal and external

---

3 Joseph S. Mayunga, "Understanding and applying the concept of community disaster resilience: A capital-based approach." *Summer Academy for Social Vulnerability and Resilience Building* (Munich, Germany) (2007): 2, http://www. ihdp.unu.edu/file/get/3761.pdf
4 See Jon Coaffee, "From counterterrorism to resilience", *The European Legacy,* Vol. 11, No. 4, 2006, pp. 389–403. Jon Coaffee and Peter Rogers, "Rebordering the city for new security challenges: From counter-terrorism to community resilience", Space and Polity, Vol. 12, No. 1 (2008): 101–118. Noor Aisha Abdul Rahman, "The dominant perspective on terrorism and its implication for social cohesion: The case of Singapore", *The Copenhagen Journal of Asian Studies*, 27 (2) (2009): 109–128. Seymour Spilerman and Guy Stecklov, "Societal Responses to Terrorist Attacks", *The Annual Review of Sociology*, 35 (2009): 167–189. Arjen Boin and Allan McConnell, "Preparing for critical infrastructure breakdowns: The limits of crisis management and the need for resilience", *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management,* Vol. 15, No. 1 (2007): 50–59. Frank Furedi, "The changing meaning of disaster", *Area*, 39.4, 2007, pp. 482–489.
5 Fran H. Norris, Susan P. Stevens, Betty Pfefferbaum, Karen F. Wyche and Rrose L. Pfefferbaum, "Community resilience as a metaphor, theory, set of capacities, and strategy for disaster readiness", *American Journal of Community Psychology,* 41, 2008, p. 130.
6 See Fran H. Norris et al, "Community resilience as a metaphor, theory, set of capacities, and strategy for disaster readiness" and Glenn E. Richardson, "The metatheory of resilience and resiliency", *Journal of Clinical Psychology,* 58, 2002, p. 309.

change and to degrade gracefully when it must".[7] It could also be useful to see resilience as a "set of networked adaptive capacities" whereby resilience draws on certain resources of the system and on "dynamic attributes of those resources (robustness, redundancy, rapidity)".[8] This perspective allows a proactive approach to building resilience by means of accumulating necessary resources in a system and ensuring that those resources possess the dynamic attributes required at a time when disruptions occur. System managers can thereby devise policies (e.g. principles, norms and standards, priorities of investments) which are conducive to resilience.

It is important to appreciate the type and the nature of disruption. Usually, this is a traumatic event or experience which shocks a system and disrupts its normal functioning by causing its various elements to fail or underperform. Stressors or "aversive circumstances that threaten the well-being or functioning"[9] can differ not only in terms of their nature (e.g. environmental disasters, terrorism, war, loss of a family member, etc.), but also in terms of severity, duration and surprise, which all may require different resources and capacities. Systems which experience a single catastrophic event (e.g. the 9/11 attacks) display different adaptive behaviours compared to those which try to cope with chronic stressors (e.g. prolonged terrorist campaigns, economic crises, or civil wars and insurgencies).[10] However, the variety and the dynamic nature of potential stressors mean that it is impossible to predict in advance which adaptive capacities of a system will be necessary, thereby calling for a broad-based approach to building resilience. Thus resilience is a "rational strategy when the probability and specifics of a particular challenge are difficult to define".[11] An increasingly complex, unpredictable and volatile security environment prompted a growing interest in and the acceptance of resilience as a key strategy in coping with this kind of environment.

7 Brad Allenby and Jonathan Fink, "Toward inherently secure and resilient societies", *Science,* Vol. 309, Issue 5737, 2005, p. 1034.
8 Fran H. Norris et al, "Community resilience as a metaphor, theory, set of capacities, and strategy for disaster readiness", 135.
9 Fran H. Norris et al, "Community resilience as a metaphor, theory, set of capacities, and strategy for disaster readiness", 131.
10 See Spilerman and Stecklov, "Societal Responses to Terrorist Attacks"; Michael Ganor and Yuli Ben-Lavy, "Community resilience: Lessons derived from Gilo under fire", *Journal of Jewish Communal Service,* Winter/Spring, 2003, pp. 105–108.
11 Allenby and Fink, "Toward inherently secure and resilient societies", p. 1034.

Societal resilience

Societal (or social) resilience is defined as the "ability of a nation-state to preserve the cohesion of its society when it is confronted by external and internal stresses caused by socio-political change and/or violent disturbances".[12] It is closely related to the concept of community resilience, or a "community's inherent capacity, hope and faith to withstand major trauma, overcome adversity and to prevail with increased resources, competence and connectedness".[13] In most cases, the concepts of societal and community resilience can be used inter-changeably. Fran Norris et al distinguish a set of four inter-related types of resources upon which societal resilience rests:[14]

1. *Economic development*, which includes such parameters as resource volume and diversity, the equity of resource distribution, the fairness of risk and vulnerability to hazards. In this set, economic growth, employment opportunities and accessible services, such as health care, housing and schools, are very important ingredients. It was noted that groups on lower socio-economic levels of development tend to suffer more adverse consequences from stressors compared to those on higher levels of development.

2. *Social capital*. This is a resource derived from the web of social relationships. It refers to levels of social support in times of need, the sense of community, formal (organisational) and informal ties linking members of society and their sense of attachment to a place. Citizen empowerment and participation as well as leadership with well-defined roles, structures and responsibilities are considered to be especially important for social capital and thus societal resilience.

---

12 S. R. Joey Long, "Charting the Concept of Social Resilience: Past, Present, and the Future", *Conference Papers – International Studies Association Annual Meeting,* 2008, p. 2.
13 Judith Landau, "Enhancing resilience: Families and communities as agents for change", *Family Process,* Vol. 46, No. 3, 2007, p. 352.
14 See Fran H. Norris et al, "Community resilience as a metaphor, theory, set of capacities, and strategy for disaster readiness".

3. *Community competence (human capital),* which refers to society's knowledge, problem-solving skills and abilities for collaborative action; in other words, collective efficacy. This resource depends on critical reflection skills, a willingness to contribute, an ability to solve conflicts in groups and to reach consensus, empowerment and opportunities for getting involved in collective decision-making. It also requires a "culture that permits challenges to authority and institutions that provide a basis for coordinating a response".[15]

4. *Information and communication,* which include trusted sources of accurate information, effective transmission mechanisms and collective narratives which "give the experience shared meaning and purpose".[16] In shaping this resource, the media plays an extremely important role. For instance, inaccurate, exaggerated and dramatizing stories may establish narratives not conducive to societal resilience and prompt inadequate political reactions to stressors. As Bernice Lee and Felix Preston put it, "the public can be swayed by the most vocal, the most active or the most politically powerful participant rather than the best informed or the most legitimate."[17] Thus the responsibility of the media is a critical ingredient in strengthening societal resilience.[18]

5. Social and human capital should be of particular interest to those concerned with societal resilience as a strategy to deal with various national security threats. According to Patrice Buzzanell, "the process of building and utilizing social capital is essential to resilience."[19] This entails pursuing societ-

