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Albert Einstein 1879 – 1955
“The unleashed power of the atom has changed everything except our modes of thinking and we thus drift toward unparalleled catastrophe.”

Fredrik Westerlund, security policy analyst at Swedish FOI, one of Europe’s leading research institutes in the areas of defence and security
Aftonbladet (leading Swedish newspaper) 17.6.2015
“We are back in a period where the use of nuclear weapons in Europe is a possibility.”

Helsingin Sanomat (leading Finnish newspaper) 4.3.2016
“The Baltic Sea region has become the central place for the military exercises of Russia and the Nato member countries – Finland is still concealing even published information about upcoming military exercises.”

Mikhail Gorbachev, the Independent 9.7.2016
“Nato has begun preparations for escalating from the Cold War into a hot one.”

Foreign minister of Germany, Frank-Walter Steinmeier (SPD), Reuters 18.6.2016
Comment about Nato’s decision to arrange military exercises in Eastern Europe
“What we shouldn’t do now is to inflame the situation by loud saber-rattling and shrill war cries,… Whoever believes that symbolic tank parades on the alliance’s eastern border will bring more security is mistaken,…History has shown that dialogue and co-operation have been crucial elements for a successful deterrence policy.”

The Guardian 27.10.2016
NATO and Russia playing dangerous game with military build-up… Russia’s president sees NATO as an implacably hostile and aggressive bloc. Paradoxically, NATO’s newest deployments in eastern Europe merely serve to confirm the story that Putin and state television have been telling Russians for so long: that the west is hell-bent on “encircling” Russia and bringing it to its knees…”

Ilta-lehti (Finnish newspaper) 20.11.2016
• Finnish armed forces military exercises with western partners are taking new turns.
• Next year Finland will take part in 84 international exercises in total.
• According to information received by Ilta-lehti, Finland is going to take part in war exercises connected to U.S. missile defence.
• Russia is of the opinion that the missile defence system is directed towards them and therefore threatens the national security of the country.
• The (Finnish) defence ministry does not believe that Finland’s participation in the exercise worries Moscow.

EXPRESS – Home of the Daily and Sunday Express 7.6.2017
“Vladimir Putin warns 'no one would survive' nuclear war between Russia and US.”
Tomas Ries, security policy expert at the Swedish Defence University - Ittasanomat 2.7.2017

“In the Baltic Sea a witch circle is in progress - a wicked spiral... the increasing tensions have a bisectional reason. Firstly Russia has, since the Ukraine crises broke out in 2014, used their military forces more aggressively. For that reason NATO has extended its presence in the Baltic countries... When something like that happens, Russia always reacts militarily. For instance by airspace violations and dangerous close by flights ... Especially this summer the situation has escalated ... During big military exercises many situations arise when things can happen by mistake.”

Frankfurter Allgemeine 23.8.2017

“SPD Chancellor candidate Martin Schulz has sharply criticized the political line of America’s president Donald Trump, and demanded that the American nuclear weapons that are placed in Germany have to be removed.”

Frankfurter Allgemeine 30.8.2017

“Foreign minister Sigmar Gabriel supports the demand presented by the SPD Chancellor candidate Martin Schulz that the American nuclear weapons have to be removed from Germany.”

STOPP Ramstein (U.S. air base) demonstration in Germany 9.9.2017 – Oskar Lafontaine, former chair of the SPD party and former finance minister of Germany

” Nuclear weapons have to disappear from the earth.”

Handelsblatt 21.3.2021 - Ami go home!, book 2021 by Stefan Baron, former financial correspondent for “Der Spiegel,” Editor-in-Chief of the “WirtschaftsWoche” and most recently Director of Global Communication for the Deutsche Bank

...But it is also true that the United States no longer embodies “western values” credibly enough... Europe must, to a greater extent, pursue its own interests, go its own way and emancipate itself from America ... A Europe that also demonstrates the western values in international relations and relies on their brilliance in a peaceful competition of systems, independent of the USA, can again give these values a new shine. In the political, economic and military pull rope of the USA, however, Europe will no longer be able to convincingly present itself as a haven of peace, freedom and human rights....

YLE news 28.3.2021 – Niinistö proposes 2025 Helsinki OSCE summit to tackle climate and security issues

“Finnish President Sauli Niinistö has proposed a Helsinki summit in the spirit of the 1975 Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE) which led to the founding of the OSCE. He made the suggestion in an op-ed column published in the leading daily Helsingin Sanomat on Sunday, entitled "Arctic Cool and the Spirit of Helsinki"... Niinistö suggested that such a meeting could be a way to defuse what he sees as growing tensions among major powers such as the United States, China and Russia...”
THE RETURN OF THE COLD WAR TO EUROPE

MONEY FOR WAR

SIPRI, April 2021 – WORLD MILITARY EXPENDITURE IN 2020 IS ESTIMATED TO HAVE BEEN $1981 BILLION, the highest level since 1988—the earliest year for which SIPRI has a consistent estimate for total global military spending.

- World military expenditure in 2020 was 2.6 per cent higher in real terms than in 2019 and 9.3 per cent higher than in 2011.

- The global military burden—world military expenditure as a share of global gross domestic product (GDP)—rose by 0.2 percentage points in 2020, to 2.4 per cent. This increase was largely due to the fact that most countries in the world experienced severe economic downturns in 2020 related to the Covid-19 pandemic, while military expenditure continued to rise overall (see box 1).

- With a military budget of an estimated $778 billion, the USA remained the world’s largest spender in 2020, accounting for 39 per cent of global military spending (see figure 2). In 2020 the USA spent almost as much on its military as the next 12 largest spenders combined.

- Military expenditure by North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) members totalled $1103 billion in 2020. Six of the top 15 military spenders are members of NATO: the USA, the UK, Germany, France, Italy and Canada.

- China, the world’s second largest military spender in 2020, is estimated to have accounted for 13 per cent of the global total. The $252 billion spent on the military in 2020 was 1.9 per cent higher than in 2019.
- Russia’s military expenditure was $61.7 billion in 2020, 2.5 per cent higher than in 2019 and 26 per cent higher than in 2011. Due to the Covid-19 pandemic, Russia’s actual military spending in 2020 was 6.6 per cent lower than its initial military budget.

- The European Defence Agency – EDA - since 2006 collects defence data on an annual basis. The Ministries of Defence of the Agency’s 27 participating Member States (all EU Member States except Denmark) provide the data.

  ✓ Defence expenditure by the 26 EDA Member States amounted to €186 billion in 2019.

  ✓ In 2019, therefore, defence expenditure continued its increase for the fifth consecutive year. Compared to 2018, defence expenditure increased by 5%, which constitutes the strongest increase since the general trend of defence spending reversed in 2015.

  ✓ The procurement of new equipment has benefitted the most from the overall increase in defence investments. Since 2014, defence equipment procurement has increased by 67% while spending on defence R&D has increased at a slower pace, by 30%, over the same timeframe.
Space-based capabilities provide integral support to military, commercial, and civilian applications. Longstanding technological and cost barriers to space are falling, enabling more countries and commercial firms to participate in satellite construction, space launch, space exploration, and human spaceflight. 5G technology also serves military purposes. 6G is already in planning.
THE DANGERS OF FALSE AND DISTORTED THREAT AND ENEMY IMAGES – NEW COLD WARS

Creating different kinds of threat and enemy images and misconceptions only serves the military industry and big corporations striving to get hold of declining natural resources, as well as politicians aiming at an undemocratic, power concentrating world order. It does not in any way improve or uphold vital environmental conditions, or secure basic human needs – not to speak of life quality and security.

- Maj-Britt Theorin – enemy images and some solutions:
  (Dr Theorin was a well known peace promoter: former Swedish Ambassador for Disarmament in charge of Swedish disarmament policy (1982–1991), Chairperson of the UN Commission of Experts on Nuclear Weapons (1989–90), Chairperson of the UN Study on Military and the Environment (1990–91), Chairperson of the UN Expert Group on Women and the Agenda for Peace (1994) and Member of the Canberra Commission on the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons (1995–96). Dr Theorin was former President of the International Peace Bureau and of Parliamentarians for Global Action.)

✓ First you have to ask the question what/who is the enemy?
  1) What / who threatens our safety? A war attack? An ecological collapse? An economic collapse?
  2) Who's the enemy? A country, an environmental disaster, a capitalist economic policy?
  3) How should we defend our security? It depends on the answers to the above questions!

✓ UNESCO Constitution: “Since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defences of peace must be constructed”. 
We have to use diplomacy, prevent conflicts, put the children in focus, stop arms trade, bring in more women at the top for decision making on war and peace, use military resources to save and restore the environment, conduct fair trade, bear responsibility for people escaping war and oppress, implement nuclear weapons disarmament and ratify the nuclear weapons ban treaty, strengthen the UN and give the UN Charter new respect.

RUSSIA

Misconceptions and enemy images created in the U.S. and Western Europe have during many years strongly been built around Russia – although the military budget of Russia amounted to only $61.7 billion in 2020 whereas the figure of the U.S. was $778 billion. In order for the U.S. figures to be comparable with Russian expenditure, the military budgets of NATO and NATO partner countries must be included.

• RUSSOPHOBIA - book by Dominic Basulto (2015)

Basulto is the U.S. editor of Russia Direct. He has extensive experience in digital media including a regular blog with The Washington Post, has taught finance at Moscow's first MBA program, published a weekly column for a Russian newspaper and has an undergraduate degree in Politics and Russian Studies from Princeton and an MBA in emerging markets from Yale.

Presentation of the book: The current Russophobia in the Western media should not come as a big surprise. During the Cold War era, the stereotype of dour, unsmiling Russians victimized by a ruthless, authoritarian regime that posed an existential nuclear threat to the West became a mainstay of the media narrative. Even after the end of the Cold War, Russophobia continued to influence the way the West viewed Russia.

This book attempts to understand how Russophobia within the Western media during the Putin era (2000-2015) led to a new Cold War between Russia and the West that includes elements of information, cyber and economic warfare. Russophobia attempts to answer the following questions: Why are any attempts by Russia to change the Western media narrative immediately derided as propaganda? What do Western policymakers get wrong about the Kremlin’s motives? And, most importantly: Is there a cure for Russophobia?

Cohen (1938-2020) was a widely acclaimed US historian of Soviet and post-Soviet Russia. He wrote or edited 10 books and many articles for The Nation, The New York Times and other publications and was also a CBS-TV commentator. Cohen has also been called “America’s most controversial Russia expert.” Some say this to denounce him, others to laud him as a bold, highly informed critic of US policies and the dangers they have helped to create.

Presentation of the book: Is America in a new Cold War with Russia? How does a new Cold War affect the safety and security of the United States? Does Vladimir Putin really want to destabilize the West? What should Donald Trump and America’s allies do?

America is in a new Cold War with Russia even more dangerous than the one the world barely survived in the twentieth century. The Soviet Union is gone, but the two nuclear superpowers are again locked in political and military confrontations, now from Ukraine to Syria. All of this is exacerbated by Washington’s war-like demonizing of the Kremlin leadership and by Russiagate’s unprecedented allegations. US mainstream media accounts are highly selective and seriously misleading. American “disinformation,” not only Russian, is a growing peril.

In War With Russia?, Stephen F. Cohen gives readers a very different, dissenting narrative of this more dangerous new Cold War from its origins in the 1990s, the actual role of Vladimir Putin, and the 2014 Ukrainian crisis to Donald Trump’s election and today’s unprecedented Russiagate allegations.


Meduza 23.4.2021 - Unlearned lessons Dmitry Medvedev’s op-ed on the ‘return to the Cold War era’ — in a nutshell
(This is a paraphrased summary of Dmitry Medvedev’s column for RIA Novosti. You can read the full version in Russian here: https://ria.ru/20210423/diplomatiya-1729522868.htm)

✓ On Friday, April 23, the Russian state-owned news agency RIA Novosti published a column by former Prime Minister Dmitry Medvedev. Titled “The Unlearned Lessons of History,” Medvedev’s op-ed warns that U.S.–Russia relations have “returned to the Cold War era.” The way he sees it, Washington has fallen into old patterns of aggressive policies and rhetoric, which, according to the former Russian prime minister, lead to a dead end in terms of relations with Moscow. Here’s Medvedev’s argument, in a nutshell:

✓ Relations between Russia and the United States have returned to the Cold War era. In the 1960s, our country was forced to respond to the aggressive policies of the U.S. — and the Cuban Missile Crisis took place. Today, these policies have returned in the form of sanctions, NATO expansion, and an organized harassment campaign against Russia...

✓ During the Cuban Missile Crisis, the situation was saved by the leaders of two superpowers, who recognized the wisdom of compromise — they were in equal dialogue, without threats and ultimatums. They learned that cooperation is better than confrontation, but now the U.S. has slipped into unstable foreign policy once again: it abandoned the nuclear deal with Iran, withdrew from the Open Skies Treaty. They speak about the need for dialogue, but at the same time increase pressure and raise tensions...

✓ To extinguish conflicts, there needs to be a willingness to abandon the language of ultimatums and rudeness. This is precisely why this rhetoric of “Russia will pay the price” — though it sounds very American — leads directly to a dead end...

✓ Since the fall of the USSR, the U.S. has simply lost the habit of equal dialogue and now it doesn’t have the fortitude to admit that someone in the world might have comparable military-political potential. Russia or China, for example...

CHINA – A NEW US ENEMY

Are Russia-China relations influencing the military situation in the Baltic region and Northern Europe?

✓ In Foreign Policy Research Institute – Baltic Bulletin, 6.8.2020 - Una Aleksandra Bērziņa-Čerenkova writes in an article “Sino-Russian Narratives of Cooperation and what it means for the Baltics” as follows:

✓ On one hand, China-US frictions are bound to push Beijing closer to Moscow.... On the other hand, increasingly nationalistic mentalities and China's newfound taste for assertiveness makes a full-scale alliance unlikely...
China has been explicitly called a threat to economy, liberty and democracy in Washington, and the US has asked its partners to choose a side. Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia (as well as other European countries in similar positions) have opted for American security over Chinese business ... The US is the Baltics’ main security shield against Russia ...

Even a NATO-cleared passing of People’s Liberation Army Navy ships for participation in Russia’s military drills in 2017 didn’t fail to cause a commotion in Baltic and Polish societies, because far-away China had suddenly materialized into a pro-Russia military reality off the Baltic Sea shores. One can only imagine the level of anxiety such a drill could cause without NATO’s explicit show of support.

Whether or not growing Sino-Russian mutual understanding was previously perceived as having its perks, or is viewed as an alarming development today, Vilnius, Riga and Tallinn cannot afford to leave the relations between the two Eurasian giants unwatched. The new geopolitical reality has added a China dimension to the long-established Baltic analytical Russia domain.

- In May 2021 the US Secretary of State Antony Blinken accused China of acting more aggressively abroad and more repressively at home (BBC 3.5.2021) and the first months of Biden’s presidency have seen a continuation of America’s anti-China stance.

- But also more positive views are presented. In Global Times 22.7.2021 – “If US-China competition is not a new cold war, then what?” - Martin Jacques, until recently a Senior Fellow at the Department of Politics and International Studies at Cambridge University, wrote:

  - How should we describe this new phase in US-China relations that started in 2016? In the West it is commonly called the New Cold War. I think this is mistaken... To call it a new cold war gives the illusion that it is similar to or the same as the first cold war and will end in the same way. None of this is true. The USSR was never even vaguely an economic match for the US, at its peak the former was perhaps 60 percent of America’s size. In contrast, China is already an economic par with the US and will be much bigger in one decade, let alone two, when it will be more than double...

  - A defining characteristic of the first cold war was the division of the world into two hermetically sealed, antagonistic blocs. In contrast China is deeply integrated into the global economy, in some respects even more than the US. It cannot be excised from the global economy. Its vast array of trading partners around the world would make such exclusion impossible...

  - In the first cold war the world was divided into two blocs and irredeemably polarised. This is not the case now and will not become so. Take Europe. It is most certainly not in the same place as the US. It is shifting away from the US at both a popular and establishment level...

  - Dialogue was the antithesis of the cold war. But dialogue is fundamental to the new phase: hearts and minds are crucial.
ARMAMENT AND MILITARY ACTIVITIES OF THE WESTERN COUNTRIES AIM AT THE ENCIRCLEMENT OF RUSSIA

In 2000 a vision about U.S. full spectrum dominance was presented at the homepage of the U.S. Department of Defence (Joint Vision 2020 Emphasizes Full-spectrum Dominance) and it was emphasized that the Department of Defence shall act according to this plan in the future.

In recent years an even tighter and more efficient cooperation has been built up in the western countries aiming at the encirclement of Russia.

- The pictures below show how the encirclement rapidly is proceeding in the Baltic Sea area, around the Black Sea and in the oceans.
RUSSIA’S MARITIME CHoke POINTS

ST. PETERSBURG

RUSSIA’S MARITIME CHoke POINTS

US military presence overseas

TheGlobal Politics – 13.6.2017
• Tensions in the Arctic ocean/Arctic region are growing. Before the year 2020 the Bering Strait will be ice free for around 160 days a year. By the year 2025 the now hypothetic Transpolar Sea Route through the central parts of the Arctic Ocean is going to be open for transports 45 days a year. It is estimated that there are oil and gas resources in the region, which are valued at around 1 trillion U.S. dollar; 13% of the untapped oil resources and 30% of the untapped gas resources in the world. There are also considerable mineral resources in the region.
Rear Admiral Jonathan White, the U.S. Navy’s top oceanographer and navigator, and director of the Navy’s climate change task force, said in a statement to Reuters in February 2014: “The Arctic is all about operating forward and being ready. We don’t think we’re going to have to do war-fighting up there, but we have to be ready.”

Norway will host its biggest Arctic exercise since Cold War - some 40,000 soldiers will take part in the Cold Response exercises in 2022. “There is a significantly increased interest among our allies for the north and the Arctic,” said General Eirik Kristoffersen, head of the Norwegian Armed Forces in a phone interview with the Barents Observer. (ARCTIC TODAY 15.4.2021)

- The Black Sea (also the Baltic States are mentioned) - The European Parliament resolution of 11 June 2015 on the strategic military situation in the Black Sea Basin following the illegal annexation of Crimea by Russia states among other things:

  "The European Parliament,
  Believes that the change in the geostrategic landscape, the evolving military situation in the Black Sea Basin and the forceful annexation of Crimea by Russia are indicative of broader and systemic challenges to the post-Cold War, norms-based European security architecture; believes that the EU and the Member States must have a security response to these challenges and reconsider their foreign and security policies in light of this, which must be reflected in a reviewed European Security Strategy, in the European Maritime Security Strategy and in the EU Strategy for the Black Sea; is concerned about the intensified Russian pressure on the EU eastern border, including on Romania, Poland and the Baltic States, which represents a major risk;...