15 Fran H. Norris et al, "Community resilience as a metaphor, theory, set of capacities, and strategy for disaster readiness", p. 142.
16 Fran H. Norris et al, "Community resilience as a metaphor, theory, set of capacities, and strategy for disaster readiness", p. 140.
17 Bernice Lee and Felix Preston with Gemma Green, "Preparing for High-impact, Low-probability Events: Lessons from Eyjafjallajökull", *Chatham House Report,* 2012, p. 3. http://www.chathamhouse.org/sites/default/files/public/Research/Energy,%20Environment%20and%20Development/r0112_highimpact.pdf
18 Social media is on the rise and gaining more importance as a channel of communication for individuals, communities, organisations and governments during crisis. Its impact on societal resilience is yet to be studied, although it is obvious that there are both risks and opportunities to resilience-based strategies flowing from growing reliance on social media (see Morie & Chance, 2012, on the use of social networks for building team resilience).
19 Patrice M. Buzzanell, "Resilience: Talking, resisting, and imagining new normalcies into being", *Journal of Communication* (60), 2010, p. 6.

ies which are built around high levels of social equity, trust, inclusion and involvement; which are highly educated and therefore able to critically assess risks, messages and leadership initiatives or to question the authorities; and which have a high density of communal relationships and high levels of understanding and trust between various communities (to which racism or ethnocentrism are particularly damaging in a multi-ethnic, multi-cultural society[20]). In turn, this requires sustained policies and leadership behaviour consistent with and conducive to social and human capital growth and the legitimacy of society's institutions, values and norms.

Neil Adger also suggests that "social resilience is...observed by examining positive and negative aspects of social exclusion, marginalization and social capital" expressed in income stability and distribution, demographic change, migration patterns, etc.[21] It is extremely important to identify specific societal groups or institutions, or geographical regions where the lack of networked resources or some elements of capital underpinning societal or community resilience may lead to a failure and breakdown once some acute or chronic stressors put pressure on them.[22] According to a Chatham House analysis, "poor communities are more vulnerable to shocks – but they are also more likely to be marginalized economically, politically or socially").[23] Thus increasing social and economic development, reducing social vulnerability and poverty of such groups and regions should mean enhancing overall societal resilience.[24]

Security strategy focused on societal resilience, however, will never yield quick results. According to Michael Ganor and Yuli Ben-Lavy, "the good news is that community resilience does not have to be specifically created; it grows by itself. It is actually a by-prod-

20 See Long, "Charting the Concept of Social Resilience".
21 W. Neil Adger, "Social and ecological resilience: Are they related?", *Progress in Human Geography*, 24:3, 2000, p. 352.
22 See Yiheyis T. Maru, "Resilient Regions: Clarity of concepts and challenges to systemic measurement", *CSIRO Working Paper Series*, 2010.
23 Lee and Preston, "Preparing for High-impact, Low-probability Events", p. 14.
24 Riyanti Djalante and Frank Thomalla, "Community resilience to natural hazards and climate change impacts: A review of definitions and operational frameworks", *5th Annual International Workshop & Expo on Sumatra Tsunami Disaster & Recovery*, 2010, pp. 164–178.

uct of the investment in community development in many areas, seemingly unrelated to resilience...The bad news is that resilience cannot be achieved overnight".[25] Societal resilience as a process of responding to a stressor taps into society's inner resources and capacities (skills, relationships, assets, values, norms, etc.) built over a long period of time and in areas which may appear as having little to do with national security in general or with resilience specifically.

Societal resilience and hybrid war

In broader strategic terms, societal resilience has already been accepted as an ingredient of deterrence 'through denial', or "persuading the enemy not to attack by convincing him that his attack will be defeated – that is, that he will not be able to achieve his operational objectives."[26] Countering terrorism is a case in point: Resilient societies are more difficult to coerce by means of violent acts which, in turn, denies terrorists the achievement of their objectives and discourages them from further attacks. According to John Gearson: "Clearly there are political contexts where the incidence of non-state violence against communities will transcend short-term deterrent messages, but in strategic terms a resilient society is one that is not only better able to withstand shocks, but is also confident about its ability to do so and is therefore a less attractive target for terrorist attack. Resilience then is not merely the capacity for physical recovery but also psychological grit. Terrorism's violence as communication is replied to by society's capacity for community strength and determination, which derives from informed and stoic acceptance of the limits of security, but also from belief in its ability to cope with many challenges thanks to preparatory measures and information."[27]

In a similar vein, hybrid war strategy – essentially a strategy aiming to cause disruption, confusion, destabilisation and paralysis (i.e. shape the behaviour of a target state and society) – can be countered

---

25 Ganor and Yuli Ben-Lavy, "Community resilience", 106.
26 David Yost, "Debating security strategies", NATO Review, Winter 2003,
http://www.nato.int/docu/review/2003/issue4/english/art4.html
27 John Gearson, "Deterring conventional terrorism: From punishment to denial and resilience",
Contemporary Security Policy, Vol. 33, No. 1, 2012, p. 191.

by demonstrating that all those aims are beyond reach due to target's resilience. Since hybrid approach entails identifying, deepening and exploiting various vulnerabilities of a targeted society, broad-based resilience means the absence of such vulnerabilities and thus closing of the avenues which can be fruitfully exploited by an adversary.

For example, high level of society's competence in critical thinking and in understanding the nature of such hybrid war tools as conducting hostile propaganda, fostering political extremism, engineering various destabilising 'protest' campaigns or using military intimidation - in conjunction with society's trust in the integrity of the political system, political leadership and government's communication – negate the advantages of those tools. Likewise, a strong sense of belonging to a community, citizen empowerment and economic equity as well as of the available mutual support reduces the potential for dividing and polarizing the society and for turning various society's groups against one another and against the nation's institutions. High level of voluntarism and citizen participation, when harvested by national security and defence organisations, strengthens those organisations in the face of adversity. Measures aimed at severely disrupting economic activities (e.g. sanctions, energy supply disruptions, financial destabilisation etc.) fail to achieve the long-term desired effect when encountering high levels of economic development, and so on.

The operational challenge, of course, lies in demonstrating convincingly that vulnerabilities are truly absent and that a particular society is indeed very resilient in all respects. This starts with the society being cognisant of its own vulnerabilities in the first place and then working to eliminate them. The problem in this regard is that the process of addressing various vulnerabilities may affect various power relations in the society and, therefore, we "must always address the question of who are the winners and losers of ongoing processes of building social resilience."[28] Some of those 'losers' are bound to become, consciously or not, natural allies of an aggressor in a hybrid war.

28 Markus Keck and Patrick Sakdapolrak, "What is social resilience? Lessons learned and way forward", *Erdkunde,* Vol. 67, No. 1, 2013, p. 12.