- In the German naval magazine MarineForum 3-2017 an article written by Heinz Dieter Jopp and Klaus Mommsen was published. Both are considered to be experts of the German marine forces. The article (Ostsee und Schwarzes Meer im Fokus – Russland und NATO in den Randmeeren auf Konfrontationskurs?) dealt with the growing importance of the marginal seas: The Baltic Sea and the Black Sea.
Concerning the situation in the Black Sea region they are reminding that during the Soviet time, the Black Sea was considered the inland sea of the country. In the current situation of Russia the Black Sea is of crucial importance for the countries access to the Mediterranean Sea and the Atlantic. The new NATO countries in Eastern Europe; Bulgaria and Romania, have changed the situation. The conclusion in the article written by Jopp and Mommsen is:

“It is a fact that both the Baltic Sea and the Black Sea are of big geostrategic importance for Russia. Only through these two marginal seas the country has access to the Atlantic and only by having access to these seas Russia can reach the ambition to act as a global superpower. NATO and EU must clearly show the limits for Russia’s aggressive and expansive behaviour, but without denying the country the use of the marginal waters. The fact that this is feasible is shown by the partnership-based relationship, especially at the maritime level, that worked in the first 15 years after the disintegration of the Soviet Union.”

---

**Akademie Bergstraße für Ressourcen-, Demokratie- und Friedensforschung** is an Academy in Germany dealing with resources, democracy and peace research. The aim is to develop future-oriented impulses, ideas and methods for preventing war. In an article on the 6th of September 2017, the Academy gives a warning about the present situation in Europe and the world:

Already for many years influential Think Tanks with close relations to big corporations put pressure on Germany to; instead of the U.S. and Great Britain, take over the “leading power” in Europe, North Africa and the Middle East. Prominent European politicians as well as the Konrad-Adenauer-Foundation are referring to the fact that after the German Bundestag elections (September 2017) considerable changes are going to take place in European foreign and security policy and in NATO.
✓ The planned rearmament shall be financed by the European Defence Fund (see below. See also EDA defence expenditure 2019 above).

✓ The Akademie Bergstraße analysis shows that war today purposefully aims at parts of the energy infrastructure and the economic structure, at housing and civilians.

- The European Leadership Network (ELN) is an independent, non-partisan, pan-European network of nearly 300 past, present and future European leaders working to provide practical real-world solutions to political and security challenges.

✓ According to ELN the security situation in Europe has deteriorated to its lowest point since the end of the Cold War. NATO and Russian military forces operate in much closer proximity than just a few years ago, previous lines of NATO-Russia communications have broken down, and the nuclear and conventional Arms control system that took decades to build is rapidly unraveling, with nothing to take its place.

✓ In December 2020 ELN, on the basis of an extended series of detailed senior expert discussions, published some recommendations, signed by 145 prominent persons from 20 countries, as a call on leaders in the US, Russia and Europe to demonstrate the political will necessary to take a number of urgent actions in order to reduce the risk of military conflict.

✓ The urgent recommendations address the following areas:

1. Re-establishing practical dialogue between Russia and NATO, including direct contacts between the military commanders and experts of Russia and NATO member states.

2. Developing common rules that will reduce the risk of unintended incidents on land, air and sea.

3. Enhancing stability by increasing transparency, avoiding dangerous military activities, and providing dedicated communication channels that would avoid escalation of incidents that might occur.

4. Utilizing (and possibly supplementing) the 1997 NATO-Russia Founding Act to codify restraint, transparency and confidence-building measures.

5. Exploring possible limitations on NATO and Russian conventional force deployments in Europe to enhance transparency and stability.

6. Establishing consultations between Russia and US/NATO on the topics of intermediate-range missiles and ballistic missile defense, in order to prevent a new nuclear missile race in Europe.

7. Preserving the Open Skies Treaty.
Stefan Baron has in the course of his professional career worked as financial correspondent for "Der Spiegel", Editor-in-Chief of Germany's leading business magazine "WirtschaftsWoche" and most recently, as the Director of Global Communication for the Deutsche Bank and he certainly would not want his book to be considered anti-American. He was for years a member of the Board of Trustees of the American Institute for Contemporary German Studies and he still enjoys good relations with the United States.

[Image]

✓ In his book he focuses the attention on the major shift in the global balance of power, shaping our present, with China's rise and the USA seeking to hold the People's Republic of China down, in order to preserve its global dominance. The consequences are a dangerous escalation of the conflict, which could lead to a Third World War, which as Baron notes, must urgently be prevented. This concern leads him to harshly criticize the United States' current situation and to suggest ways of preventing the escalation of the transpacific power struggle.

✓ "The land of freedom, equal opportunity, and democracy has degenerated into an oligarchy," even a "plutocracy," writes Baron. "The rule of law shows deep cracks, economic productivity and perspectives for the future are dwindling, the middle class is melting away, social inequality and racism are rampant. Baron depicts the foreign policy the USA - at home increasingly decaying - has been indulging in since the end of the cold war: an extremely aggressive approach toward Russia, grueling wars - such as in Iraq - in addition to "regime change operations" and unscrupulous extra-territorial sanctions. "The military-industrial-complex and the intelligence services (...) have seized an enormous amount of power," notes the publicist, and warns that only external aggression can hold the country together: "The conviction that America must be at the top in the world," is, at the moment, "almost the only thing that the deeply antagonistic Democrats and Republicans can still agree on."Baron speaks of "imperial arrogance."

✓ What is to be done? Baron relies explicitly on "Europe's emancipation" from the United States. He considers that the interests of the European powers "coincide neither with those of the United States nor those of China." This is why they should not "choose between the two powers" but rather "choose a third path, our own." A "multi-polar world order and peaceful coexistence of the systems" should become the basis of European foreign policy."
There is an ongoing dispute about what promises USA/NATO once gave Russia about the eastward enlargement of NATO.

- In an article in the German magazine Der Spiegel 26.11.2009 under the headline "NATO's Eastward Expansion - Did the West Break Its Promise to Moscow?" you find the story:

  ✔ Russian President Dmitry Medvedev has accused the West of breaking promises made after the fall of the Iron Curtain, saying that NATO's expansion into Eastern Europe violated commitments made during the negotiations over German reunification. Newly discovered documents from Western archives support the Russian position.

  ✔ After speaking with many of those involved and examining previously classified British and German documents in detail, SPIEGEL has concluded that there was no doubt that the West did everything it could to give the Soviets the impression that NATO membership was out of the question for countries like Poland, Hungary or Czechoslovakia...

  In the article three prominent statesmen (1990) are quoted; German foreign minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher, U.S. secretary of State James Baker and the foreign minister of the Soviet Union Eduard Shevardnadze:

  ✔ On Feb. 10, 1990, between 4 and 6:30 p.m., Genscher spoke with Shevardnadze. According to the German record of the conversation, which was only recently declassified, Genscher said: "We are aware that NATO membership for a unified Germany raises complicated questions. For us, however, one thing is certain: NATO will not expand to the east." And because the conversation revolved mainly around East Germany, Genscher added explicitly: "As far as the non-expansion of NATO is concerned, this also applies in general." Shevardnadze replied that he believed “everything the minister (Genscher) said.”..."
What the US secretary of state said on Feb. 9, 1990 in the magnificent St. Catherine’s Hall at the Kremlin is beyond dispute. There would be, in Baker’s words, “no extension of NATO’s jurisdiction for forces of NATO one inch to the east,” provided the Soviets agreed to the NATO membership of a unified Germany. Moscow would think about it, Gorbachev said, but added: “any extension of the zone of NATO is unacceptable.”...

Now, 20 years later, Gorbachev is still outraged when he is asked about this episode. “One cannot depend on American politicians,” he told SPIEGEL. Baker, for his part, now offers a different interpretation of what he said in 1990, arguing that he was merely referring to East Germany, which was to be given a special status in the alliance – nothing more...

• On the globalresearch.com homepage you can find an article by Valentin Zorin under the headline” NATO Build-Up On Russia’s Borders - Worst Treachery Since Munich 1938” referring to the promises of the Western countries. Zorin accompanied Mikhail Gorbachev on his visit to the U.S. in 1990. Below is an excerpt from the article:

“Mikhail Gorbachev and George Bush Sr. focused on the reunification of divided Germany. President Bush saw the reunification of Germany as a fundamental factor of continental stability and global detente. He repeatedly assured Soviet leader Gorbachev that the reunification of Germany would never bring the North Atlantic Alliance closer to the Soviet border. I can still open my old notebook or play back an old tape to recall what he said: ‘The allied forces will not be inching closer to your border’...

• In 1997 in Paris, NATO and Russia signed a Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security between NATO and the Russian Federation. The message on the NATO homepage on the 27th of May, 1997 was noble:

“NATO and Russia do not consider each other as adversaries. They share the goal of overcoming the vestiges of earlier confrontation and competition and of strengthening mutual trust and cooperation. The present Act reaffirms the determination of NATO and Russia to give concrete substance to their shared commitment to build a stable, peaceful and undivided Europe, whole and free, to the benefit of all its peoples. Making this commitment at the highest political level marks the beginning of a fundamentally new relationship between NATO and Russia. They intend to develop, on the basis of common interest, reciprocity and transparency a strong, stable and enduring partnership....”

• Now all the Baltic states and virtually all Eastern European countries are members of NATO and NATO holds extensive military exercises in countries bordering Russia. The militarization of the Baltic Sea and Eastern Europe was thus started by the U.S. and NATO.

• At the NATO summit in Warsaw in July 2016 NATO leaders agreed to deploy military forces to the Baltic states and eastern Poland for the first time, and to increase air and sea patrols. The defense alliance decided to move four battalions totaling 3 000 - 4 000 troops into northeastern Europe on a rotating basis.
In May 2016 the U.S. switched on a missile shield in Romania and in July 2016 media reported about NATO’s activation of a U.S.-built missile shield on Polish soil.

NATO and Berlin are emphasizing that this does not break the NATO-Russia agreement Founding Act of 1997.

- In January 2017 in Zagan, Polish and American Soldiers celebrated the arrival of American forces in Poland. It represents the biggest U.S. military deployment in Europe since the end of the Cold War. The so called "Iron Brigade" is made up of 3 500 highly trained soldiers and heavy military equipment; 87 tanks, 144 Bradley fighting vehicles and 2 500 vehicles being transported by land from Germany.

- They are deployed with NATO partners Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Bulgaria and Hungary on a rotational basis.

- A battalion of tanks, including 600 soldiers from the U.S. armored brigade, was sent from Poland to the Baltic states. The "Iron Brigade" also moved their troops into seven more countries across Central and Eastern Europe to train with its forces, except Poland and the Baltic states also 750 soldiers to Romania, Bulgaria and Hungary and 450 soldiers to Germany.

- According to Captain Scott Walters at the US Army, the moving of troops from five gathering places in Poland, less than 20 days after the arrival of the "Iron Brigade" in Europe, showed that the brigade is able to quickly gather troops and freely move them across Europe.

- Today the U.S. and Russia control 94 % of the approximately 15.000 nuclear weapons in the world. These weapons have, in the words of Eva Walder (disarmament ambassador of Sweden), the capacity “to destroy the human civilization, to kill millions or even billions of human beings, to destroy the environment and to end life on earth as we know it” (speech in the UN 28.3.2017).

- NATO is the biggest nuclear military alliance in the world. (Estimation 2020: USA 5.800, Great Britain 215, France 290) (Russia 6.375). In the final declaration of the NATO Summit in Warsaw 2016 it is stated that: “Our deterrence and defence is based on an appropriate mix of nuclear, conventional and missile defence capabilities…”
• **NATO 2030 – United for a New Era report November 2020** commissioned by a Reflection Group consisting of 10 “independent” experts. The report identifies **13 challenges and threats of which top of the list are Russia and China.** The whole report is steeped in **Cold War thinking:**

✓ **NATO should pursue further expansion** in order to bring in Ukraine, Georgia, and Bosnia into the alliance. It continues to make agreements with countries around the Pacific and Indian Ocean to face out China.

✓ The group proposes **strengthening its forces in Europe on its eastern flank,** providing them with ‘**adequate nuclear capabilities**, suitable for the situation created with the end of the Treaty on Intermediate Nuclear Forces’. The experts have asked the USA to speed up the deployment in Europe not only of the **new B6-12 nuclear bombs**, but also new medium-range nuclear missiles, similar to the 1980s Euromissiles.

✓ The experts also want to ‘**continue and revitalize nuclear sharing agreements**’, which allowed non-nuclear countries – Belgium, Germany, the Netherlands, Italy and Turkey – to be ready for the use of nuclear weapons under US command. This has always been **against the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty** which states that the nuclear armed states should disarm in ‘good faith’.

• **The pressure to connect Finland and Sweden to the military alliance is strong.** This has been shown by a lively debate both in Finland and Sweden about joining the NATO, and the fact that the countries participate in and organize major military exercises.

• It is also to be noted that “non-aligned” Finland, contrary to Sweden, Ireland, Switzerland and Austria considered as “neutral” countries, did not take part in the historical negotiations about the **UN Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons (TPNW).** Finland also did not participate in the vote about the Treaty on the 7th of July 2017, resulting in 122 countries out of 193 endorsing the Treaty. **It has been ratified by 55 states** (as of July 2021), with Austria, Ireland and Malta being the only EU countries. - Finland thus belonged to the group of countries that accept nuclear weapons, and to those countries that either come under their protection or host nuclear weapons on their soil, and that boycotted the negotiations.
Sweden participated actively in the negotiations for the TPNW. Margot Wallström, Minister for Foreign Affairs, wrote in the Swedish daily newspaper Aftonbladet (1.3.17) that the Swedish government intends to work for a nuclear-free world. And in a speech at the UN conference in New York 28.3.2017 Eva Walder, Swedish Ambassador for Disarmament, stated that “Sweden has always participated in multilateral negotiations related to disarmament...We support the humanitarian perspective, regardless of whether it refers to conventional arms or to weapons of mass destruction. However the humanitarian perspective carries a particular weight when it comes to nuclear weapons. They have the capacity to destroy the human civilization, to kill millions or even billions of human beings, to destroy the environment and to end life on earth as we know it...And finally, there should be references to the enormous waste of resources resulting from the production and modernization of nuclear weapons...”

Sweden’s activity led to a warning from the U.S. The Local reported 20.8.2017 that U.S. Secretary of Defence James Mattis had sent a letter to Swedish Defence Minister Peter Hultqvist warning the Nordic nation of a negative impact on relations should they sign an anti-nuclear weapons treaty.

In November 2017 the U.S. Secretary of Defence, James Mattis, visited Finland, where he met with the Finnish President Sauli Niinistö. After the meeting Mattis gave statements to the media. He stated: “We welcome the deepening bi-lateral and NATO defence partnership with Finland. In today’s conversations, we reaffirmed that relations between Finland and the United States have never been stronger.” Mattis also backed Finland’s initiative to create an international hybrid warfare center in Helsinki. - At the press conference Mattis did not take any questions.

During his visit to Finland, Mattis also took part in tripartite talks with his Nordic counterparts, which are expected to have far-reaching military consequences for both Sweden and Finland.

In Finland 45 % of the citizens oppose and 22 % support NATO membership according to a Values and Attitude Survey (EVA) spring 2020. In February 2020 the Finnish president, Sauli Niinistö, in a military magazine (Upseeriliiton Sotilasaikakauslehti) emphasised the importance of a referendum if the NATO membership becomes relevant in Finland.

In Sweden a poll (Dagens Nyheter/Ipsos) (January 2021) shows that 35 % say no to a NATO membership application and 33 percent answer yes.
THE SNEAKING MILITARIZATION OF SOCIETY

EU IS RAPIDLY DEVELOPING TOWARDS A SECURITY AND DEFENCE UNION

- **On the 28th of April 2015** the EU commission approved a new *European Agenda on Security* in which a strategy is presented for how the Union shall tackle security threats in the EU for the period 2015-2020. The press statement of the commission states that: “The EU and its Member States are confronted with significant security challenges. Terrorism, organised crime and cybercrime increasingly threaten societies in every corner of Europe, and these threats have changed in nature and magnitude. Europe faces the spill over effects of political instability in its immediate neighbourhood, which endanger the EU's security interests...”

- **On the 6th of April 2016** the EU commission adopted a *Joint Framework to counter hybrid threats*. High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy Federica Mogherini said: “In recent years, the security environment has changed dramatically. We have seen the rise of hybrid threats on EU's borders. There has been a strong call for the EU to adapt and increase its capacities as a security provider. The relationship between internal and external security needs to be further strengthened. With these new proposals, we want to enhance our capacity to counter threats of hybrid nature. In this effort, we will also step up cooperation and coordination with NATO.”

- **On the 8th of July 2016** a *Joint declaration by the President of the European Council, the President of the European Commission, and the Secretary General of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization* was signed in Warsaw. In the press release of NATO it is stated that in fulfilling the confronting common challenges, efforts have to be stepped up. There is an urgent need to:

  ✓ “Boost our ability to counter hybrid threats, including by bolstering resilience, working together on analysis, prevention, and early detection, through timely information sharing and, to the extent possible, intelligence sharing between staffs; and cooperating on strategic communication and response. The development of coordinated procedures through our respective playbooks will substantially contribute to implementing our efforts. Broaden and adapt our operational cooperation including at sea, and on migration, through increased sharing of maritime situational awareness as well as better coordination and mutual reinforcement of our activities in the Mediterranean and elsewhere.”
✓ Expand our coordination on cyber security and defence including in the context of our missions and operations, exercises and on education and training. **Develop coherent, complementary and interoperable defence capabilities of EU Member States and NATO Allies**, as well as multilateral projects. Facilitate a stronger defence industry and greater defence research and industrial cooperation within Europe and across the Atlantic. Step up our coordination on exercises, including on hybrid, by developing as the first step parallel and coordinated exercises for 2017 and 2018. Build the defence and security capacity and foster the resilience of our partners in the East and South in a complementary way through specific projects in a variety of areas for individual recipient countries, including by strengthening maritime capacity.”


✓ In the foreword of the Strategy, Federica Mogherini, High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, Vice-President of the European Commission states: “The Strategy nurtures the ambition of strategic autonomy for the European Union... For Europe, soft and hard power go hand in hand... We will keep deepening the transatlantic bond and our partnership with NATO, while we will also connect to new players and explore new formats…”

✓ In the document it is emphasized that: “The EU needs to be strengthened as a security community: European security and defence efforts should **enable the EU to act autonomously while also contributing to and undertaking actions in cooperation with NATO**…. As Europeans we must take greater responsibility for our security. We must be ready and able to deter, respond to, and protect ourselves against external threats.”

**On the 30th of November 2016** the European Commission proposed a European Defence Fund and other actions to support Member States’ more efficient spending in joint defence capabilities, strengthen European citizens’ security and foster a competitive and innovative industrial base. In the press release of the EU Commission it is stated that:

✓ “In his 2016 State of the Union speech, President Jean-Claude Juncker highlighted the importance of a strong Europe that can defend and protect its citizens at home and abroad - an ambition which cannot be achieved without innovating and pooling resources in the European defence industry. The European Defence Action Plan adopted by the Commission today delivers on that vision. European Commission President Jean-Claude Juncker said: To guarantee our collective security, we must invest in the common development of technologies and equipment of strategic importance – from land, air, sea and space capabilities to cyber security. It requires more cooperation between Member States and greater pooling of national resources. If Europe does not take care of its own security, nobody else will do it for us. A strong, competitive and innovative defence industrial base is what will give us strategic autonomy...”

(see below situation 2021)
• On the 1\textsuperscript{st} of March 2017 the EU Commission presented a White Paper on the Future of Europe. After that the commission has published a series of reflection papers that are dealing with central questions about the future of Europe.

✓ The fourth reflection paper, published on the 7\textsuperscript{th} of June 2017, outlines the main trends and challenges that will shape the future of security and defence, and it sets out three different scenarios with multiple options for moving towards a security and defence Union. While not mutually exclusive, these scenarios are underpinned by different levels of ambition for the EU in doing things together in security and defence. The paper states that the “first ambitious steps towards a security and defence union have been made…”

• Based on amongst others the documents mentioned above concrete measures are now being implemented: the structures for the common security and defence policy are being renewed, civil and military capacities and tools are being developed, European defence cooperation is being deepened and the cooperation with partner countries, the UN, Nato and other partner organizations are being extended.

• In a press statement on the 16\textsuperscript{th} of March 2017, the EU parliament emphasized that it is essential to increase national defence expenditure to 2\% of GDP. This would mean finding an extra €100 billion for defence by the end of the coming decade. Extra money should be channelled to research and development as well as to strategic cooperative programmes.

• On the 25\textsuperscript{th} of March 2017 the EU leaders were celebrating the 60th anniversary of the Union in Rome. In the Rome Declaration a way towards a new kind of Union that better listens and appeals to the citizens is presented. In the Rome Declaration the EU, strongly led by Germany, declared its intention to pursue an offensive world policy:

✓ “In the ten years to come we want a Union that is safe and secure, prosperous, competitive, sustainable and socially responsible, and with the will and capacity of playing a key role in the world and of shaping globalisation… a Union ready to take more responsibilities and to assist in creating a more competitive and integrated defence industry; a Union committed to strengthening its common security and defence, also in cooperation and complementarity with the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation,…”

• On the 7\textsuperscript{th} of June 2017 the EU commission launched the European Defence Fund, which consists of 5.5 billion euro a year to boost Europe’s defence capabilities. The Fund will coordinate, supplement and amplify national investments in defence research, in the development of prototypes and in the acquisition of defence equipment and technology.

• On the 13\textsuperscript{th} of November 2017 EU foreign affairs and defence ministers signed a joint notification on the Permanent Structured Cooperation (PESCO) that foresees the possibility of a number of EU member states working more closely in the area of security and defence.
This permanent framework for defence cooperation will allow those member states willing and able to jointly develop defence capabilities, invest in shared projects, or enhance the operational readiness and contribution of their armed forces.

The possibility of the Permanent Structured Cooperation in the area of defence security and defence policy was introduced already by the Lisbon Treaty which came into force 2009, and has therefore been referred to by European Commission President, Jean-Claude Juncker, as “the Sleeping Beauty”.

Out of totally 28 EU member states 23 countries signed the joint notification. For Great Britain, Denmark, Ireland, Malta and Portugal, which did not sign the notification, it is possible to join at a later stage.

The nonaligned country Finland was one of the driving forces behind the notification and has announced willingness to take part in several PESCO projects such as satellite cooperation, cyber defence and naval defence, and to reduce logistical and legal bottlenecks for military transport between EU countries – thus contributing to the sneaking militarization of society.

- Members of the European Parliament (MEPs) have been urging EU countries to increase expenditure on defence to 2% of their country's gross domestic product, but of course investment alone is not enough. EU countries waste an estimated €26.4 billion every year because of duplication in defence spending, overcapacity and barriers to defence procurement.

Parliament has been calling on EU countries to purchase defence resources jointly and thereby benefit from economies of scale. In a resolution on the European defence union adopted in 2016, MEPs identify ways for member states to pool capabilities, establish multinational forces and set up an EU headquarters to plan and command crisis management operations. This would allow the EU to react faster and more robustly to security threats. (News European Parliament, 21-9-2017)
The European Defense Industry: Towards EU strategic autonomy, June 2018:

✓ European cooperation in the defence industry would undeniably bring substantial technological and financial gains...

✓ This is why the Commission has put forward the European Defence Action Plan, with new financial tools for capability development and defence cooperation. As the precursor to an European Defence Fund, The European Defence Industrial Development Programme (EDIDP) is the first step towards building a genuine European industrial defence capability.

✓ The fund will support collaborative research and development in the field of defence in order to foster the competitiveness and the innovative capacity of this sensitive industry.

✓ EDIDP will enter into force in January 2019 and will be one of the greatest inroads in the field of defence, consolidating the European defence industry and increasing its competitiveness. At the same time, it will lay the foundations for industrial independence in terms of eligibility and award criteria in order to promote European companies, especially SMEs.

CNBC 30.10.2019- Europe’s defense spending nears $300 billion as experts say Trump’s pressure is paying off:

✓ European defense spending as a total is nearing $300 billion a year. The combined annual figure has been steadily rising since around 2015.

✓ Fenella McGerty, principal budgets analyst at Jane’s by IHS Markit: “Political factors are continuing to present a key driver as Europe responds to pressure from NATO allies — primarily the U.S. — to increase defense spending,” ...

✓ Janes said that Germany alone spent an estimated 11% more defense cash for 2019, while Sweden’s defense budget was up nearly 9%. On average, Western European countries, which includes the big budgets of the U.K. (no longer a member of EU), Germany, Italy, and France grew by around 4%.
The EU is the world’s third largest spender on defence: in 2020 the US spent $778 billion and China $252 billion. The EU countries (except Denmark) spent €186 billion in 2019. (Russia $61.7 billion in 2020)

European Commission homepage August 2021 – The European Defence Fund (EDF):

- There is a significant economic case for greater cooperation on defence spending among EU countries.
- Dysfunctional cooperation and EU-wide fragmentation in defence contributes to the lack of deployability of our armed forces (approximately 40,000 vs 200,000 deployed abroad for the US). It therefore hampers the EU's ability to act and protect.
The European Defence Fund will boost the EU's excellence and efficiency in defence equipment and technology by supporting the whole production chain: research, prototype development, and acquisition.

EDF budget: A budget of close to €8 billion for 2021-2027 is dedicated to the European Defence Fund. €2.7 billion to fund collaborative defence research and €5.3 billion euros to fund collaborative capability development projects complementing national contributions.

- When Finland had a referendum about the EU membership in 1994 there was no proper debate about a common defence and when EU critical citizens tried to open up a debate about the issue it was silenced totally.

THE MILITARIZATION OF THE BALTIC SEA –HAZARDOUS GAME BY THE WESTERN COUNTRIES

THE EUROPEAN CHESSBOARD: Here’s A Map Of The Russia-NATO Confrontation - Business Insider, Sep. 29, 2014
THE WESTERN COUNTRIES IN THE BALTIC SEA REGION

The head quarters of the Swedish fleet are situated in Karlskrona in the southern parts of the Baltic Sea.

Finland’s marine military bases are situated in southern Finland: Turku, Kirkkonummi, Raasepori and Helsinki.

In May 2015 it was announced that, considering the need to safeguard the marine areas of Finland and Sweden, the cooperation will be deepened by the development of a bilateral standing Naval Task Group, The Swedish-Finnish Naval Task Group (SFNTG). The countries’ performance capacities are combined to compatible units. The naval task group shall have full operational capability by 2023.
In March 2016 the defence ministers of Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden announced their intention to deepen the defence cooperation due to the increased military activity of Russia in the Baltic Sea region, which was worrying the ministers. The Nordic cooperation will be deepened by different means, amongst others tighter cooperation in regard to airspace surveillance, common safe communication between the Nordic countries and common exercises in the region. The defence ministers agreed to complete a Danish proposal to open up their territories for military forces to have access to each other's airspace and sea and land territories in peace time.

Warships of the Baltic NATO member countries Denmark, Estonia, Germany, Latvia, Lithuania, and Poland are also operating in the Baltic Sea, as well as warships from NATO countries located outside the Baltic Sea area (see military exercises below).

NATO Review Magazine, 2016 under the headline “Securing the Nordic-Baltic region”:

✓ “NATO has a strong role in coordinating closer security ties between the region’s states. Finland and Sweden are not members of the Alliance and are therefore not covered by NATO’s collective defence clause. However, the Allies are working closely with both countries – two of NATO’s most active partners – to assess security in the Baltic Sea region, to expand exchanges of information, including on hybrid warfare, coordinating training and exercises, and to develop better joint situational awareness. The prospects are positive for improved NATO-Nordic-Baltic defence cooperation, yet a number of important challenges need to be overcome. The region will test NATO’s flexibility in strengthening defence ties among its members and crucial partner states...”

✓ The number of major exercises conducted by NATO fully encompassing the land, sea and air power of its Allies in the Baltic Sea region should be increased...

✓ As Finland and Sweden are key provider states within these developing Nordic-Baltic infrastructural networks, NATO should ensure that both these partner countries are given the option to be integrated strongly within the relevant contingency planning structures...”

Germany plays an active role in the Baltic Sea – In the MarineForum-magazin (5-2017 and 6-2017, Randmeerriegsführung. Wiederaufbau einer Fähigkeit) Peter Korte, the head of a department in the German Navy Command, published an article in which he states that it is “conceivable” that “the eastern region of the Baltic Sea could become a venue for conflicts of interests and provocations”.

✓ He emphasizes that a credible deterrence necessitates preparations for “the regular and permanent presence of operational forces” and a resolute military buildup. Berlin’s decision to procure five new corvettes (K130) for the Baltic Sea is explicitly done in order to raise the presence in home (German) waters. The accuracy of the corvettes is significant both at sea and on land.

✓ Peter Korte also emphasizes the importance of both national and multinational military exercises and suggests a great number of rearmament measures, amongst others development and use of unmanned systems both beneath and on the water and creating capacity to find and fight against military targets under water and further development of the capacity.
The German Navy inaugurated its first-ever class of officers leading the multinational Baltic Maritime Component Command (BMCC) on Wednesday, providing fresh evidence that military planners are seriously considering the possibility of a military confrontation with Russia in Germany’s once-pacified backyard.

Navy chief Vice Adm. Andreas Krause established the German Maritime Forces Staff in the northeastern German city of Rostock, where the BMCC headquarters is being built. The German officers, led by a Navy captain, form the core of a small planning cell that will offer its services to the militarized NATO Command Structure once fully operational in 2025 or so.

Relations with Russia have become icy once again, however, with Moscow’s 2014 annexation of Crimea from Ukraine and an aftermath of military posturing near the borders with NATO countries. Reports of Russia bolstering its enclave Kaliningrad, which borders the Baltic Sea between alliance members Lithuania and Poland, have further increased tensions.

“The Baltic Sea has grown to a never-seen strategic significance in the past years” Krause said at the ceremony in Rostock.

Although Germany is taking on more responsibility in the Baltic Sea region, the world is changing faster than Germany is changing its approach. The country’s policies accordingly lack strategic direction and vision – and above all, action.
After German reunification in the early 1990s, Germany attempted to balance Russia and western Europe. Advocating rapprochement with Russia while pushing for the integration of its eastern neighbours into Europe, under Merkel’s first two coalition governments (2005-2013), Germany oscillated between wanting to strengthen the partnership with Russia and supporting its EU neighbours to the east.

Germany has taken a leading role in strengthening NATO’s eastern flank, clearly taking on more responsibility. Very much in line with the country’s general approach to international politics and the international order, the German approach to the Baltic Sea clearly and explicitly focuses on multilateralism, in which it joins initiatives within a NATO or EU frame-work, or together with several other countries. The maritime domain is of particular interest to Germany, as homeland defence and the defence of its allies closely overlap in the Baltic Sea.

While Germany is taking on more responsibility, adjusting its approach to security and defence to the changing situation, more will be necessary if Germany is to be able to provide security for its citizens and allies. Fundamental adjustments to Berlin’s foreign, security and defence policy are necessary, first and foremost updating the Bundeswehr and decision-making procedures, as well as encouraging a public debate about Germany’s security and defence policy and its strategic direction within Europe and NATO.

- **Nordefco** – The Nordic Defence Cooperation - consists of Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden. The overall purpose of NORDEFCO is to strengthen the participants’ national defence, explore common synergies and facilitate efficient common solutions.

An autumn meeting 2020 between the NORDEFCO Military Coordination Committee and Partners from the Baltic States concluded an eventful year 2020 of strengthened Nordic-Baltic defence cooperation.

The meeting took stock of the initiatives already established to enhance cooperation between NORDEFCO and the Baltic States. The participants also looked ahead at possibilities for further cooperation, for example within capability development. The Baltic States are already deeply involved in the work going on within NORDEFCO. At present all Cooperation Areas have some degree of cooperation with their Baltic colleagues. Additionally, the Baltic States are now represented in several Working Groups of the Cooperation Areas, for example on Veterans.
Among the results of the NORDEFCO-Baltic cooperation in 2020 is an agreement on exercise coordination between the Nordic and Baltic States in connection with the NATO exercise planning conference in November/December. In order to accommodate the increased cooperation between the Nordic and Baltic States it was also decided to add an additional Nordic-Baltic meeting to the yearly meeting schedule: A spring meeting will ensure quick consultation on decisions made at the Nordic and Baltic Chiefs of Defence meeting which usually takes place at the beginning of the year. As the Chairman of NORDEFCO in 2021 Finland has set the aim to continue enhancing the NORDEFCO cooperation and dialogue with the Baltic States.

- **DefenseNews 24.5.2021 - Baltic states vow to tighten defense ties with an eye on Russia:**

  ✓ The governments of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania have agreed to tighten their defense cooperation, vowing to explore the joint acquisition of new rocket launchers amid fears of Russian military moves in their neighborhood, the countries said in a joint declaration.

  ✓ The three defense ministers stressed air defense as a vital capability that they want to see strengthened in concert with NATO. Baltic officials have lobbied for years that the alliance expand its air-policing program in the region into a more comprehensive umbrella against all manners of aerial threats.

  ✓ The three governments welcomed “consultations” between the United States and allies about the Pentagon’s ongoing global force posture review, highlighting American troops on NATO’s eastern flank as “one of the main and most viable means of defense against aggressive and revisionist Russia.”

- **Bloomberg 10.1.2021 - Sweden’s NATO Skepticism Endures as Russia Flexes Muscles**

  ✓ Sweden’s top defense official said staying out of NATO remains the best security option for the country, even with an increasingly assertive Russia. A Swedish application for NATO membership would “affect the entire security policy architecture in our part of Europe,” Defense Minister Peter Hultqvist said in an interview in Stockholm on Thursday. “Above all, it puts very strong pressure on Finland, which has a long border with Russia.”

  ✓ The two Nordic nations outside of the alliance have increased joint exercises with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization since Russian President Vladimir Putin annexed Crimea from Ukraine in 2014 and backed a war on the two former allies’ border.

  ✓ “What we strive for are stability and predictability,” Hultqvist said. “That’s why we believe the fundamental security policy doctrines should not be changed. And that’s why we have chosen to build national military capability, based on non-alignment in cooperation with other countries.”

  ✓ Sweden’s defense collaboration with the U.S. during the last six years has been “very fruitful” and been “delivered with stability,” Hultqvist said. **Sweden signed a deal with the U.S. government in 2018 for Patriot air-defense missiles.**
NATO homepage 7.4.2021 - Relations with Finland:

- Finnish cooperation with NATO is based on its policy of military non-alignment and a firm national political consensus.
- **NATO and Finland share common values**, conduct an open and regular political dialogue and engage in a wide range of practical cooperation. NATO and Finland actively cooperate in peace-support operations, exercise together and exchange analysis and information. **An important priority is to ensure interoperable capabilities, maintaining the ability of the Finnish armed forces to work with those of NATO and other partner countries in multinational peace-support operations.**

RUSSIA’S SITUATION IN THE BALTIC SEA

When the Berlin wall fell Russia lost the main part of its Baltic Sea coast. All countries along the eastern coast of the Baltic Sea, except the small Kaliningrad oblast that belongs to Russia, are now members of NATO. Russia's access to the Baltic Sea is now secured only by Kaliningrad and the region around St. Petersburg. The Danish Strait is important for both Russia's military fleet and its merchant fleet. At the strait, NATO controls the traffic to and from the Baltic Sea and the alliance can close the passage for Russia if it so wishes.

In recent years Russia has expanded its troops in the Baltic Sea region and improved its equipment. Russia – as well as the western countries – have from time to time used dangerous provocation methods in the area, and sometimes the word exchange has been rather heated.

Suomen Kuvalehti 10.8.2017:

*Military bases in the Baltic region*

“In the Baltic Sea region thousands of new soldiers and heavy equipment has been placed in recent years”
TASS, 21.6.2017: Russia’s Defense Ministry plans to establish around 20 military units and bases in the Western Military District before the year ends... around 40 garrison towns are currently being built.
CAN (Center for Naval Analysis), June 2021: Russian Forces in the Western Military District:

- Between 2013 and 2019, Russian forces in the Western Military District (MD) underwent deep structural and organizational reforms to ensure that they are able to respond to a range of contingencies on Russia’s western borders. Yet, there is little verified information in open sources on the full structure of units deployed to guard the Russian western flank...

- Out of all the military districts, Russia’s Western Military District (MD) fields the most robust, most numerous, and most capable fighting forces...

- Units stationed in the district are capable of conducting military operations across the entire spectrum of warfare, from low-level peacekeeping missions to high-tempo maneuver operations supported by long-range air-launched and ground-based missile strikes. At any time, these can be supported by a (indirect) threat to employ nuclear weapons in order to showcase Russian determination and resolve.
Baltic Fleet: Ministry of Defence of the Russian Federation, homepage August 2021: Baltic Fleet (BF)- is the operational strategic large unit of the Russian Navy in the Baltic Sea. It has its main base in Baltiysk (Kalinigrad Oblast) and another base in Kronstadt (Leningrad Oblast). It is organized with a division of surface ships, a brigade of diesel-powered submarines, units of auxiliary and S&R vessels, the Naval Aviation, units of coastal troops, combat service support and special support units.

Sosnovyj Bor is an area at the Southern shore of the Gulf of Finland, about 80 km from St.Petersburg and only 90 km across the bay from the Finnish coastal town Kotka. The area is classified as a military area where nuclear power plants and different kinds of nuclear facilities are situated. It is home to the Russian Training Centre for Officers of the Russian Navy which houses working nuclear reactors of the type found on nuclear submarines. These reactors are used to test nuclear fuel and other technologies applicable to nuclear submarine reactors.