Then it is necessary to understand the status and progress of closing vulnerabilities and enhancing resilience, which is a problem of measuring resilience. There is a great variety of international composite indices (e.g. the Gini index for measuring socio-economic inequality, the UN Human Development Index[29], the OECD's Education at a Glance, etc.) and standard statistical measures in various fields which could give a reasonable picture of where a particular society stands in terms of its resilience. A team of Israeli researchers has developed and validated a tool of self-assessment for community resilience, called Cojoint Community Resiliency Assessment Measure (CCRAM), which allows policymakers to monitor, evaluate and take steps to enhance community resilience, focusing on social and human capital aspects. The CCRAM measures 21 items in five components of resilience – leadership, collective efficacy, preparedness, attachment to place and social trust.[30] This, however, requires an effective national framework for systematically monitoring and analysing societal resilience in order to ensure that 'whole-of-government' and 'whole-of-society' efforts to build it are rooted in evidence.

Last, but not least, deterrence – by denial or in any other form – lies in the eye of the beholder, which means that an adversary must be sufficiently convinced that its target society is too resilient to succumb to the hybrid war approach. This is difficult to achieve, given that each adversary is driven by own logic, rationality and calculations and may assess target's resilience very differently. This, in turn, means that some adversaries may never stop trying to spot vulnerabilities and then constantly testing and probing a targeted society. In this case, once various hybrid war measures have been deployed by an adversary, societal resilience becomes a process in action and, in the end, the strategy of defence, not only of deterrence.

---

29 The UN Human Development Index is a composite of measures reflecting the standard of living (Gross National Income), health (life expectancy) and access to knowledge (years of schooling, etc.). It is also adjusted to reflect inequalities (such as of income, gender, education) within each country. The measures are so pertinent to the concept of resilience, that the UNDP Human Development Report 2014 is even entitled *Sustaining Human Progress: Reducing Vulnerabilities and Building Resilience*.
30 Odeya Cohen, Dima Leykin, Mooli Lahad, Avishay Goldberg and Limor Aharonson-Daniel, "The conjoint community resiliency assessment measure as a baseline for profiling and predicting community resilience for emergencies", *Technology Forecasting & Social Change,* Vol. 80, Issue 9, 2013, pp. 1732-1741.

Conclusions

Resilience is indeed an attractive concept, because it is not just a 'one trick pony' conjured up to deal with only one kind of threats. It provides a basis for addressing any given society's exposure to a very broad range of stressors such as terrorist attacks, natural disasters, industrial emergencies, financial collapses, cyberattacks and other contingencies as a result of which the sense of security in society can be profoundly affected. It is certainly highly relevant and applicable in the context of hybrid war, when societies seek avoiding persistent dysfunction or even collapse while subjected to a prolonged duress from multiple sources and directions – exactly the outcomes that hybrid war protagonists' desire. Societal resilience can serve as a deterrent and, should deterrence fail, as the main line of defence against covert and overt measures of hybrid war.

Nurturing societal resilience is, however, a complicated process in the context of national security. The intangible nature of social and human capital means policymakers tend to focus on economic or physical capital which are easier to measure or which have a greater visibility. Investing resources, time and effort in less tangible social and human capital, which is critical to societal resilience but which leads to resilience as a 'by-product', often receives far lesser attention in national security and political discourses. At the same time, explicitly establishing the notion that social and human capital are essential to national security somewhat 'securitises' such aspects of society as education, voluntarism, community relationships, media responsibility and inter-ethnic dialogue. 'Siege mentality' might be an unintended consequence of too much focus on security in society's life, which is hardly beneficial to a society's long-term flourishing and well-being. Avoiding such an outcome while coping with hybrid war and other security challenges should be part of the balanced and nuanced approach to strengthening societal resilience.

Security Cooperation in the Baltic Sea Region under the Nordic Defence Cooperation (NORDEFCO): A Way Forward?

Gundega Rēboka, Žaneta Ozoliņa

Introduction

Since the end of the Cold War the Baltic Sea region was named as a region of high intensity cooperation taking place in different areas - starting with the economy, environment, people-to-people, civil security, and many others. There was only one domain where cooperation had ad hoc, fragmented and limited character – it was a security and defence policy. Despite the fact there were impressive individual contributions from Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden to defence systems in the Baltic States, a more formalized security cooperation was not flourishing. Along the last 25 years the Baltic States were constantly appealing to their northern neighbours to invest more in strengthening regional security across all sectors, though hard security was excluded from, at that time, a dominant cooperative or comprehensive security framework seen as old fashioned and not corresponding to post-Cold war realities.

Recent geopolitical changes at a global scale have its implications in the Baltic Sea space. One of the regional countries, namely Russia, has demonstrated it has ambitions in restoring its "proper place in the world", as well as claiming that "as a great power has its zones of legitimate interests". These are not only words from security and foreign policy documents, but these statements have converted into actions in Crimea, Ukraine, and Syria. Russia's behaviour internationally has changed the name of the game in the region, and international system at large. Indeed, if statistics tell that in the last year the total number of specific security related incidents caused by

Russia amounted to 66 and that 40 of them took place in the Baltic Sea area, it is no big surprise that countries of the region attempt to synchronize and share their security concerns and outlooks.

The Baltic Sea Region is considered to be rather diverse in terms of the size of countries, their institutional affiliations and security ambitions. At the same time threats and risks emanating from the neighbourhood are in terms of impact and likelihood very similar. Security logic dictates that under such circumstances there should be striving for more intensive regional cooperative efforts in order to ensure stability in the area. Indeed, in the last two decades there were several regional security projects put in place, but they were serving the interests of parts of the regional countries, such as BALTBAT, BALTRON, BALTNET and other examples, but they were not inclusive in terms of countries and hard security components.

In the paper we would like to look at only one defence cooperation framework launched in 2009 by Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden, called NORDEFCO. One of the driving questions behind this analysis is why instead of comprising different regional efforts in a coordinated and effective regional security framework that could satisfy the security interests of players forming a community of democratic states, the Northern countries decided to launch their own without participation of the Baltics, Poland and Germany? We will start with addressing the reasoning behind the formation of NORDFECO. After that we will look at the progress within NORDFECO, and at the end explore some possibilities in the evolution of security cooperation in the area.

Why was NORDEFCO needed?

Until 2009 defence cooperation among Nordic countries was based on an ad hoc level. In 2009 Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden came to an agreement in launching a defence cooperation framework called NORDEFCO. The cooperation within this framework was based on the experience within NORDAC[1], NOR-

---

1 NORDAC - armament cooperation existing since early 1990s fostering cooperation on acquisition of defense materiel.

DCAPS² and NORDSUP³. NORDEFCO consists of five cooperation areas based on projects and each of them is led by one country. The areas of cooperation are: Strategic Development, led by Sweden; Capabilities, led by Finland; Human Resources & Education, led by Denmark; Training & Exercises, led by Norway; and Operations, led by Sweden. In order to foster cooperation, responsibility for these areas rotate biannually. So far the picture looks promising indeed, and corresponds to principles of pooling and sharing proposed by the European Union (EU) and smart defence approved by NATO. However, one should stress that NORDEFCO should be considered as a framework, not as organization, as agreements within this framework are reached by the consensus principle and participation in regional projects are on volunteer basis. Therefore there are only few projects that include the participants of all five Nordic countries. More frequently projects within NORDEFCO are based on bilateral or trilateral cooperation.

There is no surprise that once initiated NORDEFCO, which is relevant and contributes to the coordination and collaboration in security domain, lacked strategic ambitions. One of the reasons why the credibility and efficiency of NORDEFCO is still questioned relates to different levels of commitment of Nordic countries to the project. If countries of the same region have differing threat perceptions then cooperative arrangements cannot be sufficient in case of real threats. Thus, for Denmark, the threats itself were de-territorialized, Sweden considered Russia as the highest threat to Baltic States which served as a buffer zone for its security. Norway, however, is mainly concerned with the security and defence of the High North and Russia's growing ambitions in it. Like Norway Finland, as the only Nordic country to have a long territorial border with Russia, was concerned about its territorial defence. Iceland is more concerned about its economic recovery and growth after the financial crisis and puts any environmental issues ahead of military challenges.

---

2 NORDCAPS - peace support education and training, existing since 1960s.
3 NORDSUP – enhanced cooperation initiative agreed by the Chiefs of Defense of Finland, Norway and Sweden in 2008.

One should ask, why in 2009? Overall there are two main reasons which fostered the decision regarding the necessity of a fully functional Nordic security cooperation framework. Firstly, one of the main factors which fostered the creation of a more formalized defence cooperation among the five North European countries were power shifts in the international system. Russia's aggression in Georgia and the modernization of Russia's military forces afterwards highlighted the dramatic transformation in Russia's policy towards the western countries. The intervention in Georgia proved that force can be used without consultations and that most likely Russia will not respect international laws and norms in near future. Modernization of Russia's military was taking place at a rapid pace. For instance, since 2008 Russia has increased its military budget more than 26 percent and increased its military exercises close to the territorial borders of Nordic countries. Russia's Baltic fleet has conventional superiority in the Baltic Sea Region with 60 warships, 35,000 soldiers and sailors and 13,000 coastal defence troops. As a counter measures to raising security concerns in the North, in 2010 and 2011 there were 152 training sessions taking place within the NORDEFCO framework, as well as "Cold Response" and "Air Wing" trainings organized.

Secondly, the global economic situation put a lot of pressure on the defence spending of countries that have to be able to cope simultaneously with two challenges – increased (in terms of numbers) and diversity security threats, on the one hand, and limited defence capabilities available for countries to fight against them on the other. Thus, NORDEFCO was considered an example of the concept of smart defence within a particular region.

After Russia's invasion in Crimea and support to rebels in Eastern Ukraine, the security debate in Nordic countries reached another level – whether it was enough to proceed with the defence cooperation network established within NORDEFCO or would other policy instruments be of value. The debate is simply called the NATO membership debate. During the last few years both non–NATO Nordic countries Finland and Sweden have shifted away

from the deep neutrality policy and repeatedly considered the possibility of NATO membership. But Russia's objections to further enlargement of alliance and neutrality tradition resonated in public opinion and certain political parties in the North of Europe were still dividing societies in both countries. Even if the most recent public opinion polls in Finland and Sweden demonstrate increased support to NATO membership, political consensus on the issue still remains unsettled. Therefore, for the time being, NORDEFCO remains as one of the defence instruments in the Baltic Sea area in the hands of Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden. But the question still remains – is NORDEFCO a sufficient defence policy instrument under the present security challenges in the region?

Is there a new shift for Nordic-Baltic cooperation: *NORDEFCO* towards openness?

From the very early days of the existence of NORDEFCO the Baltic States were questioning their Northern neighbours as to why they have not been invited to be part of the framework. There were no convincing arguments, except privately stated that the Baltic States in their security and defence policies tend to ally themselves strongly with a pro-American stance in NATO and with their policies on the board NORDEFCO could look provocative from Russia's perspective that in the end could harm a cooperative project *per se*. Thus, NORDEFCO was created for the sake of only part of the region, not fully taking into consideration the possible threats from regional countries. The Baltic States were considered more as trouble makers rather than credible partners. This statement sounds paradoxical because Nordic states played a key role in the fields of rebuilding Baltic national armed forces and their defence system at large. Nordic and Baltic units were operating shoulder to shoulder in Afghanistan, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Kosovo and other places, but were not considered relevant for strengthening the regional security landscape.

However, gradually the Baltic States have become engaged in NORDEFCO. In 2010, although initially quite distant, the Nordic states developed an air and territorial surveillance programme and invited the Baltics to be part of the project which is going to be developed by 2020. Deeper cooperation in several areas between both parts of the region began in 2011. This step towards openness was assured by the document signed between Nordic Ministers titled: "Nordic Defence Cooperation 2020" which highlights the importance of close cooperation with the Baltic States as to be at the highest level. After the intimidating political rhetoric of Russia, and military violations of national airspace and territorial waters, Nordic ministers have stepped up joint exercises and plan to intensify cooperation with the Baltics.

Currently, closer cooperation between Baltic and Nordic states is observable through various kinds of joint projects. The idea of harmonizing military standards and battle groups is considered a step towards building a high level, efficient framework of security cooperation, where there exists high levels of specialization between the Nordics and Baltics. One of the latest joint projects is related to counter cyberattacks in the region. Therefore *NORDEFCO* introduced the Cyber Warfare Collaboration Project or CWCP. The main aim of this project is to eliminate cyber threats in real time. This project is carried out in close cooperation with NATO's "Centre of excellence for Cyber defence issues", located in Tallinn. The Baltic States are also contributors to the analytical field.

The second sector of cooperation is targeted at the strategic communications domain. Latvia became a country where the NATO Centre of Excellence for Strategic Communication was opened in 2015. The Centre serves as a ground where Nordic and Baltic states can address the most urgent issues related to Russia's execution of hybrid and information warfare elements in the Baltic Sea region. This is the area where all EU and NATO countries present in the region agree upon, as one of the currently pending projects is related to the creation of alternative media for the Russian-speaking population in order to offer a different perspective on happenings.

The involvement of high ranking officials symbolizes the importance in this field of cooperation. Besides, this project also brings together different regional players such as the Nordic Council and Baltic Assembly. This project has drawn the attention of EU and NATO member states outside the region.

NORDBALDEFCO - to be or not to be

The defence cooperation project NORDEFCO definitely serves the purpose of coordination and pooling and sharing some of the capabilities at the disposal of Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden. However, it cannot be regarded as a fully functional regional security instrument under the present conditions. These conditions are 1) growing militarization and modernization of armed forces taking place in the east from the North; 2) without harmonization of threat perceptions and defence policies NORDEFCO will be treated as a framework but not an asset; 3) if it remains as a project of five countries with fragmented participation from the Baltic States, Poland and Germany, its credibility will decrease; 4) collaboration with the EU and NATO is decisive for the Baltic Sea region.

However, the fastest, cheapest and long term investment in regional security is Finnish and Swedish NATO membership that will withdraw institutional confusions, political controversies, and the time consuming search for the harmonization of security policies and creation of special cooperation frameworks. It will be in the interest of Baltic and Nordic countries that their security policies rest on an equilibrium of values and interests. Countries around the Baltic Sea are operating in the world on the foundations comprised by a set of national interests (as a majority of 200 countries around the globe do). Therefore, it would be misleading to assume that only a values-based cooperative security thinking will allow the avoidance of challenges and threats present in a contemporary international system. It would be more than naive to presume that values defined by one nation or

a region are attractive and appealing to those who speak the language of national interests. Security interests that rest on values, and values that serve the purpose of national interests, can ensure survival, security and sustainability of the state and the region in the long run.