Kaliningrad is the most militarized region of Russia in the Baltic Sea. The headquarters of the Russian Baltic Sea fleet are situated there and in case of war Russia counts on being able to prevent NATO from bringing more forces to the Baltic. From Kaliningrad, Russia could severely harm maintenance connections for Finland, Sweden Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania in a crisis situation. Russia has placed missiles and war ships that can carry nuclear weapons in Kaliningrad. The tactical nuclear weapons stored there are likely meant for use with Iskander missiles.
The strategic importance of the Suwalki Gap: For NATO the Suwalki Gap, also called the “Suwalki Corridor” constitutes a problem. Here two NATO countries, Poland and Lithuania, have a roughly 100 km long border area running through heavily forested territory that separates close Russian ally Belarus from Russia’s enclave on the Baltic Sea, Kaliningrad. If the new cold war turns hot, the Suwalki Gap might be where the fighting starts. It is situated at the outskirts of NATO territory, where European military force is at its thinnest. But it butts up against a major concentration of Russian forces in Kaliningrad.

Concerning the militarization of the Baltic Sea, Russia’s envoy to NATO, ambassador Alexander Grushko said in the German newspaper die Welt (7.6.17): "NATO is building a new military security situation that we cannot ignore, that we should address using our own military instruments."

DANGEROUS MILITARY INCIDENTS IN THE BALTIC SEA REGION

A significant number of incidents involving encounters between ships or between ships and aircraft have been noted in recent years. These incidents are not confined to one part of Europe, but occur in the Baltic Sea, the Black Sea and the Mediterranean. Incidents include deliberate actions intended to signal that a naval presence is unwelcome.

As a result of the worsened security situation in Europe, turbulence and dangerous incidents increased in the Baltic Sea region, especially in 2014–15. After that it seems that the frequency of risky incidents has decreased and a tense state of balance and stability has emerged in the Baltic Sea region.

However, as long as NATO Allies, other European states and Russia continue to operate their forces in close proximity, the ‘friction’ and the risk of miscalculation related to incidents remains. It is imperative to manage the danger of escalation to a crisis and to continue working towards reducing the number of hazardous incidents to zero, and improving crisis communication.

In the process the OSCE (Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe) must be supported by the civil society to play a much more active role. Proposals to modernize the Vienna Document as a whole covers a wide range of broadly supported initiatives that address declarations of military information; composition and size of inspection and evaluation teams; thresholds for notification and observation of certain types of military activity and new proposals on risk reduction, incidents and accidents; and procedures to address “snap” or no-notice exercises which have become one of the more alarming military activities in recent years.
• Some examples of dangerous incidents:

✓ On the 19\textsuperscript{th} of June 2017 a \textbf{Russian} fighter jet and a US Air Force reconnaissance aircraft flew extraordinarily close to each other in the airspace of the Baltic Sea. On that same day a Russian fighter jet also flew close to a Swedish fighter jet.

✓ On the 21\textsuperscript{st} of June 2017, \textbf{during a flight control}, a \textbf{NATO} fighter jet flew close to a \textbf{Russian airplane} carrying the Russian defence minister Sergei Šoigu to Kaliningrad.

✓ According to CNN \textbf{Russian and US military aircraft and ships have had more than 30 interactions in the Baltic Sea region in June 2017}.

✓ NATO homepage: 28.12.2020: NATO air forces across Europe scrambled more than 400 times in 2020 to intercept unknown aircraft approaching Alliance airspace. Almost 90 percent of these missions - around 350 - were \textbf{in response to flights by Russian military aircraft}. This is a moderate increase from 2019... .

“In recent years, we have seen an increased level of Russian military air activity close to the Alliance’s borders,” said NATO spokesperson Oana Lungescu.

\textbf{RUSSIA IN THE NORTH}

• Russia’s main military marine regions are situated in Murmansk and the northern Arctic Ocean. \textbf{Murmansk} is the headquarters of the northern fleet and home to amongst others 30 submarines (out of which 10 are strategic missile submarines), Russia’s air craft carrier and many other military vessels. The strategic missile submarines carry intercontinental nuclear warheads, and the submarines also carry cruise missiles.
In 2020, NATO conducted 88 of the 113 NATO military exercises originally scheduled for 2020. Allies held 176 national and multinational exercises. The COVID-19 pandemic did affect the full execution of the planned NATO Exercise Programme.

For 2021, a total of 95 NATO exercises are planned. According to information provided by Allies, they will conduct 220 national and multinational exercises. The exercises led by NATO and Allies this year include around 20 joint (multi-domain) exercises, 24 exercises primarily focused on the land domain, 24 exercises in the air domain, and 9 exercises focused mainly on maritime operations. Many other exercises train specific functions or skills such as cyber defence, crisis response decision-making, Chemical, Biological, Radiological Nuclear defense, logistics, communications and medical activities.
- **FOI (Swedish Armed Forces), February 2021 - Western Military Capability in Northern Europe 2020:**

  ✓ **In order to maintain Western cohesion, there is a need to show solidarity in handling Russia as well as other strategic competitors and non-state threats.** NATO allies and partners should also prepare for action in smaller coalitions to enable rapid reaction. In addition, Western strategy should include flexible response against a range of enemy actions.

  ✓ **Russia’s means of power are limited compared to a united Western alliance,** but the country could pose a serious threat on NATO’s eastern flank. Given likely funding constraints, improvements in the defence of Northern Europe should focus on the near term, while still keeping an eye on the future.

  ✓ **The increasingly multipolar world order,** now again characterised by the competition between great powers and the weakening of multilateral organisations and norms, affects the security situation in Northern Europe.

  ✓ Consequently, **from 2014 to 2015, the number of exercises across the Alliance almost doubled; this new level was maintained until 2019.**

  ✓ Several large-scale exercises were planned for **2020,** but many were curtailed or cancelled due to the Covid-19 pandemic.

  ✓ **The number of large exercises, here defined as involving 7,000 participants or more, have risen to 3–5 annually** and, although few, this represents a step forward.

  ✓ The geographical location of exercises has also contributed to deterrence signalling, with the number of “key exercises” conducted in Northern Europe having increased from 8 to 12 from 2015 to 2019.

  ✓ The number of Alliance members participating in exercises has also increased since 2014. For instance, in **Trident Juncture 18,** all NATO members and some partner countries participated.

- **NATO homepage 30.4.2021 - MULTINATIONAL DIVISION NORTH SUMMARIZES 2020:**

  ✓ **NATO presence and visibility in the Baltic region has increased when Headquarters Multinational Division North (HQ MND-N) was activated in Latvia with additional elements being located in Denmark.** As their work towards Full Operational Capability (FOC) continues, the new Headquarters will become NATO’s most north-eastern division-level command.

  ✓ **At the 2018 NATO Summit in Brussels, the Ministers of Defence of Estonia, Denmark and Latvia signed a joint declaration of intent to establish a new divisional command.** Today, the main task of Multinational Division North (MND-N) is to conduct a variety of tasks in their assigned Area of Responsibility under the command of Headquarters Multinational Corps Northeast (MNCNE). The Division headquarters must be prepared to plan, coordinate and integrate activities of Allied land forces deployed in Estonia and Latvia and to provide training activities in accordance with national and NATO's defense plans.
In 2020, MND-N expanded the use of their information systems for military purposes, which allowed them to do their work faster and more securely. Although 2020 was affected by the COVID-19 pandemic, MND-N managed to increase their staff and run several internal training and study periods.

MND-N has successfully completed all of the tasks, and they have steadfastly moved towards their main goal: Full Operational Capability (FOC) planned for 2022. Initial Operational Capability (IOC) is set to be accomplished in the first half of 2021. After that, the divisional command will be formally integrated into the NATO Force Structure. They will be able to take over some of the responsibilities from MNCNE, especially those related to subordinate formations within their designated Area of Responsibility.

In peacetime, MND-N and their Command Support Battalion are scattered mainly between four locations: Ādaži in Latvia and the Danish cities of Karup, Slagelse and Federica. The Danish detachments are ready for a rapid deployment to Latvia at any time, if necessary.

HQ MND-N will have nearly 300 service members, of whom more than a hundred shall serve during peacetime. These positions are manned by both active service members and reservists. This organizational pattern is similar to the functioning of the Estonian Defense Forces, which are built upon the principle of a military reserve force. The Division headquarters and their Command Support Battalion are mainly manned by the framework countries representatives. Canada, Lithuanian, Great Britain and Spain provided their personnel, too.

Drawing on the experiences from 2020, MND-N continues to move forward towards their ultimate NATO test: Combat Readiness Evaluation (CREVAL) in late 2022. The CREVAL will be the opportunity for Multinational Division North to prove their ability to act as a warfighting division headquarters.
Euronews 31.5.2021:

✓ Russia’s military will form 20 new units in the country’s west this year to counter what it claims is a growing threat from NATO, the defence minister said Monday.

✓ Sergei Shoigu made the announcement at a meeting with top military officials. He pointed to a growing number of flights by US strategic bombers near Russia’s borders, deployments of NATO warships and increasingly frequent and major drills by alliance forces.

✓ He charged that such actions “destroy the international security system and force us to take the relevant countermeasures.”

THE “NON-ALIGNED” COUNTRIES: FINLAND AND SWEDEN

✓ FIIA (Finnish Institute of International Affairs - Finnish-Swedish defence cooperation: What history suggests about future scenarios – published 3.6.2020:

✓ Sweden and Finland have also increased defence cooperation due to their shared geostrategic and geopolitical status. As Russia’s assertive foreign policy and willingness to adopt power politics in Europe has highlighted the politico-military significance of the Baltic Sea Region, Finland and Sweden have become strategically important partners for NATO. The two countries became enhanced NATO partners in 2014 and have both signed a Host Nation Support Agreement with NATO, which allows for logistical support for NATO forces located on, or in transit through, their territory during exercises or in a crisis.

✓ Recent developments in the Nordic-Baltic region have also made Finland and Sweden more interesting partners for NATO.

✓ Due to Norway’s membership of NATO, this defence integration is unlikely to be as deep as that which could exist between Sweden and Finland, but in the northern (Lapland) region in particular, increased trilateral cooperation would be beneficial.

✓ Another potential trilateral combination is that of Finland, Sweden and the United States. The three countries signed a trilateral statement of intent in 2018, which would enable considerably deeper cooperation than is currently the case.

✓ While Finland and Sweden remain militarily non-aligned, they continue to participate in NATO’s defence exercises and are deepening their joint dialogue with the Alliance on regional security issues.

✓ Yle uutiset/news – 23.9.2020 - Finland, Sweden and Norway intensify defence cooperation in the north - increasing readiness for military operations:

✓ Military activity has increased in the region in recent years, especially on the Norwegian-Russian border.

The defence ministers of the countries signed a letter of intent on the matter. The declaration is not binding, but indicates a political aim.
The countries consider their northern regions to be a natural co-operation area, where their air forces already have cross-border exercise activities.

To begin with, the situations in which the countries can act together in the event of a crisis or conflict are identified. For this purpose the national crisis plans of the countries are being reviewed.

The aim is to improve the ability and readiness to conduct coordinated military operations in crises or conflicts.

- **Government Offices of Sweden – July 2021 - Bilateral cooperation:**
  - The Swedish Armed Forces frequently participates in exercises together with the Baltic States, both bilaterally and multilaterally.
  - The defence cooperation with Finland is Sweden’s most far-reaching and has a special position in this respect. Since 2015, the cooperation has deepened significantly. The Government has steered the development of the cooperation in a number of areas, such as bilateral operational planning, exercise cooperation, combined units, establishment of secure communication, mutual use of military infrastructure, defence equipment cooperation, exchange of personnel, etc. The cooperation covers a large number of activities that are conducted on a regular basis in all branches of the armed forces, not least within the framework of national and international exercises.
  - The bilateral cooperation with the United States is of major significance to Sweden. Sweden and the United States have a shared interest in improving their capabilities to act together in a crisis situation. The bilateral Statement of Intent signed by Sweden and the United States in 2016 contains five key areas for cooperation: interoperability; training and exercises; armament cooperation; research and development; and multinational operations.
  - In 2018, a Trilateral Statement of Intent was signed by Finland, Sweden and the United States on deepened defence cooperation that aims to complement bilateral cooperation and create synergies between these.
• The Finnish Defence Forces – homepage August 2021:
The Defence Forces participate in 60-70 international exercises and training events a year.
✓ The majority of the exercises are conducted together with the EU, NATO and Nordic countries. The number of exercises is growing and especially our cooperation with Sweden is deepening.

• FOI (Swedish Armed Forces) – homepage August 2021:
✓ The Swedish Armed Forces conduct thousands of training exercises every year. These range from teaching new recruits to assemble and take apart their weapons, to large-scale exercises involving all active units. Most training exercises are based on real-life scenarios such as multi-national peacekeeping missions or national missions. All aspects of such missions are practised: armed combat, negotiation, and co-operation with international colleagues.

• Svenska Yle nyheter/news (Finland) - 23.9.2021- Sweden, Denmark and Norway introduce new military cooperation
✓ According to the three countries, the security situation has deteriorated in Öresund and the North Sea, among other places, reports TV4Nyheterna (TV4News)... . For this reason, there is a need to increase the ability to jointly meet threats and violations, the countries believe.
✓ The aim is to be able to act faster through the collaboration, says Hultqvist (Defence minister of Sweden) to TV4Nyheterna. He also hopes that a possible antagonist will see the collaboration as a reason not to "implement negative plans towards us".

SOME OF THE MOST SIGNIFICANT MULTINATIONAL MILITARY EXERCISES IN THE BALTIC SEA REGION 2014 – 2021 INVOLVING NATO, U.S.ARMY EUROPE AND THEIR PARTNERS

In addition to the increasing number of permanent troops in the Baltic Sea Region, the number of war exercises has also increased. Many times a year both western and Russian exercises are held with thousands and even tens of thousands of participants. Significantly, the contents of the exercises have changed. Before, the troops of the different countries were mainly exercising crisis management. Nowadays also heavily armed and well equipped confrontations between war troops are simulated.

AP, 25.7.2020 - “Extensive military operations are underway in the Baltic Sea region, both from Russia and the West, in a way that in some parts has not been experienced since the days of the Cold War,” Chief of Joint Operations Vice Adm. Jan Thornqvist said.

• BALTOPS (Baltic Operations) annual multinational maritime war exercises held since 1971 in June in the Baltic Sea and surroundings (i.e. the Baltic Sea, Sweden, Poland, Germany).
BALTOPS 2016 Includes More Anti-Sub, More Challenging Amphibious Operations

- **Spring Storm/Kevadtorm** exercises have been held in Estonia in May since 2003.

- **Saber Strike** exercises have been held in Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia and Poland in June since 2010.
Center for Strategic and Foreign Policy Studies, 6.6.2018 – “Saber Strike” What is American army doing on border with Belarus?

- **Swift Response multinational airborne exercises** yearly as part of other major exercises

  TORUN, Poland: **Exercise Swift Response 16** kicked in to high gear here this week as paratroopers from the British, Italian, Polish and U.S. Army conducted multiple and simultaneous airborne jumps on to the Polish countryside as a demonstration of allied rapid response capabilities. The paratroopers near Torun then secured a bridge leading in to the city of Torun for the passage of the 2nd Cavalry Regiment the following day as that unit moved through Poland on their way to exercise Saber Strike 16 in the Baltics.
- **Iron Sword** exercises have been held in Lithuania in November since 2014
  - RT News – 3.11.2014 - Iron Sword 2014: NATO stages massive military drill in Lithuania - The exercises will be conducted mainly in two locations: Silvestras Zukauskas training range in Pabrade, and at the Lithuanian Grand Duke Algirdas Mechanised Infantry Battalion’s training area in Rukla.

- **Steadfast Javelin I and II, 2014**: Air and ground forces - Germany + Poland and the Baltic States.

- **Atlantic Resolve** multinational annual exercises since 2014 in the Baltic States, Poland, Romania, Bulgaria.

- **Anakonda** – exercises in Poland
  - Business Insider 21.6.2016 – Photos from Anakonda 16, NATO’s massive war game that worries Russia – A map of Anakonda 16’s operations (US Army Europe)
- **Black Eagle, November 2014**: in Poland.
- **Noble Jump 2015 June**: in Poland.
- **Dragon, October 2015 and 2017**: in Poland.

![Dragon 17 exercise - Ustka, located in northern Poland](image)

- **NATO’s Allied Rapid Reaction Corps = ARRC**, November 2015, exercised for the first time in the Baltic States.
  ARRC- exercises have been held annually since 1992 in different NATO regions.

- **Arrow 16 and Arrow 17, May 2017**: in Finland

- **Brilliant Arrow 2017** (exercise areas: Schleswig-Holstein, Vorpommern, Brandenburg/Baltic Sea Coast)
• **Northern Coasts (NOCO)** - NOCO is an annual multinational exercise led by Germany since 2007.

• **Aurora 17, 11.-29.9.17.** The Aurora exercise was held in Sweden and the Baltic Sea with Sweden as host country. It was the most important war exercise in 2017 not only militarily but also politically. It was the biggest war exercise arranged by Sweden since 1993.
- **Trident Juncture 2018 – Norway, Sweden, Finland, North Atlantic, Baltic Sea**


  “The exercise is drawing criticism from Moscow amid persistent tension between NATO and Russia, which seized Crimea from Ukraine in 2014... . Moscow has frequently said that it views NATO’s enlargement to include former Warsaw Pact countries and the Baltic states since the 1991 Soviet collapse as provocative, and Russia and NATO have repeatedly accused each other of aggressive action repeatedly in recent years.”

- **Dynamic Moongoose 2019 – Norway – NATO Anti-Submarine Warfare**

- **DEFENDER-Europe** is an annual large-scale U.S. Army-led, multinational, joint exercise designed to build readiness and interoperability between U.S., NATO and partner militaries.
Russia’s political-military leadership frequently criticizes the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) for its enlargement and for staging military exercises close to Russian borders. This pattern has intensified since Russia’s intervention in Ukraine in 2014 and the subsequent downturn in its relations with the United States and its allies... . Surprisingly, therefore, Moscow’s official reaction has been somewhat muted during the current run up to the active phases of NATO’s largest exercise in Europe in 25 years—though some Russian military experts have been making critical comments to the media... .

On January 23, the US Department of Defense confirmed that a redeployment of United States military personnel had commenced, transferring forces from the homeland to Europe as part of the NATO exercise Defender Europe 2020. The wide-spanning maneuvers will focus on the Baltic States, Poland and Georgia, involving more than 36,000 personnel from 11 countries (Lenta.ru, January 26, 2020)... .

Defender Europe will become an annual NATO exercise with a large-scale iteration planned for even-numbered years and smaller versions occurring in between. US military personnel will constitute the bulk of the force this year, with European allies collectively providing only 8,000 personnel... .

Almost 500 American tanks, self-propelled guns and heavy infantry fighting vehicles, hundreds of aircraft, [as well as] tens of thousands of wheeled vehicles will take part in the exercises... . US military personnel and equipment will land at airports across Europe and seaports in Antwerp (Belgium), Vlissingen (Netherlands), Bremerhaven (Germany) and Paldiski (Estonia).