Keeping a strong focus on Russia: UK Strategic Defence and Security Review and the Baltics

Uģis Romanovs

The UK Defence Committee, with support from academics, industry and Think Tanks, is now working on the 2015 National Security Strategy (NSS) and Strategic Defence and Security Review (SDSR). According to UK Defence Secretary, Michael Fallon, the documents will be published in late 2015. This forms part of the commitment made in 2010 by the coalition government to revise British defence and security policy every five years. The Defence Committee has been examining international security and trying to define the requisite capabilities the UK will need to counter potential threats. It is quite a challenging task as the SDSR should provide "a gearing mechanism" between three components of UK defence strategy: the defence budget; force posture; and security future.[1]

As no other European country has the potential to play a global role like the UK, the capitals of the three Baltic States hope the Defence Review will also shed light on the future of military security in Eastern Europe. Furthermore, the level of ambition – as defined in defence planning assumptions – in combination with defence budget commitments suggests the UK is preparing to (re)build a force which might have the potential to start leveraging the security balance in Europe. Furthermore, if forecasts of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development come true and the UK economic recovery continues to maintain similar performance as in 2014, the defence budget in 2015 will reach £45 billion (€61 billion), which might be sufficient to start repairing essential military capability gaps.[2]

---

1 Paul Cornish and Andrew M. Dorman, *"Complex security and strategic latency: the UK Strategic Defence and Security Review 2015,"* International Affairs 91: 2 (2015), pp. 351–370, https://www.chathamhouse.org/sites/files/chathamhouse/INTA91_2_09_Cornish_Dorman.pdf, p. 353
2 HM Treasury, "Summer Budget 2015", July 2015, p. 5

**What would the three Baltic States like to see
in the Strategic Sefence and Security Review 2015?**

The Baltic States have been central to European security debates over the past few months. Almost every analyst or commentator when discussing matters relating to European security and the future of NATO conclude that the Baltic states are the most exposed and vulnerable countries within the Alliance. Various triggers and scenarios are frequently mentioned, ranging from a conventional full scale attack to the application of hybrid warfighting methods explicitly designed by the Kremlin's military planners for the Baltic region.

Russian speaking minorities – particularly in Estonia and Latvia – have been one of the most discussed potential tools of destabilisation for Russia. According to the current UK Defence Secretary "a murky campaign of infiltration, propaganda, undercover forces and cyber-attack such as that used in the early stages of the Ukraine conflict could be used to inflame ethnic tensions in Estonia, Lithuania or Latvia."[3] Many researchers share the idea. Some argue 'the hybrid war against Baltic states has already begun', but the EU is not ready to counter the Kremlin's actions due to insufficient financing and due to a lack of knowledge.[4]

However, such a conclusion is probably oversimplified: the application of a 'hybrid war' scenario, like that utilised by Moscow in Ukraine, is problematic if applied to the Baltic States. The potential role of the Russian-speaking minority in the Baltic region in the case of the hybrid scenario is unlikely. The social domain in the Baltics is a very complex and hard to assess phenomena segregated by various individual and social factors. Imants Liegis, the Latvian Ambassador to Hungary, and former Latvian Minister of Defence, has highlighted this by stating that: "The vast majority of Latvia's ethnic Russians no doubt feel insulted by unfounded perceptions that they are not loyal members of Latvian society and can in some

---

3 Ben Farmer, "Putin will target the Baltic next, Defence Secretary warns", *The Telegraph,* 18 February 2015, http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/vladimir-putin/11421751/Putin-will-target-the-Baltic-next-Defence-Secretary-warns.html
4 *Security of Baltic States: Russia's threats, NATO's capabilities and Belarus factor.* East European Security Research Initiative, May 26, http://charter97.org/en/news/2015/5/26/153061/, p.6

way be manipulated by Moscow."[5] It should not be a surprise that the splitting of Baltic societies has been on Moscow's agenda for very long time. The constant offensive against the governments of the Baltic States, particularly Latvia and Estonia, in relation to the supposed discrimination against the Russian-speaking population, is part of the Kremlin's daily agenda. Ironically, the discussion of hybrid threats in almost every case places the Russian-speaking minority at the centre of events thus unintentionally making the split between two parts of society even wider.

Edward Lucas argues that Russian aggression could increase due to a decision by Sweden and Finland to joint NATO. As he puts it: "It could provoke Russia to launch a pre-emptive provocation in order to demonstrate the alliance's weakness."[6] Should this be the case, Marius Lavrinavicius, an analyst at the East European Security Research Initiative, has come to the conclusion that Putin would not use the same approach as utilised in Ukraine; instead he would rather come up with a specifically designed Baltic 'engagement' strategy. This is because the Baltic States are not Ukraine: they are far better governed, far wealthier, inside the European Union, and the Russian-speaking minorities are in any case smaller and better integrated. Instead, Lavrinavicius considers the possibility of a *conventional* attack against the Baltic States as Russia's most likely option. As the main excuse for occupation of the Baltic States he mentions the Kremlin's 'concerns' regarding security of the Kaliningrad enclave. However, the true aim of such an attack would be related with Putin's regime's interest in confronting and dividing NATO.[7]

One of the most dramatic scenarios is predicted by Terrence Kelly, Director of the Strategy and Resources Programme at RAND. By referring to wargames conducted by RAND staff and experts, he is has concluded that: "Russian forces could overrun local defenders and the light US and NATO units currently able to respond

5 Imants Liegis, *The Russian threat to the Baltics: scaremongering or reality?*, European Leadership Network, 8 April 2015, http://www.europeanleadershipnetwork.org/the-russian-threat-to-the-baltics-scaremongering-or-reality_2620.html, p. 3.
6 Edward Lucas, *"The Coming Storm"*, Baltic Sea Security Report, Center for European Policy Analysis (CEPA), June 2015, p. 4
7 *"Security of Baltic States: Russia's threats, NATO's capabilities and Belarus factor,"* East European Security Research Initiative, 26 May 2015, p. 2, http://charter97.org/en/news/2015/5/26/153061/

within as few as two days. While the capitals and a small number of key points could be held for some time, Russian forces could seal the border between Lithuania and Poland, prevent reinforcement by sea, and confront NATO with a fait accompli. Once secured, these territorial gains would be defended by heavy ground forces occupying the conquered states, along with very capable Russian anti-air and anti-ship defences on Russian territory. Any serious attempt to liberate Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania would entail attacks to suppress these systems."[8]

To sum up, there is only one key conclusion the UK SDRS drafters need to reach when defining military risks towards British interests: Russia's military aggression against Estonia, Latvia or Lithuania is a medium probability; a very high impact risk. This is not scaremongering. Firstly, as we all have recently witnessed, the methods the Kremlin is ready to use to achieve its strategic goals and foreign policies imply its readiness to use military force. There is no doubt the three Baltic countries, despite all their efforts to increase their defence budgets and build up military capabilities, still represent – and will likely remain for the foreseeable future – the weakest link of the Euro-Atlantic military security system. This adds plausibility to the possibility that Russia could choose the Baltic region as a battleground to confront the West militarily. Therefore 'it is important to be aware of a potential threat from an increasingly aggressive and revisionist Russia, even though it may not appear imminent and seems unlikely that Putin could want a war with NATO'.[9]

Furthermore, there is an obvious truth, which was effectively ignored by the West since 2008 because of its too political sensitivity, and that is Russia's force build-up near the Baltic States has continued to expand. This is why Riga, Tallinn, and Vilnius are so eager to see their allies permanently prepositioned on their grounds; and why NATO, with its present military posture, would be unable to

8 Terrence K. Kelly, *"Stop Putin's Next Invasion Before It Starts,"* U.S. News and World Report, 20 March 2015, http://www.usnews.com/opinion/blogs/world-report/2015/03/20/stop-putins-aggression-with-us-forces-in-eastern-europe.
9 Imants Liegis, *The Russian threat to the Baltics: scaremongering or reality?*, European Leadership Network, 8 April 2015, http://www.europeanleadershipnetwork.org/the-russian-threat-to-the-baltics-scaremongering-or-reality_2620.html, p. 4.

defend the Baltic States against Russia. Firstly, Russia is beefing up its Western vector by opening new units and modernising existing ones. For example, during the past five years the Kremlin has established two new units in the vicinity of the Baltic States: the 25th Motorised Rifle Brigade in Estonia's immediate vicinity, and Ostrov Air Base, which is next to the Latvian border. The latest is now home to fifty of the newest attack and transport helicopters. Secondly, the Russian air defence system fully covers the Baltic region, thus creating a favourable air situation for Russia from the very beginning of any potential conflict. Furthermore, ballistic rockets are positioned, or on short notice can be deployed, so they can reach all the most important strategic locations in the region, including ports, airports, communication nodes and other similar targets.[10] In recent snapshot exercises the Russian military has demonstrated its capabilities to move a significant number of units over huge distances. "Certain units were activated, moved into position (often over several thousand kilometres), and then engaged in simulated combat. These redeployments are supported by a wide range of naval and air activities designed to contest and control the sea lanes and airspace surrounding the Russian Federation."[11] Recently demonstrated in Syria, the intermediate range precision-guided 'Kalibr' missile has added an additional timidity to Baltic military planners.

Taken together, this is why Baltic military planners would like to see in the UK SDSR 2015 a statement like this: "The resurgence of Russia and the changing global balance of power have destabilised the security situation in Eastern Europe. The defence of NATO means Russian military aggression against the Baltic States, though unlikely, must nevertheless be deterred. Therefore, from 2016, the UK will revise its European force posture and pre-deploy a sufficient number of personnel and military equipment into the Baltic region."

---

10 Uģis Romanovs, "The means and ends of Russia Security Strategy," in *Riga Dialogue: Towards a Shared Security Environment,* ed. A. Spruds, Latvian Institute of International Affairs, 2015.

11 Thomas Frear, *"Anatomy of a Russian Exercise,"* European Leadership Network, 12 August 2015, http://www.european-leadershipnetwork.org/anatomy-of-a-russian-exercise_2914.html

What does the UK defence planners' 'body language' say?

The SDSR process is supposed to be primarily defined by security threats. This allows for the defining of focus areas for investment and savings. An encouraging fact is that in "The 2015 SDSR: a primer", which is defining expectations for the 2015 SDSR, Russia is clearly defined as assertive factor contributing to the more dangerous world.[12] The Defence Secretary has pointed to the same in his address to RUSI: the SDSR will be driven by three overlapping security challenges: a continuous rise of religious extremism in the form of ISIL, the governance crisis across northern Africa, and consequential migrations into Europe and actions by revanchist Russia, which is adding an additional flavour of uncertainty to the future of the security of Europe.[13] The statements made by the UK Minister of State for the Armed Forces, Penny Mordaunt, acknowledge that the UK keeping a strong focus on Russian actions in preparing for the 2015 SDSR provides additional reassurance.[14]

All this sounds like good news for the Baltic States; and apparently security risks deriving from Russia do not fall into the category of 'chronic diseases'[15] as described by Paul Cornish and Andrew Dorman.[16] Equally, the UK's decision to deploy 150 troops – and perhaps eventually as many as three companies – to the Baltic States and Poland, points towards the future evolution of the British strategic posture on the European mainland.

How easy would that be?

However, in order for the UK to be able to engage more actively in strengthening the eastern flank, a number of preconditions should

---

12 Louisa Brooke-Holland, *The 2015 SDSR: a primer,* House of Commons, Briefing Paper, Number 07235, 22 July 2015, http://researchbriefings.files.parliament.uk/documents/CBP-7235/CBP-7235.pdf, p. 5

13 The Defence Secretary, Rt Hon Michael Fallon MP, speech to RUSI on the SDRS, 22 September 2015, https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/defence-secretarys-speech-to-rusi-on-the-sdsr-2015

14 *"UK 'Extremely Focused' on Russia Military Activities -Armed Forces Minister,"* Sputnik International, September 4, 2015, http://sputniknews.com/europe/20150904/1026569359.html

15 Both authors came up with ten unwritten rules which influence the quality of the defence review. Rule number two argues that 'strategic assessments knowingly exclude certain risks on the ground that they are politically too sensitive'.

16 Paul Cornish and Andrew M. Dorman, "Complex security and strategic latency: the UK Strategic Defence and Security Review 2015," International Affairs 91: 2 (2015), pp. 351–370,

be met. Firstly, the three Baltic States have to remove their 'division and mistrust'.[17] Tactical level peace time military co-operation projects have to be brought to the next level by integrating the military capabilities of the three armed forces, while mechanisms must be established where allied and particularly UK military capabilities could be effectively geared up with local forces. Unfortunately there are no indications this is going to happen in the near future. When Edward Lucas was criticising military co-operation between the countries of the Baltic Sea, he used very articulated words to illustrate the scope and causes of the fragmentised and ineffective nature of military co-operation in the region. He stated: "They do not have the brains or the muscle needed to maintain regional security."[18]

Secondly, the SDRS 2015 will be built around three key themes: efficiency, innovation and internationalism. The last one is orientating the development of force capabilities and force posture towards involvement into multilateral efforts, such as NATO defence of Baltic countries.[19] Despite the fact the UK could deploy a brigade level unit (up to 6,500) with maritime and air support as requested for an enduring period to the Baltic States, it will never will be possible if Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania are not taking the defence efforts of their own countries more seriously.[20] The Baltic States have to intensify defence capability building, particularly related with the development of fully equipped and manned army and territorial force units capable to integrate arms provided by allies. In other words, the UK has the capability to buy time and help the Baltic States build their forces, but Riga, Tallinn and Vilnius should demonstrate a tangible and viable end state to this mission.