- Defender Europe 2021 - US Dept. of Defense 3.5.2021: "It’s defensive in nature, focused on deterring aggression, while preparing our forces to respond to crisis and conduct large-scale combat operations if necessary," said Pentagon Press Secretary John F. Kirby, during a briefing today at the Pentagon.
Defender Europe 2022 – Voltaire Network 10.5.2021 - Ukraine to take part in NATO’s 2022 Defender Europe Exercise:

✓ The Ukrainian army is scheduled to participate in the 2022 army-led NATO exercise Defender Europe.

✓ The United States had pledged not to allow admission to NATO of former Soviet republics, but only that of former Warsaw Pact members outside the USSR. Ukraine’s accession to the Atlantic Alliance was thereby excluded.

✓ This exercise aims to verify and improve the interoperability between NATO armies and other US allies.

✓ Russia has made Ukraine’s accession to NATO a red line not to be crossed.

DANGEROUS OVERLAPPING OF MILITARY EXERCISES IN THE BALTIC REGION

• The Zapad-2017 war exercises 14.-20.9.2017 of Russia and Belarus, Aurora 17 and the Northern Coasts exercises overlapped both in timing and location.
It is remarkable that in a situation where three large scale military exercises were arranged in the Baltic Sea, a small peace exercise at the demilitarized Åland islands, arranged by the Stockholm peace association, raised the remarks below. Some 30 persons from Sweden and Russia took part in the peace exercise. Some quotes from the Finnish daily newspaper Uusi Suomi 28.6.17:

- "Finland’s former ambassador to Russia, Himanen, said in an interview that he regarded the event as a Russian operation, as an attempt to influence public opinion..."
- "Stefan Forss, security policy expert, spoke on Twitter about ‘peace fanatics’ and described the exercise arranged in Finland as ‘shameless’..."
- "Senior researcher Jussi Lassila from the Finnish Institute of Foreign Affairs made on his part, without taking a stand for the camp at the Åland islands, the assessment that such events pose a danger that Russia is spreading false information"

Painting such threat images has been critizised by an authoritative source.
In an article published in the biggest Finnish daily newspaper, Helsingin Sanomat 10.9.2017, under the headline “with the Zapad ghost, the West has put a weapon in the hands of Putin – Even children know what is spoken about”, Jyri Raitasalo, associate professor of strategy and security policy at the National Defence University of Finland criticizes the attitude of the western countries to the Zapad exercise. He calls for a more critical and analytical way to approach the threat that Russia is causing. In the article Raitasalo states amongst other things:

- “Zapad has become a slogan, with which more broadly Russia’s surprising and often attacking and aggressive acting is being described. Zapad has in a way become a symbol for what Russia’s bad intentions could mean militarily.”
“When Zapad is mentioned toady even ten year old children know what is spoken about. **Everybody is afraid of Zapad**, has been afraid during the last half year, in order to address the matter somewhat pointedly.”

“Rather often it feels like the analysis is based on key words and slogans and that it is not particularly profound. Of course what is used in the political and common debate must easily and fast be consumed, but in this way much is lost. According to my opinion Zapad has become a good example of this.”

**SIGNIFICANT WESTERN EXERCISES IN NORTHERN EUROPE**

- **Cold Response** exercises have been held in Northern Norway almost yearly since 2006.
Cold Response 2022 – The Barents Observer 14.4.2021 - Norway to host biggest exercise inside Arctic Circle since Cold War:
About 40,000 soldiers will participate in Cold Response 2022, planned to take place in the Ofoten area with navy and air force as main players in the war game. Ofoten is also home to Evenes airport where Norway’s new fleet of P8 Poseidon maritime surveillance planes will be based together with NATO’s two northernmost Quick Reaction Alert (QRA) F-35s fighter jets on standby to meet Russian military planes flying near Norwegian air space. For NATO and the Nordic countries’ defense partnership, Ofoten is core strategic important in case of a larger global conflict involving Russia in the North-Atlantic.

“There is a significantly increased interest among our allies for the north and the Arctic,” said General Eirik Kristoffersen, head of the Norwegian Armed Forces in a phone interview with the Barents Observer.

- Multinational Arctic Challenge Exercise (ACE) air force exercises have been arranged every second year since 2013 by the Finnish, Swedish and Norwegian air forces. The exercises are a part of the Nordic Defence Cooperation (NORDEFCO), decided upon in 2009.

The main region for the air exercises in Finland, Sweden and Norway. Flights connected to the exercises are also made over the Gulf of Bothnia between Kokkola and Oulu and in regions bordering Oulu, Rovaniemi, Ivalo and Kuusamo.
- Finnish Air Force 1.2.2017
• **JOINT VIKING** is a large winter exercise held in Norway every second year. It includes forces from land, sea and air – including Allied troops and units.

**Joint Viking 2017 - The Barents Observer 3.3.2017:**

*Joint Viking 2017 is a national Norwegian exercise, but includes some 700 soldiers from the United States Marine Corps, United States Army and the British Royal Marin*

**RUSSIA’S MOST SIGNIFICANT MILITARY EXERCISES IN THE BALTIC SEA REAGION AND RUSSIA’S WESTERN REGIONS BETWEEN THE ARCTIC OCEAN AND THE BLACK SEA**

Russia annually organises big war exercises in some part of the vast nation. Every forth year exercises are held in the western parts of Russia. Since 2009, Russia and Belarus have held common Zapad exercises in the Baltic Sea.

The exercises of Russia and Belarus are held in the western military district of Russia and include Kaliningrad, Baltic Sea areas and Belarus. **Zapad means west** and the name stems from the Cold War. It has turned out that preliminary data about the exercises are not always accurate. The number of participants has in reality been bigger than informed and the preliminary data about the activities of the exercises has not been correct.

**Russia has also held several large “rapid/snap exercises” at NATO’s eastern border. These exercises are held with short notice or completely without notice**, and the western countries have criticized Russia for lack of transparency concerning them.

- **Zapad 2009**. It was informed that the exercise was a defence exercise. In fact Russia was exercising a nuclear attack against Poland.

- **Zapad 2013**. Russia informed in advance that about 13,000 soldiers would participate in the exercise. In fact 90,000 persons participated. According to the preliminary information, “terrorists” attacking from the Baltic area were supposed to be the enemy. In fact the exercise included traditional warfare against a technically advanced enemy.

- **2014 March** – Russian navy war exercise in the Kaliningrad area. More than 3,500 persons participated in the exercise on the Baltic Sea and along the coast of the Baltic Sea. The exercise was a rapid control of the war readiness in the western and central military districts of Russia. Russia did not comment on the reason for the exercise.
• **2017 July** - **Russia and China arranged a common war exercise in the Baltic Sea.** Warships and air planes from the Russian navy and warships from the Chinese navy participated. The exercise concerned common activities at sea.
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• **Zapad 2017, September 2017** - In the west it is assumed that the number of participants will be closer to 100,000 than Russia’s estimate of around 12,700 (see image below).

![Map of Zapad 2017](image2.png)
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In the Finnish daily newspaper Iltalehti and in Finnish radio news 7.11.2017 Russia’s Zapad exercise was reported to be over and it was referred to the Estonian newspaper Postimees according to which nuclear forces were involved in very early stages of the drills and the nuclear exercise concentrated on the Baltic region this time. However it was not mentioned that also NATO organizes nuclear weapons exercises in Europe.

Russian Western Military District Activity
September 15-28, 2020

Russian Western Military District and Belarusian Military Readiness Exercises on January 25-28, 2021

```
Oblasts with significant Russian exercises*

*SWF has not identified the exact locations where these Russian exercises are occurring. These Russian exercises are seen by following general within these larger administrative boundaries. SWF will issue an updated map if more sources provide higher fidelity information.
```
• **Zapad 2021 – September 10 - 16. 2021**
  ✓ **DefenseNews, 10.8.2021 - NATO chief flags Baltic tensions ahead of Zapad military drill:**
  The event will see **12,800 troops training in Belarus from Sept. 10 to Sept. 16, including 2,500 from Russia**, according to Russian state-owned news agency Tass.

  According to Tass, the exercise will entail roughly 140 tanks, 110 artillery pieces and multiple rocket launchers, and more than 30 aircraft and helicopters.

• **Anadolu Agency/AA, 11.8.2021 – Russia, China launch active part of Zapad/Interaction-2021 military exercises - Russia to take part in 2 major military exercises in September:**
  ✓ Jointly with Belarus and Kazakhstan, the Zapad-2021 military exercise will take place on Sept. 10-16 in Belarus and Russia with the participation of up to 12,800 military personnel -- mostly Belarusian but also 2,500 Russian and 50 Kazakh servicemen.

  ✓ Zapad-2021 will focus on countering signal and electronic intelligence with an accent for detection and suppression of communication systems of a conditional enemy, as well as protection from possible strikes of self-made unmanned aerial vehicles.

  ✓ The drill will be held on five Belarusian and two Russian training grounds and supported by Russia's Baltic Fleet.

• **CSIS (Center for Strategic and International Studies, 28.7.2021 - Russia Goes to War: Exercises, Signaling, War Scares, and Military Confrontations:**
  ✓ Zapad does not start and end during its active phase. Drills and exercises held pre-Zapad are an integral, if not more important part than the actual active phase of the exercise. They will show how Russia plans to force generate new units, deploy them, and cooperate with Belarus to attack and defeat NATO. There will be much to learn post-exercise.
THE THREAT OF MAKING USE OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS HAS INCREASED

THE HISTORICAL UN VOTE IN JULY 2017 ON BANNING NUCLEAR WEAPONS

Even though the nuclear weapon countries and their allies will not sign the Treaty, the historical vote in the UN in July 2017 about a Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons (TPNW) is a significant step towards a nuclear weapon free world. The Treaty was opened for signatures on the 20th of September 2017.

It entered into force January 22, 2021. As of July 2021 it has been ratified by 55 states and a further 33 states have signed but not yet ratified. Thus, in total, 88 states (or 44.7% of all states) are either states parties or signatories to the Treaty. (decision process: voting – signing – ratifying).

✓ The voting was welcomed with gratitude by civil society and numerous politicians from all over the world:

✓ Setsuko Thurlow, an 85-year-old prominent atomic bomb survivor expressed joy over the adoption of the historic treaty at the United Nations headquarters on July 7th, 2017. She was 13 years old when the atomic bomb fell on Hiroshima: "I have been waiting for this day for seven decades, and I am overjoyed that it has finally arrived..."

✓ Simon Coveney, Irish Minister for Foreign Affairs and Trade, said in his statement on July 7th, 2017 in the UN: “The text adopted today represents the successful outcome of the first multilateral nuclear disarmament negotiations in over 20 years. This new Treaty is entirely consistent with the objectives of the United Nations. The very first UN Resolution in 1946 called for proposals on ‘the elimination from national armaments of atomic weapons and all other major weapons adaptable to mass destruction’. Ireland has consistently been in the vanguard of the move for nuclear disarmament since we joined the UN over sixty years ago... We view this new Treaty as strengthening the NPT and the shared, global vision of a world free from nuclear weapons.”

✓ Zia Mian, professor at Princeton University’s Program on Science and Global Security, wrote in the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists July 7th, 2017 about the Treaty: “The treaty’s foundational claims are that any use of nuclear weapons would be contrary to the rules of international law applicable in armed conflict, in particular the principles and rules of international humanitarian law, and that any use of nuclear weapons would also be abhorrent to the principles of humanity and the dictates of public conscience...These obligations break new ground. The prohibition on threatening to use nuclear weapons, for example, sets up a fundamental challenge to all policies based on nuclear deterrence. From now on, deterrence advocates are on the wrong side of the law, as understood and accepted by the majority of countries in the world.”
Beatrice Fihn, executive director of ICAN, the International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons, said on the adoption of the treaty: “We hope that today marks the beginning of the end of the nuclear age. It is beyond question that nuclear weapons violate the laws of war and pose a clear danger to global security. No one believes that indiscriminately killing millions of civilians is acceptable – no matter the circumstance – yet that is what nuclear weapons are designed to do. Today the international community rejected nuclear weapons and made it clear they are unacceptable. It is time for leaders around the world to match their values and words with action by signing and ratifying this treaty as a first step towards eliminating nuclear weapons...”

In October 2017 ICAN was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize. The timing couldn’t have been better.

YouGov polls conducted in late 2020 in six NATO countries - Belgium, Denmark, Iceland, Italy, the Netherlands and Spain - show very high levels of public support for their countries to join the TPNW.

Public opinion in all four surveyed host nations is strongly in favor of signing the TPNW and of the removal of US nuclear weapons from their countries.
Sweden opinion poll (SIFO) December 2019: **Almost 8 out of 10 citizens support TPNW**

Finland opinion poll (Kantar) November 2019: **84% of the citizens support TPNW**

Norway (Respons Analyse) December 2015: **78% of the citizens support TPNW**

Denmark (YouGov) January 2021: **77% of citizens support TPNW**

European Parliament Think Tank, 20.1.2021: **Most EU Member States**, 21 of which are members of NATO, **oppose the TPNW**, and only three have ratified it. The European Parliament has noted that the TPNW provided evidence of the desire to achieve the objective of a nuclear weapons-free world.

As of July 2021 hundreds of cities (including Washington, Paris and Manchester), **local and regional bodies all around the world have spoken out in support of the TPNW** through the ICAN Cities Appeal. They are bypassing their governments’ opposition and becoming Nuclear Ban Communities as they sign up to support the TPNW.

In the Baltic Sea region (as of September 2021) some 70 German, 54 Norwegian, 1 Swedish and 1 Finnish city had joined the ICAN cities appeal.

The TPNW must be used as an instrument to stop the new nuclear rearmament that includes new nuclear weapon technology, amongst others “smaller” and more precise nuclear bombs. The illusion that the radioactive fallout of such bombs would be smaller lowers the threshold for making use of these weapons.

**MAKING USE OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS – NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN EUROPE**

According to the **Stockholm International Peace Institute (SIPRI)** the nuclear weapon states in the world are at an increasing pace modernizing their nuclear weapons. Even though the number of nuclear weapons has decreased somewhat in the world, for instance the U.S. B61-12 bombs that are planned to be based also in Germany, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands and Turkey, will be more precise. This might lower the threshold for making use of them.

**SIPRI May 2020 - SIPRI Insights on Peace and Security:**

In recent western debates, concerns about a lowering of the threshold for nuclear weapon use have focused particularly on Russia’s so-called escalate to de-escalate doctrine, the existence of which has been denied by Russia. Despite US statements to the contrary, development by the United States of new low-yield nuclear weapons that seek to counter that perceived threat can similarly be seen as lowering the threshold for nuclear weapon use.

Moreover, Russia and China have for a longer period been concerned about what they see as an emerging US capability for preventive nuclear strikes with the help of missile defences and advanced conventional weapons. Both states have sought to hedge against this perceived threat by strengthening their strategic deterrence capabilities.
All these developments reflect increasing uncertainty regarding the threat of first use of nuclear weapons, which has already fuelled new armament dynamics...

This uncertainty has been further accentuated by the erosion of the US–Russian nuclear arms control architecture, leading to a loss of transparency, verification mechanisms and channels of communication between the two largest NWS.

- **Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists 12.1.2021: Nuclear Notebook: United States nuclear weapons, 2021:**
  - At the beginning of 2021, the US Defense Department maintained an estimated stockpile of 3,800 nuclear warheads for delivery by 800 ballistic missiles and aircraft. Most of the warheads in the stockpile are not deployed, but rather stored for potential upload onto missiles and aircraft as necessary. Many are destined for retirement.
  - We estimate that approximately 1,800 warheads are currently deployed, of which roughly 1,400 strategic warheads are deployed on ballistic missiles and another 300 at strategic bomber bases in the United States. An additional 100 tactical bombs are deployed at air bases in Europe.
  - The remaining warheads—approximately 2,000—are in storage as a so-called hedge against technical or geopolitical surprises. Several hundred of those warheads are scheduled to be retired before 2030.
  - The nuclear weapons are thought to be stored at an estimated 24 geographical locations in 11 US states and five European countries.

- **NATO/the US have some 100 - 150 nuclear weapons in Europe (Germany, Italy, Netherlands, Belgium, Turkey)**

These weapons are going through the above mentioned modernization. Traditional nuclear bombs are transformed into exactly penetrating bunker busters that can be used to destroy underground command centres and other hardcore war targets.

Is NATO preparing for a "limited" nuclear war in Europe – and may be also in the Baltic Sea area? Nuclear weapons are a core component of NATO’s overall capabilities for deterrence and defence, alongside conventional and missile defence forces.
• Center for Arms Control and Non-Proliferation, Fact Sheets: France and the United Kingdom
  ✓ 27.3.2020: France is estimated to possess 290 nuclear weapons, of which about 280 are deployed. The remaining weapons are thought to be in maintenance or storage. The vast majority, or approximately 240, are deployed by the French Navy, which maintains a continuous at-sea presence via its nuclear-powered submarines. This posture ensures a secure second-strike capability in the event of a nuclear attack.
  ✓ July 2021: The United Kingdom is estimated to possess 225 nuclear weapons, of which 120 are operationally available and only 40 are deployed at a time. All of the deployed warheads are controlled by the Royal Navy, which maintains a continuous at-sea presence via its four Vanguard-class nuclear-powered submarines. This posture ensures a secure second-strike capability in the event of a nuclear attack.

• Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists 15.3.2021: Nuclear Notebook: How many nuclear weapons does Russia have in 2021?
  ✓ As of early 2021, we estimate that Russia has a stockpile of nearly 4,500 nuclear warheads assigned for use by long-range strategic launchers and shorter-range tactical nuclear forces.
  ✓ Of the stockpiled warheads, approximately 1,600 strategic warheads are deployed: just over 800 on land-based ballistic missiles, about 624 on submarine-launched ballistic missiles, and 200 at heavy bomber bases. Another 985 strategic warheads are in storage, along with about 1,912 nonstrategic warheads. In addition to the military stockpile for operational forces, a large number – approximately 1,760 – of retired but still largely intact warheads await dismantlement, for a total inventory of approximately 6,257 warheads.

![Bases for Russian Strategic Forces (August 2019)](image-url) - Note: Compiled by CRS
The UNDIR (United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research) report 2017 - Lock them Up: Zero-deployed Non-strategic Nuclear Weapons in Europe – states that:

- The United States and the Russian Federation (before it the Soviet Union) have long acknowledged the immense security benefits of nuclear arms control. Through the Intermediate Range Nuclear Forces Treaty, both States eliminated an entire class of weapons. In addition, thousands of warheads have been removed from service under the START and New START accords. Yet, despite significant reductions in their strategic nuclear arsenals, both countries have been reluctant to include non-strategic nuclear weapons in the arms control process. As both countries move towards deeper reductions in their nuclear arsenals, the consolidation of tactical nuclear weapons into central storage sites lays important groundwork for their elimination at a future stage.

- Today, it is difficult to imagine a scenario in which “non-strategic” or “tactical” nuclear weapons would be deliberately used in a conflict in Europe. However, these weapons are still present on the continent and complicate efforts to strengthen the European security architecture. Moreover, these weapons pose potential risks of miscalculation, inadvertent escalation, or accidental use in a time of crisis. Yet, today there is no mechanism to reduce or eliminate arsenals of these weapons or to exclude the catastrophic scenarios of inadvertent use. This reality raises the imperative to develop a practical proposal that would make sure that nuclear weapons are not introduced into any potential conflict in Europe and that would lay the groundwork for eventual reductions in non-strategic nuclear arsenals.