Thirdly, the deterrence of Russia or supporting the defence of the Baltic States are just two tasks among many for a country like the UK with extended global obligations and responsibilities. Therefore,

---

17 Edward Lucas, *"The Coming Storm"*, Baltic Sea Security Report, Center for European Policy Analysis (CEPA), June 2015, p. 2.
18 Edward Lucas, *"The Coming Storm"*, Baltic Sea Security Report, Center for European Policy Analysis (CEPA), June 2015, p. 2.

19 The Defence Secretary, Rt Hon Michael Fallon MP, speech to RUSI on the SDRS, 22 September, 2015, https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/defence-secretarys-speech-to-rusi-on-the-sdsr-2015, p. 4.
20 Louisa Brooke-Holland, *The 2015 SDSR: a primer*, House of Commons, Briefing Paper, Number 07235, 22 July 2015, http://researchbriefings.files.parliament.uk/documents/CBP-7235/CBP-7235.pdf, p. 8.

defence planning efforts of other NATO allies in Central and Eastern Europe should be aligned towards the most exposed flank of the Alliance. Conclusions from RAND Corporation's war gaming, which was conducted in August this year, suggest that "to prevent the rapid overrun of the Baltic States, NATO – and the United States – would need to station three armoured brigades and supporting forces in the Baltics in concert with the three NATO infantry brigades and one Stryker brigade that can be deployed on short warning". It seems a lot compared to the current numbers allies have deployed to the region; on the contrary not that much compared to, for example, the armoured vehicles, equipment, ammunition and supplies for 15,000 marines for thirty days of combat the US Marine Corps has pre-positioned in Norway or the 11,000 troops the UK is withdrawing from Germany.[21] Consequently, the UK Defence Secretary's words to "better reap the reward of early defence engagement than the whirlwind of later conflict" will hopefully be taken into account.[22]

21 Christopher P. Cavas, *"Inside the US Marine Corps Prepositioning Program-Norway,"* Defence News, 22 September 2015, http://www.defensenews.com/story/defense/naval/marines/2015/09/20/inside-us-marine-corps-prepositioning-program-norway/32511065/
22 The Defence Secretary, Rt Hon Michael Fallon MP, keynote address at the 2015 RUSI Land Warfare Conference, https://www.rusi.org/events/past/ref:E551A90AC9BFBB/info:public/infoID:E55965CCE84F1D/

Energy Markets – A Key Factor Behind a Consumer-Driven Cooperation between EU Member States

Reinis Āboltiņš

Practical gains from developing our own and joining neighbouring energy markets play an important role in fostering technical as well as political cooperation between EU member states. The question is what comes first – politics or economics? The hypothesis is that the consumer is at the centre of everything and therefore the energy sector can make states cooperate closer than anything else.

Size does matter

Sometimes the functioning of complex systems is defined by elementary things. Elementary at first glance, that is. For example, when it comes to the power sector, size occasionally does matter. The bigger the market the more sufficient production capacity is available, and the better the interconnections between market areas the less consumers experience production and transmission outages, and limitations. There is, however, one important precondition for size to matter – a solid legislative and regulatory framework has to be in place to enjoy benefits from a better integrated and more liquid - or in other words – a bigger market. The three Baltic States where the effects of being an energy island when it comes to being part of a broader EU energy market have started fading away recently are a comfortable example of the importance of an effectively functioning energy market.

The Baltic States are hailed for their ability to cooperate in the energy sector. Notably, the Baltic Energy Market Interconnection Plan or BEMIP is referred to often when characterising the aspirations of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania towards a common Baltic

energy market as well as becoming an integral part of the bigger EU energy market. It is true, but also important to understand there are other factors influencing cooperation than just an assumption that cooperating is better than not cooperating. In the energy sector energy a portfolio is something that does not form overnight – one has to deal with the heritage of past decisions as well as planning energy policy and make decisions preferably in a sustainable way.

Two important commodities are essential when speaking of a common Baltic energy market – one is electricity and the other is natural gas. While electricity is of equally high importance in all Baltic Sea region (BSR) states, natural gas plays a particularly significant role in Finland, Latvia and Lithuania. Developing a well-functioning energy market is an important part of the process of the Baltic States shedding off the consequences of being integrated in the North-Western energy system of the former USSR.

When it comes to electricity the bigger Nordic and Baltic Nord Pool Spot (NPS) electricity exchange is the key factor in setting trends and altering patterns of producing electricity. The energy portfolio of the BSR countries together is a diverse one allowing for multiple ways of generating electricity. However, when it comes to individual countries the situation is slightly different. Nordic countries, with the exception of Denmark, possess huge hydropower resources that allow accumulating a lot of power and producing large volumes of cheap electricity. Sweden and Finland also have nuclear capacities that add to permanently available significant energy production capacities. Finland at the same time uses natural gas as an important energy resource for powering its CHPs, just like Latvia and Lithuania. Ultimately, the more diverse and balanced an energy portfolio is the higher the energy security.

Production and interconnections with next of kin

After the closure of the Ignalina nuclear power plant (NPP) Lithuania became one of the most energy dependent EU member states[1] as it imports circa 60 percent of electricity and roughly 70 percent of domestic production depends on natural gas which, until the commissioning of the Klaipeda LNG terminal that allows diversifying supply sources, used to be 100 percent supplied by the Russian Federation. The share of natural gas in electricity production in Latvia is smaller than that of its Southern neighbour, but can still amount to roughly one third of the total production. One hundred percent of natural gas in Latvia is supplied by the Russian Federation. Among the Baltic States Estonia feels most comfortable exploiting its fairly vast oil shale reserves that secure production of more than 80 percent of electricity, while natural gas is used almost exclusively for district heating purposes during the heating season.

It is not only the energy portfolio that determines the ability to ensure an uninterrupted flow of energy as, for example, electricity import is neither inherently good nor bad *per se*. Electricity import is part of most energy systems and depends on the structure of supply whether importing poses no, average, or high risks. In terms of the liquidity of an energy market imports can do a great job, given that 1) the import is physically possible, 2) the capacities that can be physically imported are sufficient and 3) imported electricity drives power prices down. In other words – for the market to be interesting for both producers and consumers it is good to have a smaller market integrated into a bigger market. Like, for example, the Baltic power market being integrated into the Nordic electricity market. To reap the benefits you have to have interconnectors in place that make the physical transfer of capacities possible. The same principles apply to the gas market.

---

1 According to Eurostat (2013), Lithuania ranked fifth most dependent among the EU member states with 78.3% dependence. Estonia, to the contrary, ranked the most energy independent EU member state with just 11.9% dependence. The EU average was 53.2%. Latvia performed just above the EU-28 average with 55.9%.

Deployment of the EstLink 1 and EstLink 2 underwater HVDC cables[2] connecting Estonia and Finland effectively brought to life a coupling of Estonian and Finnish electricity markets: consumers in Estonia are enjoying mostly the same prices as Finnish consumers with the exception of moments when the transmission capacity has limitations or there is an outage or limitation of production on the Estonian side. Latvia and Lithuania are two deficit areas within the Nord Pool Spot exchange and their price areas experience similar prices that are usually significantly higher than those in Estonia. However, with the NordBalt HVDC coming in to play by the end of 2015 it is expected to have positive effects on electricity prices in Lithuania and Latvia as it will make the exchange of electricity between the Baltic States and Sweden a reality. A good reality for Lithuania and Latvia since the average price of electricity on the Swedish end of the cable (price area SE4) is almost permanently less than half of that at the Baltic end of the new HVDC cable.[3] An estimated decrease in electricity price could average 7 to 10 percent which is good for consumers, be it industrial producer or a household.