- The core of the “zero-deployed arrangement” we propose would be to transfer nuclear warheads associated with non-strategic delivery systems to a small number of storage facilities. Once warheads are removed from bases near units that operate nuclear-capable delivery systems, it should be possible to develop verification procedures that would confirm the absence of deployed warheads at those bases.

- At the 2015 NPT Review Conference, Russian ambassador Mikhail I. Uliyanov declared that Russia’s tactical arsenal had been cut "fourfold" and that the remaining weapons had been moved to the non-deployed category and concentrated at central storage bases within the national territory... . We suggest that Russia withdraws all its non-strategic nuclear weapons to the twelve national-level storage facilities.
NATO does not maintain a similar central storage system... For US non-strategic weapons in Europe, the choice would be more difficult since NATO does not maintain a similar central storage system. From a technical standpoint, transferring the weapons to the Kirtland Storage Complex in the United States could be a viable option. However, such a move may be politically controversial within NATO and probably in the United States as well. An alternative would be to make modifications at one or more bases in Europe that already have the necessary support infrastructure to service and store nuclear warheads long term. The weapons could be stored in bunkers away from airfields, as opposed to the current practice of storage under aircraft bays.

INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES – CYBER WAR

SATELLITES

- Statista - Number of satellites in orbit by country as of January 1, 2021:

  ✓ Since the first satellite was launched by the Soviet Union in 1957, over 5,000 satellites launches have taken place for a variety of objectives. Earth observation satellites are used for both civilian and military purposes, playing a crucial role for activities such as monitoring the earth’s weather. Satellites also form an integral part of the world’s navigation and communications infrastructure. Space exploration also relies on the space telescopes, space stations and spacecraft included under this category.

  ✓ Of the 3,372 active artificial satellites orbiting the Earth as of January 1, 2021, 1,897 belong to the United States.... with their nearest competitor, China, accounting for only 412.

  ✓ In the years between 2008 and 2019, the global satellite industry almost doubled to reach 271 billion U.S. dollars... Over the coming decades the prevalence of private companies within the sector is expected to grow; for example, Elon Musk’s company SpaceX plans to increase its number of launches fourfold between 2020 and 2040.
European Union Agency for the Space Programme (EUSPA)

- **Galileo is the European Union’s Global Satellite Navigation System (GNSS).** Like the other global systems, Galileo provides radio signals for position, navigation and timing purposes. When completed, Galileo will offer the following services: Open Service, Public Regulated Service, Search and Rescue Service, High Accuracy Service, and Commercial Authentication Service.

- Once the Galileo constellation reaches Full Operational Capability (FOC) it will consist of 30 satellites. The constellation will contain 24 operational satellites and six spares.

National Cyber Security Centre, Finnish Transport and Communications Agency (Traficom):

- **Galileo is a global navigation satellite system (GNSS) built by the European Union and the only such system to remain under civilian control (see below dual-use).** Other comparable global systems are the American GPS, the Russian GLONASS and the Chinese BeiDou, all of which are managed by defence administrations.

- **Decisions on the implementation and use of the Galileo system are made by the European Union (EU) and its Member States.** The most critical services provided by the Galileo system are available to the EU Member States even during crises. Such access cannot be completely guaranteed when using navigation satellite systems under the control of other actors.

- **A significant share of the services offered by the Galileo system are already available.** Galileo’s open services (including open services and search-and-rescue services) are set to become fully available in the Full Operational Capability (FOC) phase, scheduled for launch in 2020. This will be followed by Full Operational Capability for public administration services and other specialised services, currently planned for 2023, with development work on the system set to continue beyond that date.


- While a civilian project, **Galileo also has a security dimension.** As a dual-use system, it will offer numerous applications in the security and defence field. PNT services give military planners and commanders means to manage assets, troops and munitions more effectively. Given its global coverage, Galileo will offer a large portion of these services to any interested party, thus opening the door for unintended users and uses. This has implications for EU and its allies.

European Space Agency (ESA) homepage August 2021:

- ESA is an intergovernmental organisation, created in 1975, with the mission to shape the development of Europe’s space capability and ensure that investment in space delivers benefits to the citizens of Europe and the world.
• **The Sentinel satellites – Copernicus Earth Observation project**
  
  ✓ **ESA/EU launched its first Sentinel-1A earth observation satellite in April 2014.** The Sentinel satellites are part of the Copernicus earth observation project that will cost the ESA and the EU around 8 billion euro until 2020. The program includes 6 satellites that will be launched within the time span 2014 – 2021.
  
  ✓ According to EU, the Sentinel satellites are an earth observation programme that will be used for environmental and security surveillance to tackle climate change and to aid disaster response, but the spy satellites will also provide “imaging capabilities to support common security and defence missions and operations”.

---

**ESA has 19 Member States:** Austria, Belgium, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Romania, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and the United Kingdom, of whom 17 are Member States of the EU. ESA has Cooperation Agreements with nine other Member States of the EU and is negotiating an Agreement with the one remaining (Bulgaria). Poland is in the process of becoming ESA’s 20th Member State. Canada takes part in some ESA programmes under a Cooperation Agreement.

**By coordinating the financial and intellectual resources** of its members, ESA can undertake programmes and activities far beyond the scope of any single European country.

**ESA develops the launchers, spacecraft and ground facilities needed to keep Europe at the forefront of global space activities.**

Today, it launches satellites for Earth observation, navigation, telecommunications and astronomy, sends probes to the far reaches of the Solar System and cooperates in the human exploration of space.
The Telegraph 4.4.2014, European Commission President Jose Manuel Barroso: "Once all the Sentinel satellites have been launched, the Copernicus programme will be the most efficient and fullest Earth-observation programme in the world."

- **Swedish Space Corporation (SSC) homepage 2021: ESRANGE SPACE CENTER - The world's most versatile space center:**
  - Esrange is located in the very north of Sweden, above the Arctic Circle (68°N, 21°E) and has access to a vast, unpopulated impact and recovery area.
  - The facility has been operational since 1966 and is presently used by the international scientific community for launching sounding rockets for microgravity and atmospheric research as well as high altitude balloons for astronomy and drop tests of space and aerial vehicles.
  - Esrange also accommodates one of the world’s largest civilian satellite ground stations and acts as a hub in our satellite station network.

- **Swedish Parliament- Education Committee report 2018/19: UbU3 (Sveriges riksdag- Utbildningsutskottets betänkande 2018/19:UbU3):**
  - The operations at Esrange should continue to be run and developed. Strategic goal should be that - The Swedish Space Company's infrastructure at Esrange should be dimensioned to remain an important national and European strategic resource for national and international research, development, demonstration, test operations and other space-related activities. International co-operation must take Sweden’s foreign, security and defense policy interests into account.
  - Esrange's geographical location in the Arctic is particularly suitable for capturing data from satellites in the polar orbit, which can be tracked during a large part of its passage over the North Pole. This can also contribute to the work with a space-state image. This has given SSC the opportunity, within its commercial mission, to expand Esrange into one of the world's largest receiving stations for satellite data collection and control of a globally geographically dispersed network of satellite stations. SSC operates one of the world's largest networks for such data. An important commercial assignment is e.g. to monitor data from EU Galileo satellites and governance.

- **The Swedish Radio (Sveriges Radio) - Esrange – the Vidsel base:**
  - 18.4.2017: The presence of other defense forces and the foreign arms industry at the Swedish Defense Materiel Administration FMV’s Vidsel base in Norrbotten is increasing and now accounts for most of the operations there.
  - 15.10.2020: ... satellites can also be used in a bad way. In wars and conflicts. This is what the Swedish Defense Research Agency, FOI, says... They say that Sweden should keep in mind that other powerful countries will follow the work on Esrange.
Defence & Security Systems International - Vidsel Test Centre in Northern Sweden:

- With its 3300 km² restricted ground space, FMV Vidsel Test Range is by far the largest over land test facility in Europe. Add to that 8 000 km² of restricted airspace over an almost unpopulated area with an open radio spectrum, allowing live navigation- and communication jamming, then you begin to realize that FMV Vidsel Test Range is the place for realistic live training and exercise.

- The instrumentation and infrastructure comprise high-speed cameras, optical- and radar tracking systems, telemetry and Flight Termination Systems. The Electronic Warfare (EW) capabilities include in-flight GPS and communication jamming of both platforms (aircrafts, helicopters etc.) and missiles. The target palette includes static and mobile ground targets as well as remotely controlled airborne drones, that can be equipped with different payloads such as jammers and IR flares etc.

- The unique environmental conditions as well as the vast instrumentation and infrastructure enable staging of complex T&E (Test & Evaluation) scenarios and demanding training and exercise opportunities. Other possibilities are low-level navigation during extremely dark night conditions or demanding cold climate trials and exercises.

HYBRID CENTRES

- The European Centre of Excellence for Countering Hybrid Threats (HybridCoe) opened in Helsinki in September 2017.

  - The establishment, by the Government of Finland, of the Centre of Excellence for countering hybrid threats will contribute to the strengthened cooperation between the EU and NATO, in line with the Joint Communication on countering hybrid threats that was adopted in April 2016.
Matti Saarelainen, Doctor of Social Science, was appointed Director of the Centre. Saarelainen has previously worked at the Finnish Security Intelligence Service (Supo). Hanna Smith, expert on Russia issues, was appointed director of strategic planning and responses.

Currently, the 12 participating countries to the Centre are Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway, Poland, Spain, Sweden, the United Kingdom and the United States. EU and NATO countries have the possibility of joining as participant countries.

Similar centres already exist in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania and NATO has two dozen accredited centres of excellence. The Hybrid centre in Helsinki is the first to link the military alliance with the auspices of the EU. Moreover the Helsinki centre in the far north is meant to function as a complement to the other centres. (USA Today 4.10.2017)

Speaking at the opening event, NATO Secretary General Jens Stoltenberg pointed out that Moscow’s actions have sparked new cooperation in the region and that the centre was evidence that “Europe is moving quickly to respond to Russia.”

Similarly Federica Mogherini, EU High Representative (foreign policy chief), said the centre is a sign that the two organizations are cooperating at “an unprecedented level” as evidenced by Finland, an EU country that is not a NATO member, being host. “A strong European Union in terms of security and defence makes also NATO stronger”, said Mogherini.

Sauli Niinistö, President of Finland said in his opening remarks that he was “honoured to welcome the NATO Secretary General and EU High Representative to Finland. Your joint visit is a clear sign of your commitment to counter threats also together…”

Other Centres of Excellence already contribute to NATO’s efforts to counter hybrid threats, including the Strategic Communications Centre of Excellence in Riga, Latvia; and the Cooperative Cyber Defence Centre of Excellence in Tallinn, Estonia. Centres of Excellence are international research centres, which are nationally or multi-nationally funded and staffed. They work alongside and contribute knowledge and expertise to the Alliance, but they are not NATO bodies. (NATO homepage 11.4.2017)

CABLES

Fenno-German "Sea Lion" telecom cable laying in the Baltic Sea completed in January 2016

The optic cable will improve connection to mainland Europe and bring with it new data centres.
Mark Klamberg, Swedish legal scholar at the Stockholm university and expert in Swedish intelligence law (FRA) made a remark about the cable in the Finnish newspaper Turun Sanomat 20.10.2016. Below excerpts from the article: “Russia has with the Sea Lion undersea cable got a possibility to direct its communication traffic to bypass Swedish intelligence. This might explain why Finland is in a hurry to adopt a new intelligence law. A big part of the data traffic from Russia reaches the world through Finland. Earlier almost all data traffic was passed on via undersea cable to Sweden. But the direct cable that this year was opened between Finland and Germany can make the intelligence activities of the west more difficult... Mark Klamberg however thinks that the intention is to spy on Russia: - the situation was the same eight years ago when we got the new intelligence law (FRA). The authorities did not want to tell us on what they wanted to spy on and motivated the law as a tool against terrorism. But actually Russia is the most important thing. They want to monitor embassies, naval activities in Kaliningrad and companies closely connected to the Russian government…”

According to Mark Klamberg members of the Swedish parliament remained in the dark about many aspects of the intelligence law program when it was adopted in 2008 and there may still be a lack of awareness amongst politicians of its huge scale.

In autumn 2017 the Finnish government began discussing surveillance legislation of its own, aimed in part at gaining access to the new cable data. Some Western security analysts now view the Baltic Sea as a main stage in a new cyber warfare arms race.

DefenseNews 1.7.2020 - Protecting undersea cables must be made a national security priority

Without the approximately 750,000 miles (ab. 1.2 million kilometers) of cables that crisscross the world’s oceans, our interconnected, digitally driven societies would be unable to function.
Undersea cables make instant communications possible, transporting some 95 percent of the data and voice traffic that crosses international boundaries. They also form the backbone of the global economy — roughly $10 trillion in financial transactions are transmitted via these cables each day. And undersea infrastructure is not just for civilian use. The U.S. government relies on cables to transmit information.

Not surprisingly, America’s competitors consider undersea cables strategically significant. Tapping undersea cables could provide foreign leaders with valuable intelligence, while severing cables could slow communications between the U.S. and its NATO allies significantly — perhaps by even months.

Data can also be siphoned from undersea cables. This is most easily done during the cable manufacturing process, when backdoors could be inserted to collect information. Similar vulnerabilities exist at onshore landing stations, where cables connect to terrestrial networks.

Finally, cables can be tapped at sea, though this is relatively difficult to do.

Russia and China have developed capabilities in these areas. Russian submarine activity near undersea cables is well-documented: The Yantar, a Russian spy ship, carries mini-submersibles that can either sever or tap them. Russian activity often clusters around crucial, yet hard-to-reach cables because these are difficult to repair.

- **Military.com: Operation Ivy Bells**

  At the beginning of the 1970's, divers from the specially-equipped submarine, USS Halibut (SSN 587), left their decompression chamber to start a bold and dangerous mission, code named "Ivy Bells". Nearly 400 feet beneath the frigid waters of the Sea of Okhotsk, deep inside Soviet territorial waters, the divers stayed alive only by the umbilical cords that pumped warm water into their dive suits.

  In an effort to alter the balance of Cold War, these men scoured the ocean floor for a five-inch diameter cable carry secret Soviet communications between military bases. The divers found the cable and installed a 20-foot long listening device on the cable.... Each month Navy divers retrieved the recordings and installed a new set of tapes.

- **The National Interest 26.7.2021 - How a US Navy Submarine Secretly Tapped Russia's Undersea Cables**

  There appears to be renewed interest in undersea cables, however. Not secret communication cables, but fiber-optic internet cables that carry much of the world’s internet traffic which, if severed could potentially cripple governments or economies thanks to the degree to which the world depends on the internet. In a time of crisis, severing underwater internet cables could be catastrophic. We are it seems, going back to the future.
Russian seabed warfare capabilities can target underwater infrastructure including internet communications.

COMPREHENSIVE INTELLIGENCE AND SURVEILLANCE ACTIVITIES REQUIRE CONSTITUTIONAL CHANGES

- In 2008 the Swedish parliament adopted the new intelligence law that gives the National Defence Radio Establishment (Försvarets Radioanstalt = FRA) the possibility to intercept all phone calls, SMS and email messages that are crossing the national border. It concerns millions and millions of messages; also messages with a Swedish transmitter and a Swedish receiver often technically cross the border.
• A significant part of the Russian data communication runs through Sweden (see the map above) and Sweden has since 2011 shared its intelligence data with NSA (The National Security Agency). NSA is the intelligence service of the U. S. Ministry of Defence. In 2013 documents that were revealed by Edward Snowden showed that Sweden had provided the NSA with a unique collection of communication information about high priority Russian targets; leadership, national policy, international policy and energy issues.

• In December 2013, the Norwegian newspaper Dagbladet, in cooperation with the American journalist Glenn Greenwald, reported that Norway was providing the NSA with tens of millions of communications every month. Drawing on NSA documents and sources in Norway, the newspaper revealed that the NIS (Norwegian Intelligence Service) was targeting Russia in particular, “conducting surveillance against politicians” as well as Russian military and energy targets.

• In October 2016 a working group appointed by the Finnish Ministry of Justice suggested additional powers for the intelligence activities. The suggestion would make it possible to get access to classified messages in order to protect national security. Such methods could be used concerning terrorism, violent radicalism or activities of foreign intelligence services. The suggestion requires changes in the constitution. The changes would make it possible for the Finnish Security Intelligence Service and the defence authorities to make use of signal intelligence.

• In April 2017 a Finnish daily newspaper, Hufvudstadsbladet, wrote that major general Harri Ohra-aho, head of intelligence at the Defence Command, hopes that it will not take long before the defence forces shall have the new tools in their tool box. The military frequently uses the internet for issuing of orders, and by monitoring the data traffic the defence forces could in advance get information about troop transfers in the neighborhood of Finland and collect information about the intentions of the troop activities. Ohra-aho is of the opinion that the geopolitical location of Finland is very advantageous for making use of signal intelligence in order to reveal military threats.

• In September 2017 the newspaper Hufvudstadsbladet revealed the intentions in the Finnish Parliament to make a very unique change to the constitution; to adopt the new intelligence/reconnaissance law, in an urgent order. Such a procedure is extremely rare. It means that the parliament declares the change urgent with a majority of 5/6. After that, the law can be adopted by 2/3 majority.

  A normal procedure for changing the constitution is that the present parliament adopts the matter with simple majority and then the next parliament adopts it with 2/3 majority. This means that the law would come into force only after the next parliament election.

• Lakimiesuutiset (Lawyers News) 17.6.2019: Intelligence laws change legal law practice: Amendments to the law relating to civil intelligence, which entered into force at the beginning of June 2019, challenge law enforcers to uphold the fundamental rights of the citizens. In the European framework, the interpretation of laws can be problematic.
**CYBER WARFARE - WAR IN SPACE**

**CYBER WARFARE DEFINITION:**
Cyber warfare consists of **attacks on computer systems of countries or institutions with the intention of disrupting, damaging, or destroying infrastructure.** Cyber warfare can also be used to cause death.

Cyber warfare often refers to the techniques used during cyber war. While it involves one group’s computers attacking those of another group, the effects on the general population or critical systems can often have far-reaching ramifications.

- Attacks on financial infrastructure
- Attacks on public infrastructure like dams or electrical systems
- Attacks on safety infrastructure like traffic signals or early warning systems
- Attacks against military resources or organizations

Cyber warfare is different from cyber/space war in that cyber warfare typically refers to the techniques used while engaging in cyber war. For example, a state-sponsored hacker may try to hack into the Bank of England as an act of cyber warfare while engaging in a cyber war against England and its allies.