The situation is slightly more complex with the gas market where Latvia, Estonia and also Finland still get 100 percent of their gas supplies from Russia. The consequences vary depending on particular energy portfolios and the proportion of natural gas in energy production. The energy security situation has improved in Lithuania, which not only liberalised its gas market first among the three Baltic States, but also succeeded in building its own LNG terminal which opened the possibility to supply gas from sources other than the Russian Federation.

It is important to note the Klaipeda LNG terminal is an energy infrastructure object of enormous significance not only for Lithuania, but for all the Baltic States. The only issue remaining

---

2 Total capacity 1000MW.
3 The average monthly electricity price in the SE4 area in January 2015 and July 2015 was 30.46 EUR/MWh and 9.19 EUR/MWh respectively. The average monthly electricity price in LV/LT area in January 2015 and July 2015 was 39.78 EUR/MWh and 44.26 EUR/MWh respectively.

is a gas market liberalisation in Latvia where the process is still under way and facing strong opposition from the current gas monopoly. Another infrastructure project that should benefit Baltic energy consumers, and first and foremost energy production companies that are the biggest gas consumers, is the gas interconnector (GIPL) connecting natural gas transmission systems within Lithuania and Poland thus connecting the Baltic States to the broader integrated EU gas pipeline system.

Thus, the situation in terms of the connectivity of the Baltic States with the rest of the EU is improving, and market participants are looking forward to embracing wider opportunities as well as deal with new risks the bigger market brings.

Consumer power

It is not an exaggeration to say the whole idea behind a free energy market is a better choice for the consumer. The consumer is at the centre of the EU energy policy or even ideology. Even when it comes to long-term planning of the energy policy the reason behind a sustainable approach to energy production is the consumer who needs electricity and heat for an affordable price and preferably produced in ways that do not jeopardise one's health or ability to get energy for a long time to come.

Reaction to the opening of the electricity market in the Baltic States has demonstrated consumers understand the benefits of a free energy market. Consumers try to adjust their energy consumption patterns and expect constantly improving services from providers that ensure energy supply. Once consumers get a taste of understanding the causal relationship between different elements from publicly available information on the Nord Pool Spot electricity exchange platform from producers, system operators and traders, they want nothing less than ever increasing transparency and quality, which is in line with and safeguarded by the EU energy law.

The energy sector can make states cooperate closer than anything else, especially when it comes to working on ways about

how to ensure an uninterrupted supply of energy to consumers and therefore carefully planning for strategically important infrastructure that can guarantee the fulfilment of this not so simple task. This is also the case of the three Baltic States as a strong energy market stands for common interests as well as stronger unity in external relations.

A common energy market is key to closer Baltic cooperation, which can successfully be based on employing market forces as an overriding factor when it comes to politics and political issues. Thus the energy consumer becomes the common denominator in the algorithm of cooperation. There is no better price than the market price and the market is a very practical and good stimulus for cooperation.

Energy is international relations

Both hardware and software is important and this is where the interests of the Baltic States coincides perfectly with one of the main ideas behind the European Energy Union – to put in place infrastructure and ensure the adoption of a solid legal framework and regulatory environment.[4] Failure to meet the expectations of market participants might increase the risk of neighbours being pulled apart by domestic and/or external pressures. Thus, pressure and interest from consumers is crucial to demonstrate that energy has the power to achieve even greater success than just purely politically based projects. The energy market feeds consumer-driven political cooperation and creates a natural demand for closer cooperation.

It is true that countries, even close neighbours, may experience the presence of divisive forces, but it is also true that in the end it is the very practical aspects of our lives that serve as a solid basis for politicians to make decisions. The energy sector is one

---

4 See specifically chapter 2.2 *A fully-integrated internal energy market* from communication from the Commission on *A Framework Strategy for a Resilient Energy Union with a Forward Looking Climate Change Policy,* COM(2015) 80 final, Brussels, 25 February 2015, pp. 7-11.

such example – the better consumers understand the benefits of a free energy market the higher the demand will be for a closer cooperation that serves the interests of energy consumers. The making of the common Baltic energy market and its integration into the bigger European energy market is an example of an energy market being able to make governments cooperate for the benefit of everybody. After all, energy resources and energy has always been a key element of international relations and it is even truer in the twenty first century as the EU embraces new challenges directly related to the possibility of offering consumers affordable and sustainable energy.

About Authors

Aldis Austers – Research Fellow at the Latvian Institute of International Affairs

Reinis Āboltiņš – Advisor to the Parliament of the Republic of Latvia on energy issues, associate researcher at the Centre for Public Policy Providus

Sven Biscop - Director of the Europe in the World programme at the Egmont – Royal Institute for International Relations in Brussels

Janusz Bugajski - Senior Fellow at the Center for European Policy Analysis (CEPA) in Washington DC

Kārlis Bukovskis – Researcher and Deputy Director of the Latvian Institute of International Affairs

Mārtiņš Daugulis – Research Fellow at the Latvian Institute of International Affairs, Lecturer at Rīga Stradiņš University

Maxine David - Assistant Professor in European Union Studies at Leiden University

Balkan Devlen - Associate Professor of International Relations in Izmir University of Economics, Turkey

Mark Galeotti - Professor of Global Affairs at the Center for Global Affairs at New York University

Tomas Jermalavičius - Research Fellow at the International Centre for Defence and Security, Tallinn

Elena Korosteleva - Professor of International Politics at the University of Kent, Jean Monnet Chair in European Politics, Director of Global Europe Centre at the School of Politics and International Relations

Andis Kudors - Executive Director and Researcher at the Centre for East European Policy Studies

Kai-Olaf Lang - Senior Fellow at the Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik (SWP)

Imants Lieģis – Ambassador of Latvia to Hungary, former Minister of Defence of Latvia

Žaneta Ozoliņa – Professor of International Relations at the Social Science Faculty of the University of Latvia

Volker Perthes - CEO and Director of Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik (SWP)

Andris Piebalgs – Senior Fellow at the Florence School of Regulation, former European Commissioner for Energy and Development Cooperation

András Rácz – Senior Research Fellow at the Finnish Institute of International Affairs

Gundega Rēboka – Researcher at the University of Latvia

Uģis Romanovs - Research Fellow at the Latvian Institute of International Affairs, faculty member of the Baltic Defence College in Tartu, Estonia and National Defence Academy in Riga

Anke Schmidt-Felzmann - Researcher in the Europe programme at the Swedish Institute of International Affairs (UI)

Andris Sprūds - Director of the Latvian Institute of International Affairs, Professor at Rīga Stradiņš University

Ramūnas Vilpišauskas - Director of the Institute of International Relations and Political Science, Vilnius University

Viljar Veebel - Associate Professor of Social Sciences at the Estonian National Defence Academy