---

**WIRED 23.8.2019 - The WIRED Guide to Cyberwar - The threat of cyberwar looms over the future: a new dimension of conflict capable of leapfrogging borders and teleporting the chaos of war to civilians thousands of miles beyond its front:**

- More fundamentally, **governments haven't been willing to sign on to cyberwar limitation agreements** because they don't want to limit their own freedom to launch cyberattacks at their enemies. America may be vulnerable to crippling cyberattacks carried out by its foes, but **US leaders are still hesitant to hamstring America’s own NSA and Cyber Command, who are likely the most talented and well-resourced hackers in the world.**

- The Trump administration has only **loosened the leash on Cyber Command,** elevating its authority and freeing it up to launch preemptive attacks on enemy infrastructure. Just this year, **Cyber Command has reportedly used those new authorities to fry the servers of the Russian troll farm known as the Internet Research Agency, target disruptive attacks on Iranian cyberspies, and plant potentially disruptive malware deep in Russia’s power grid.**
• Forbes 14.1.2020 - Cyberwarfare Will Explode In 2020 (Because It’s Cheap, Easy And Effective):
  ✓ Let’s cut right to the chase: the number of severity of cyberattacks will explode in 2020. Cyberwarfare has now leveled the playing field in industry, in government, and in national defense: **why spend ten or fifteen billion dollars on an aircraft carrier when you can disable it digitally?** Why spend billions on new product R&D when you can hack into your competition’s strategic plans? Why not just phish around municipalities for a quick $100K?
  ✓ **Cyberwarfare is a cost-effective solution to all sorts of problems** – and opportunities: cyberwarfare is a revenue stream, a new business model, digital transformation with its own unique flavor... . **it’s the cheapest, easiest, fastest and most effective form of warfare we’ve ever seen**, and because cyberwarfare defenses are more vulnerable than they’ve ever been.

• Forbes 6.7.2021 - Cyber Warfare Is The Last Competitive Advantage No One Sees & Why SolarWinds Is The Wakeup Call No One Heard.
  ✓ Afghanistan was not the US’s longest war. Not even close. We’ve been at cyberwar for half a century – and we’re losing. Globally, the US is losing, and the homeland is far from safe. Hell, why not just hack a municipality for a few hundred k? It’s easy. **There’s no cybersecurity strategy good enough to win a cyberwar.**

**SPACE WARS COULD BE FOUGHT IN MANY WAYS:**

- **ground-to-space warfare**, such as attacking satellites from the earth (for instance, terrestrial lasers that can ‘dazzle’ satellites, launch of missiles to destroy satellites)
- **space-to-space warfare**, such as satellites attacking satellites
- **space-to-ground warfare**, such as satellites attacking earth-based targets.

**Today the original two space powers (the USA and Russia) are no longer the only players.** Now, numerous states, including China, France, India and Japan possess counter-space capabilities.

*Space-based laser offers a powerful pulse of energy to destroy missiles in flight (image credit: US Air Force)*
Existing space treaties do not sufficiently regulate counter-space technologies.

- **In 2009** a decision was made in the U.S. to set up a new authority, United States Cyber Command (USCYBERCOM). Full Operational Capability was achieved in October 2010. USCYBERCOM plans, coordinates, integrates, synchronizes and conducts activities to direct the operations and defence of specified Department of Defence information networks, and prepare to, and when directed, conduct full spectrum military cyberspace operations in order to enable actions in all domains, ensure US/Allied freedom of action in cyberspace and deny the same to their adversaries.

- **In 2009 the U.S. turned down a proposition made by Russia to negotiate about** an international treaty along the lines of those negotiated for chemical and biological weapons in order to prevent cyber warfare. The U.S. denial to negotiate - causing the absence of a treaty - is now permitting a kind of arms race with potentially never before experienced consequences. As already mentioned, there are severe signs that the Baltic Sea area is turning into one of the most important scenes for these new cyber wars.

- **European views 26.11.2019 - NATO Adopts Space As Military “Operational Domain”:**
  - Until last week, the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) operated in four domains: air, land, sea, and cyberspace. Now, NATO decision makers have agreed that space should be adopted as a new operational domain for the alliance.
  - Following a meeting of foreign ministers in Brussels, NATO Secretary General Jens Stoltenberg told reporters that space can be used for peaceful purposes - but that it can also be used with aggressive intentions. “Satellites can be jammed, hacked or weaponized. Anti-satellite weapons could cripple communications and other services our societies rely on, such as air travel, weather forecast or banking,” he said.
  - If it does declare space a war zone, NATO could start using space weapons that can destroy satellites or incoming enemy missiles.
  - NATO’s decision to adopt space as an operational domain is in line with decisions already made by a number of countries.
  - In August this year, Washington launched the US Space Command to oversee off-world military operations; the Command’s leader, four-star Gen. John Raymond, describing space as a “warfighting domain.”
  - In a recent first for space technology, Russia has launched a commercial satellite specifically designed to rendezvous with other satellites. The purpose of this vehicle is peaceful: it will perform maintenance tasks on other satellites in orbit.
WAR MACHINERY AND THE NUCLEAR INDUSTRY ARE BIG POLLUTERS

SOME EXAMPLES OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS CAUSED BY MILITARY ACTIVITIES

RADIOACTIVE POLLUTION

- NIH (National Library of Medicine – National Center for Biotechnology Information) 30.9.1999: The radiological exposure of man from radioactivity in the Baltic Sea:
  - A radiological assessment has been carried out considering discharges of radioactivity to the Baltic Sea marine environment since 1950. The sources of radioactivity that have been evaluated are atmospheric nuclear-weapons fallout, fallout from the Chernobyl accident in 1986, discharges of radionuclides from Sellafield and La Hague transported into the Baltic Sea, and discharges of radionuclides from nuclear installations located in the Baltic Sea area.

- Hufvudstadsbladet 24.1.2016 – the tracks we are leaving behind are permanent:
  - “Since the nuclear bombs in the 1940s nuclear tests have caused radioactive fallout that will be seen in the bedrock for at least 100,000 years. According to geologists this is the clearest track that human beings are leaving behind.”

---

**Cs-137 in fish**

FOA (Swedish Defence Research Establishment): Levels of cesium-137 in fish from northern Seas during the first half of the 1990s
UN homepage:

In the five decades between that fateful day in 1945 and the opening for signature of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) in 1996, over 2,000 nuclear tests were carried out all over the world.

- The United States conducted 1,032 tests between 1945 and 1992.
- The Soviet Union carried out 715 tests between 1949 and 1990.
- The United Kingdom carried out 45 tests between 1952 and 1991.
- France carried out 210 tests between 1960 and 1996.
- China carried out 45 tests between 1964 and 1996.
- India carried out 1 test in 1974.
- Israel most likely—according to many sources—conducted a nuclear test south-east of South Africa in 1979.

Since the CTBT was opened for signature in September 1996, 10 nuclear tests have been conducted:

- India conducted two tests in 1998.
- Pakistan conducted two tests in 1998.

MailOnline 9.10.2010 – ”Is this the most polluted place on Earth? The Russian lake where an hour on the beach would kill you”

- Lake Karachay was a dumping ground for one of the Soviet Union’s biggest nuclear weapons facilities. It is situated in Russia’s south-west Chelyabinsk region and located within the Mayak Production Association, one of the country’s largest—and leakiest—nuclear facilities. Built in the Forties as Soviets moved armament production east, Mayak was one of the Russia's most important nuclear weapons factories.

The Guardian 2.7.2017 - “Russia begins cleaning up the Soviets' top-secret nuclear waste dump”

- Andreyeva Bay contains the largest reserves of spent nuclear fuel in the world, in fragile conditions that have disturbed the international community for years. During the Cold War period, nuclear submarines were refuelled at sea, and the spent nuclear fuel was then shipped to Andreyeva Bay, where it was placed in a special storage facility to cool off before being transported to a reprocessing plant at Mayak, in the Urals. But in the early 1980s, leaks sprung up in the storage system, causing high levels of radioactive contamination.

- The European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) has since 2003 managed the donor funds from western countries (165 million euro) to help with the clean-up in the area.

- In June 2017 the first shipment of radioactive waste was taken to Murmansk. From there it is transported by train to the Mayak reprocessing plant in the Chelyabinsk region.
Popular Mechanics 17.1.2021, The Terrifying History of Russia’s Nuclear Submarine Graveyard - The equivalent of six-and-a-half Hiroshimas lies just beneath the ocean’s surface:

✓ In the icy waters north of Russia, discarded submarine nuclear reactors lie deteriorating on the ocean floor—some still fully fueled. **It’s only a matter of time before sustained corrosion allows seawater to eat its way to the abandoned uranium, causing an uncontrolled release of radioactivity into the Arctic.**

✓ For decades, the Soviet Union used the desolate Kara Sea as their dumping grounds for nuclear waste. Thousands of tons of nuclear material, equal to nearly six and a half times the radiation released at Hiroshima, went into the ocean. The **underwater nuclear junkyard includes at least 14 unwanted reactors and an entire crippled submarine** that the Soviets deemed proper decommissioning too dangerous and expensive.

The Barents Observer 23.5.2021, Tackling dumped nuclear waste gets priority in Russia’s Arctic Council leadership - The reactors from the submarines K-11, K-19, and K-140, plus the entire submarine K-27 and spent uranium fuel from one of the old reactors of the Lenin-icebreaker have to be lifted from the seafloor and secured:

✓ **Russia’s Foreign Ministry invites international experts from the other Arctic nations to a June 2022 conference** on how to recover the sunken radioactive and hazardous objects dumped by the Soviet Union on the seafloor east of Novaya Zemlya.

✓ No other places in the world’s oceans have more radioactive and nuclear waste than the Kara Sea.

EcoWatch 15.5.2017 “’U.S. Military Is World’s Biggest Polluter’”:

✓ ”... the U.S., which has conducted more nuclear weapons tests than all other nations combined, is also responsible for the massive amount of radiation that continues to contaminate many islands in the Pacific Ocean. **The Marshall Islands**, where the U.S. dropped more than sixty nuclear weapons between 1946 and 1958, are a particularly notable example. Inhabitants of the Marshall Islands and nearby Guam continue to experience an exceedingly high rate of cancer.”
“The American Southwest was also the site of numerous nuclear weapons tests that contaminated large swaths of land. Navajo Indian reservations have been polluted by long-abandoned uranium mines where nuclear material was obtained by U.S. military contractors...”

- **Stanford University 11.2.2017 - The Health and Environmental Impact of Uranium Mining**
  - Uranium mining facilities produce tailings that generally are disposed of in near surface impoundments close to the mine. These tailings pose serious environmental and health risks in the form of Radon emission, windblown dust dispersal and leaching of contaminants including heavy metals and arsenic into the water.

- **Euractive 18.5.2021 - 2,800 radioactive waste barrels found near Baltic Sea, stored carelessly:**
  - A stock control inspection has revealed that about 2,800 barrels of radioactive waste partly originating from the healthcare and defence industries may have been handled carelessly, Swedish Television (SVT) reported.
  - The barrels are reportedly stored incorrectly in a repository for short-lived, low and intermediate level waste 60 metres below the bottom of the Baltic Sea in Forsmark, where one of Sweden’s seven nuclear plants is situated.

**CLIMATE CHANGE**

- **Military exercises require enormous amounts of fuel and cause big carbon oxide emissions.**
  - The production of everything that the war machinery needs requires enormous amounts of energy and diminishing natural resources, the exploration of which often causes severe environmental problems.
  - The fuel consumption of for instance a 10 minute flight with an American B-52 Stratocruiser warplane equals the fuel an average car driver uses in one year.

U.S. Marine Corps amphibious assault vehicles give off tactical smoke which has been criticised for its environmental impact
The Guardian 14.12.2015, “Pentagon to lose emissions exemption under Paris climate deal”:

“The US military is widely thought to be the world’s biggest institutional consumer of crude oil, but its emissions reporting exemptions mean it is hard to be sure...

The Iraq war (started 2003) was responsible for 141 million metric tonnes of carbon releases in its first four years, according to an Oil Change International report. On an annual basis, this was more than the emissions from 139 countries in this period, or about the same as putting an extra 25 million cars on to US roads for a year...
The paper found that projected US spending on the Iraq war could cover all global investments in renewable energy needed to halt global warming trends in the period to 2030...”

The Aurora 17 exercise is a sad example of the “environmental responsibility” in regard to military exercises. Due to pressure from media and groups worrying about the environmental effects, an environmental analysis for Aurora 17 was ordered from the Ramböll consultant enterprise. The analysis shrunk into a “presentation” with lists of environmental law and protective measures. Calculations are missing. In the environment presentation it is stated: “...it is not possible to judge what environmental effects the exercise is causing, neither locally nor nationally...”

Gotlands Tidningar (Gotland’s newspaper) states that only for the Gotland part of the exercise 400.000 liters of air fuel, 122.000 liters of vehicle diesel and 9.200 liters of motor fuel were purchased, and these are conventional fossil fuels that the Swedish Defence Forces material department purchased.

Quartz – 28.6.2019 - CARBON BOOTPRINT - The US military is a bigger polluter than more than 100 countries combined:

... recent work, including our own, shows that the US military is one of the largest polluters in history, consuming more liquid fuels and emitting more climate-changing gases than most medium-sized countries. If the US military were a country, its fuel usage alone would make it the 47th largest emitter of greenhouse gases in the world, sitting between Peru and Portugal.

Our study shows that action on climate change demands shuttling vast sections of the military machine. There are few activities on Earth as environmentally catastrophic as waging war.

The money spent procuring and distributing fuel across the US empire could instead be spent as a peace dividend, helping to fund a Green New Deal in whatever form it might take. There are no shortage of policy priorities that could use a funding bump. Any of these options would be better than fueling one of the largest military forces in history.
• Conflict and Environment Observatory 16.6.2021 - A lack of transparency makes it hard to calculate the true scale of military emissions but it’s clear they are significant.

✓ Militaries are huge energy users, making a significant contribution to climate change. Military emission reduction targets should be included in national climate strategies but we first need to better understand their emissions.

✓ Reducing emissions should not be the sole aim. This is because focusing only on transitioning the military to non-fossil fuel technology without addressing the whole life environmental cost of military technology and of military activities, risks overlooking the wider impact of military activities on the environment.

✓ Energy use at military bases and fuel use from the operation of military equipment – such as aircraft, naval vessels and land vehicles – are often seen as the main contributors to military GHG (green house gas) emissions. When the military do report on their emissions, it is this data which is usually provided. However, research into the UK and EU militaries shows that it is military equipment procurement and other supply chains that account for the majority of military emissions. This excludes those related to the impact of conflict operations.

✓ Arms production and the military supply chain therefore plays a significant role in the carbon cost of war. In 2019, sales by the largest 25 arms producing companies reached an estimated US $361 billion, an increase of 8.5% compared to 2018. Each sale has its individual carbon cost, from the extraction of raw materials, through to production by arms companies, the use by militaries, decommissioning and end-of-life disposal.

OTHER MILITARY POLLUTION – CHEMICALS, DEPLETED URANIUM, DESERTIFICATION

• The Moscow Times 6.11.2013 - “Two Russian Cities on Top 10 Most Polluted Places List”

✓ Dzerzhinsk, once the Soviet Union’s major site for producing chemical weapons, including mustard gas and phosgene. Some 300,000 tons of chemical waste were "improperly land filled" in and around Dzerzhinsk between 1930 and 1998, Green Cross (Switzerland) and Blacksmith (New York) said in a 2013 report. From this waste, around 190 identified chemicals were released into the groundwater.
Norilsk, founded in 1935 as a mining and smelting center (nickel, copper and palladium) with huge discharges of copper and nickel oxides and sulfur dioxide into the air from the operations. (Nickel is amongst others widely used in military, transport/aerospace, marine applications.)

• EcoWatch 15.5.2017 ” U.S. Military Is World’s Biggest Polluter”:
  ✓ “One of the most recent testaments to the U.S. military's horrendous environmental record is Iraq. U.S. military action there has resulted in the desertification of 90 percent of Iraqi territory, crippling the country's agricultural industry and forcing it to import more than 80 percent of its food. The U.S.’ use of depleted uranium in Iraq during the Gulf War also caused a massive environmental burden for Iraqis. In addition, the U.S. military’s policy of using open-air burn pits to dispose of waste from the 2003 invasion has caused a surge in cancer among U.S. servicemen and Iraqi civilians alike… .

• CND UK (Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament) homepage:
  ✓ Depleted uranium (DU) used in weapons is a chemically toxic and radioactive heavy metal which is produced as a by-product of the enrichment of uranium for civil nuclear power programmes. It is used in armour-piercing munitions because of its very high density; DU is 1.7 times denser than lead.
  ✓ DU weapons were used on a large scale by the United States of America and the United Kingdom in the Gulf area in 1991, and then in Bosnia-Herzegovina in 1995, in Serbia and Kosovo in 1999, and again in the war in Iraq in 2003. They were also used by the US in Syria in 2015.
  ✓ At least 17 countries are thought to have weapon systems containing DU.
  ✓ It is thought that using DU has caused a sharp increase in the incidence rates of some cancers, such as breast cancer and lymphoma, kidney failure, nervous system disorders, lung disease and reproductive problems.

MILITARY BASES NATIONWIDE AND OVERSEAS
Unfortunately, military pollution often tends to be the norm rather than an exception at present as well as former military bases worldwide. This constitutes a huge problem both nationwide and at the more than 1.000 military bases of different countries and different sizes overseas, i.e. in the territory of another country. The economical, political, environment and health costs of the military bases are only rarely openly admitted and discussed.

✓ At the military bases dangerous polluting material and substances are stored, such as nerve gas, depleted uranium (= DU), unexploded mines and shells. If the storage is inadequate the chemicals leak out into the ground and the groundwater, causing human beings and the environment great problems.

✓ All around the world military bases have caused great damage; toxic emissions, accidents and in some cases deliberate dumping of toxic substances on the ground, in oceans, lakes and other bodies of water.

✓ Military bases in the home countries as well as abroad also cause harmful and scary noise disturbances. Navy operations cause damage to marine ecology.
• **Newsweek 17.7.2014** "The US Department of Defence is one of the world’s biggest polluters":

  ✓ "The US Department of Defence is one of the world’s worst polluters. Its footprint dwarfs that of any corporation: 4,127 installations spread across 19 million acres of American soil. Maureen Sullivan, who heads the Pentagon’s environmental programmes, says her office contends with 39,000 contaminated sites…"

  ✓ "Almost every military site in this country is seriously contaminated, said John D Dingell, a soon-to-retire Michigan congressman, who served in the Second World War. Lejeune is one of many. They form a sort of toxic archipelago across the land from McClellan Air Force Base near Sacramento, California, where radioactive waste was found, to the Massachusetts Military Reservation on Cape Cod, poisoned by explosives and perchlorate, a rocket fuel component that is a major Pentagon pollutant…".

• **Military.com 3.4.2020** Dozens More Military Bases Have Suspected 'Forever Chemical' Contamination

  ✓ According to a report released Thursday by the Washington, D.C.-based Environmental Working Group (EWG), 678 installations are either contaminated or had suspect discharges of PFAS compounds used in firefighting foams.

  ✓ PFAS chemicals have contaminated communities across the U.S. from industrial sites that manufacture or use the compounds in products such as non-stick cookware, stain repellent, materials and food wrappers. But EWG found that many of the highest levels of the chemicals, sometimes called "forever chemicals" because they do not break down and are impossible to destroy, are on or near military bases, where firefighting foams containing PFOS and PFOA have been used for decades in training and emergencies.

• **Northeastern University Social Science Environmental Health Research Institute 15.9.2020 - NATO Poisoning Fish in Germany**

  ✓ "Throughout much of Europe, NATO military bases have used and carelessly discarded hundreds of thousands of gallons of toxic fire-fighting foams containing a variety of PFAS chemicals during routine fire-fighting exercises."

  ✓ The aqueous film-forming foams (AFFF) have been in use since the early 1970’s and have been allowed to seep into the ground to contaminate groundwater, soil, and surface water. The resulting pollution is responsible for a serious European public health crisis, although few are paying attention.

  ✓ A German Brown Trout caught in Spanger Bach Creek, near Spangdahlem NATO Airbase, was found to contain 82 ug/kg (micrograms per kilo of fillet) of per – and poly fluoroalkyl substances, or PFOS.

  ✓ 82 ug/kg is the same as 82,000 parts per trillion, (ppt). Public health scientists around the world have been warning people not to consume more than 1 ppt of the toxins daily.
• Pat Elder, September 12, 2021: The U.S. Army has contaminated groundwater and surface water at U.S. Army Garrison - Ansbach, Germany:

✔ The United States military has contaminated groundwater and surface water with PFAS in German communities surrounding bases throughout the country. The U.S. Army Garrison Ansbach, Katterbach Kaserne, Germany provides the clearest indication we have of the specific levels of contamination in the German environment.

Unlike other U.S. Army and Air Force installations in Germany, a partially redacted U.S. Army report detailing the contamination was published in April, 2020 by Ansbach city officials who obtained a copy from the Army.

✔ Since the early 1970’s American military facilities throughout the continent have recklessly used and discarded massive amounts of firefighting foam used during routine fire-training exercises. The foams contain carcinogenic PFAS (per- and poly fluoroalkyl substances) that were allowed to leach into the groundwater and pour into sewer systems that drain into nearby creeks, contaminating the environment, perhaps forever.

✔ Two generations of Germans have been eating food and drinking water tainted with the poisons, although municipal drinking water sources are slowly managing to rid most of the chemicals from drinking water.

PFAS concentrations in groundwater in Ansbach are 500 times over Bavarian standards. Groundwater Monitoring Site 70 contains a concentration of 35,000 parts per trillion, (ppt). The American military is poisoning G

• The Environmental Legacy of the Soviet Armed Forces in the Baltic States and Poland as well as other former members of the Warsaw Pact.

✔ Poland as well as the three Baltic States, Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania being at the western edge of the Soviet Union (SU), represented a strategically important area. Thus, once the SU collapsed in 1991, these countries were left with a large number of former often heavily polluted military facilities.
The military complex of the Soviet Union and of its satellite states was proportionally much larger than in most other countries. The military was under little or no civilian control, and negative traits which permeated the whole society, such as a tradition of secretiveness, low level of official environmental concern, lack of proper safety and environmental standards, wasteful use of resources, and lack of direct responsibility, were even more pronounced in the military sector than in civilian life.

The military used a vast array of chemicals, many of which were potentially hazardous. The environmental problems caused by the SU military activities: for instance unexploded ordnance (UXOs), petroleum products, other chemical pollution (missile propellants, solvents, POPs, explosives, chemical warfare agents, heavy metals, etc).

The SU legacy includes furthermore indefinable waste, contaminated land and water, dumping areas, enormous amounts of concrete, launching pads for missiles, bunkers, underground tunnels as well as military residential areas.

NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS AND OTHER NUCLEAR COMPLEXES SITUATED IN EUROPE – NO WAR IN EUROPE CAN BE NUCLEAR FREE

The nuclear weapons placed in Europe, as well as the dense network of nuclear power plants, storage sites for radioactive waste, cooling basins for spent nuclear fuel, reprocessing plants, nuclear fuel factories and other nuclear industry complexes mean that a war in Europe most likely cannot be anything but a nuclear war. All so called flight bans over nuclear power plants and other nuclear facilities are turned into empty promises in a war situation – not to mention accidental accidents or misjudgments in connection with military exercises or war.

Nuclear power plants also constitute possible cyber war, sabotage and terrorist targets.

- There are a total of 15 nuclear power plants in operation in the Baltic Sea area. In Finland a new 1.600 MW EPR reactor OL-3 will go on line in the near future (as of September 2021). Another new Russian reactor is planned in Northern Finland.
- Finland 4 reactors
  Sweden 6 reactors
  Russia/Sosnovy Bor, St. Petersburg 4 reactors
  Belarus 1 reactor

Japan to check background of nuclear workers to prevent terrorism, Kyodo News, TOKYO, Sept. 7, 2016
Map of the dense network of Nuclear Power plants in the Baltic Sea area

Spent fuel and other nuclear power facilities are not on the map

If and when nuclear-powered nations go to war, they will have to choose between shutting down their nuclear power reactors, or taking the risk of attacks potentially leading to widespread, large-scale dispersal of radioactive materials. Spent fuel stores, typically containing enormous quantities of radioactive materials may be more vulnerable than reactors as they are generally less well protected.

- Finland is the first country worldwide that has almost finished the building of a final repository for high-level radioactive waste in Olkiluoto. The “Onkalo” repository is based on a tunnel system in the bedrock almost 450 metres underground (see picture below). According to the plans the final repository will be taken into use in the mid-2020s. It is built according to the the Swedish/Finnish method KBS-3.

- In Sweden – due to a complicated legal procedure – a license for the construction of a final repository in Forsmark has not yet been granted. The nuclear waste company SKB hopes to be able to start work on the construction in the early 2020s and reckons that the Spent Fuel Repository can then be ready to start operations about ten years later.

Finland – Onkalo final repository for highly radioactive spent fuel about 45 metres underground
In the background the Gulf of Bothnia
Europe – the potential hazards of radioactive contamination due to a nuclear power accident

Nuclear power plants cause different kinds of emissions harmful to human beings and the environment during “normal operation”.

- In nuclear power plants numerous radio nuclides occur through nuclear fission. The vast majority of this radioactivity is safely retained in the fuel itself and in the fuel element tubes. A small amount of radioactivity, however, occurs in the cooling water pumped into the watercourse. Through the ventilation, small amounts of noble gases, dangerous to humans and the environment, are released, such as tritium, carbon 14, radioactive iodine. The used cooling water pumped from nuclear power plants into the sea or other watercourses has a harmful warming effect on the surrounding water.

- **Journal of Environmental Radioactivity, Volume 133, July 2014**: “A hypothesis to explain childhood cancers near nuclear power plants”
  - “Over 60 epidemiological studies world-wide have examined cancer incidences in children near nuclear power plants (NPPs): most of them indicate leukemia increases.”

- **Nuclear power is not CO2 neutral.** The nuclear power plants do not cause significant carbon dioxide emissions during operation, but the entire life cycle shows significant emissions; uranium mining and uranium management, production of fuel rods, construction and dismantling of nuclear power plants, construction of interim and final repositories for different kinds of nuclear waste as well as all transports that are carried out in connection with the various operations.
THE BALTIC SEA – A POLLUTED SEA

THE BALTIC SEA, OUR VULNERABLE INLAND SEA – ONE OF THE MOST TRAFFICKED AND POLLUTED SEAS

The rapid increase in military activity and the extensive waste of natural resources generated by the all military operations pose a serious threat to the Baltic Sea and to the people living in the area.

- Nuclear contamination – in peacetime and in case of war
  - The nuclear power plants - with cooling basins for the fuel rods, ports and final repositories for different types of radioactive waste - which operate around the Baltic Sea, pose serious threats to human beings and the environment.
  - The Baltic Sea – the most radioactive sea in the world – Yle-news 28.3.2011. The high cesium-137 levels of the Baltic Sea are largely due to the Chernobyl accident. According to Tarja K. Ikäheimonen, director of the Radiation Safety Center (STUK), the nuclear weapons tests that were made during the Cold War have also affected the Baltic Sea. The radiation stays in the sea because the Baltic Sea is a shallow sea where the water is slowly replaced, contrary to the world oceans. The impact of nuclear power plants on radioactivity in the Baltic is small. The Baltic Sea is still the most radioactive sea in the world - Hufvudstadsbladet 25.5.2015. Calculations indicate that radioactivity in the Baltic Sea will sink to the level before Chernobyl in the 2020s.
  - Sweden and the former Soviet Union have dumped radioactive waste in the Baltic Sea, IAEA – TECDO – 1105, Inventory of radioactive waste disposal at sea, August 1999:

- Chemical weapons
  - The Economist 21.11.2013: “The ticking time-bomb at the bottom of the Baltic Sea”: ”Under an agreement reached at the Potsdam Conference in 1945, Britain and the Soviet Union dumped around 65,000 tonnes of Germany’s chemical weapons stockpile into the murky depths of the Baltic Sea in 1947-48. Since then the threat posed by the shells and drums full of hazardous waste has been subject to speculation and research. Some scientist called it a ‘ticking time-bomb’.”
  - VOXeurop 26.3.2013: the Baltics: “Thousands of tonnes of chemical weapons sunk in the Baltic Sea after WWII pose a lethal hazard to humans and the environment. After 70 years at the bottom of the sea, the corroded containers risk leaking deadly poisons... In 2009, the Swedish public was shocked by a public TV documentary, which revealed how the Soviets had sunk chemical weapons in the Baltic as recently as 1992.”
Climate change and eutrophication in the Baltic Sea

- The eutrophication of the Baltic Sea has been a major concern for decades. Widespread algal blooms and decreases in species diversity are the consequences of human activity along the Baltic coasts. Enormous amounts of nutrients have polluted the sea.

- Climate change, to which also the entire war machinery significantly is contributing, also affects the Baltic Sea in different ways. One can estimate the effects of climate change based on temperatures of the Baltic Sea, winter ice as well as changes in salinity. Studies show that temperatures have risen since the 1990s both on the surface and in the deeper water layers. The salt content has varied but it has not fallen noticeably. The size of the ice sheet and the length of the ice period have varied a lot yearly. Temperature, the ice layers and salinity affect each other, and in the long run, climate change can indirectly affect the saltwater pulses, oxygen deficiency and organism communities.
• The financial resources of the states around the Baltic Sea should be used to save the Baltic Sea - not to destroy it totally.

• Military resources are urgently needed to clean-up the military material dumped in the Baltic Sea.

HOW TO TURN THE BALTIC SEA INTO A SEA OF PEACE?

THE CAPABILITY TO MAINTAIN PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE WITH RUSSIA AND SHOW MUTUAL RESPECT – A BIG CHALLENGE FOR ALL COUNTRIES IN THE BALTIC SEA REGION

• During the Soviet time Finland was defined as a "benevolent country". Finland managed to achieve its goal, namely to stay out of the conflicts of the Great Powers and to fulfill what was written in the 1948 Agreement on Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance (YYA-Sopimus). Finland’s neutrality policy was largely based on this. Moscow did not fully approve of it, but Finland however, found its place among the other neutral and alliance-free countries in Europe.

✓ Maintaining dialogue with Russia, and not further contributing to a militarization that catastrophically increases tensions between East and West, is important not only for Finland but for the whole Baltic Sea area and for world peace.

• Sven Hirdman, former ambassador of Sweden to Moscow, former State Secretary at the Swedish Ministry of Defense, proposed at a Helsinki conference in 2015 under the heading "The Baltic Sea Region has in recent years transformed into a high-voltage area", a number of ways to avoid escalating the situation:

✓ "It is essential that Sweden and Finland should not become members of NATO..."

✓ "It is important to remember that tension and conflict are grounded in the minds of people – in their memories of historical injustices, in their fear and prejudices of foreign people. To overcome these feelings, security must be built up from the bottom-up through people-to people contacts, not only top-bottom through government agreements..."

✓ ... In the so called Vienna agreement from Col War I on CBM measures (confidence building measures), there are a number of proposals that should be re-enacted, for instance relating to the holding of military exercises. CFE 2 on conventional force reductions never entered into force after the break-up of the Soviet Union. This means that there is a certain lacuna with respect to force levels in the Baltic States area and in Poland, which should be looked at again as should the Russian flank agreements. This also relates to the stationing of NATO forces and equipment in Eastern Europe according to the NATO-Russia agreement of 1997...
... Another area for serious arms control discussions involving our area relates to **tactical nuclear weapons**. Such weapons are stationed in western Russia and also in some West European countries. So far, *no force limits have been agreed*...

... **twinning between municipalities in the Nordic countries and Russia** should be renewed with government support... one might consider increased government support at organizations such as the Union of Baltic Cities (UBC is an association of 107 cities around the Baltic Sea) or the Baltic Sea States Sub-regional Cooperation (BSSC)...”

- June 2018 - MANAGING COMPLEXITY: ADDRESSING SOCIETAL SECURITY CHALLENGES IN THE BALTIC SEA REGION –(SIPRI, Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Sweden) - Conference Report:


The conference discussed strategies for protecting the safety of people and building effective resilience in the face of various contingencies, ranging from climate change to terrorism and major infrastructural disruption. The transnational nature of many societal security challenges requires regional cooperation. Regional cooperation is not only more effective than the efforts of a single state, but also a necessary aspect of national preparedness.

From the chapter: Key takeaways:

Trust within and between citizens, communities and countries is identified as key to achieving regional stability...

The Baltic Sea region has a rich institutional framework with the capacity to address the security risks of today. The challenge lies in finding common ground on which to act and ensuring that preventative efforts are implemented from a long-term perspective. Effective resilience can only be achieved through broad cooperation, mutual trust and long-term institutional stability...

In discussions on security, military threats—or the so-called ‘hard’ security agenda—are often given priority over that which is treated as ‘soft’ security. This conference has made clear that such a perspective is flawed. Instead, understanding the interlinkages between various security challenges and how they intersect will be central to achieving sustainable and long-term regional security.
ELN (European Leadership Network)  
Commentary 1.10.2018 - Challenges and opportunities for deterrence and arms control in the Baltic Sea area – Lukasz Kulesa/Senior Associate Fellow:

✓ Since 2014, the Baltic Sea region has emerged as one of the main areas of confrontation between Russia and NATO, with important roles also played by Sweden and Finland. Geography, tragic experiences of history, alliance relations, distribution of military assets, and each side’s threat perceptions, combined to create conditions for increased tensions with possibility of intentional, accidental, or inadvertent, escalation… .

✓ Capturing all the relevant military developments and activities connected with a NATO-Russia crisis in the core Baltic Sea area requires enlarging the zone. It would be artificial to exclude from the picture Finland and Sweden – EU members with strong links to NATO countries in the region and increasingly stronger ties to NATO itself. It would be necessary therefore to include them in the “Baltic region”, in addition to the rest of the territory of Poland, Northeastern Germany, and Denmark to one side, and Russia’s Western Military District and Murmansk region to the other… .

✓ The way forward: Baltic Security Symposium?  
... In such a dynamic environment, any ideas to create a sub-regional arms control regime with restrictions on military holdings, infrastructure, outside deployments and military activities, and with pre-agreed zones of application and verification regime seem to be a non-starter... .

The “Western” countries of the region remain focused on strengthening their deterrence and defence potential vis-à-vis Russia. Instead of restraining themselves, they work actively to secure existing and – if possible – add new elements to the defence posture... .

In regards to Russia, it is likely in coming years to proceed with the modernisation of its military infrastructure and the introduction of new or modernised weapon systems into the Western Military District. The further strengthening of Russian forces in Kaliningrad will most likely also be a priority, and one can expect the prolongation of a busy exercising schedule... .

Until countries of the region reach a stage in which conventional arms control solutions become attractive, additional CSBMs (Confidence and Security Building Measures) between the states concerned and unilateral measures (such as moratoria on some kind of exercises) may be the most feasible way forward. These may be focused primarily on increasing the transparency and predictability of ongoing military activities, as well as reducing the space for brinkmanship or incidents. Using existing formats for bilateral or regional CSBMs and incident-prevention mechanisms, such as confidence-building agreements conducted under Vienna Document Chapter X, or Incidents at Sea Prevention agreements (INCSEAs), should be relatively easy if political will is present... .
Concerning the contribution of the expert community, a dedicated Track 1.5 or Track 2.0 dialogue format aimed at formulating specific military confidence-building proposals for the region should be contemplated; such an effort could bring together former officials and military experts from Russia, Belarus, Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Sweden, Finland, Germany and Denmark...

(Explanation: Track 2 or “backchannel diplomacy” is the practice of non-governmental, informal and unofficial contacts and activities between private citizens or groups of individuals, sometimes called ‘non-state actors’. It is there to assist official actors to manage and resolve conflicts by exploring possible solutions derived from the public view and without the requirements of formal negotiation or bargaining for advantage. The term track 1.5 diplomacy is used by some analysts to define a situation where official and non-official actors cooperate in conflict resolution.)

To assure regional buy-in, such a dialogue could be led either by non-aligned Sweden or Finland, or by one of the smaller countries in the region, e.g. Latvia, Lithuania or Belarus. The Riga Dialogue could be a good umbrella framework for these detailed discussions, as it already brings participants from these countries together. Such a “Baltic security symposium”, focused both on credible deterrence and arms control solutions, could be a space for developing ideas that could improve the regional security in the Baltic Sea area.


  ✓ 20 years of NATO membership of Poland and 15 years of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia show that the threat from the Alliance’s expansion to the East has not been exaggerated. As a voluntary hostage of bloc policy, the Baltic Rim (BR) countries – NATO members are forced to sacrifice the interests of regional development as a result of the aggravation of international relations at the global level.

  ✓ The military situation in BR, as in Europe, is now largely determined by the negative dynamics of Russian-American relations. The Alliance’s hard-line containment of the Russian Federation is newly consolidated. Russia’s relations with the EU, burdened by the problem of economic sanctions, also remain at a low level. The reasons are related to the events of 2014, which Washington and Brussels consider as a policy of revival of the Russian world.

  ✓ In these circumstances, a special role for the security of BR is the preservation of Finland’s policy of non-aligned foreign policy and independent defense, a stable position of Finnish society to remain on the side of the policy of military non-alignment.

  It is advisable to improve cooperation in all areas: military transit, safety of navigation and aviation operations in the Baltic sea. The annual meetings of the chiefs of staff of the armed forces of the BR countries, the resumption of Russia’s participation in the exercises “Baltops” will also contribute to regional integration, increase the level of trust between the parties. Active cooperation in the military sphere makes the region less dangerous for all its participants.
• OSCE: the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe

✓ With 57 participating States in North America, Europe and Asia, the OSCE – the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe – is the world’s largest regional security organization. It is the only security policy cooperative body in which all European states, as well as the United States, Canada and the Central Asian states, participate on equal terms.

✓ OSCE is today an organization focusing on conflict prevention, crisis management and democracy development in the field. The organization is working on security issues in a broad perspective. The activities are based on an all-encompassing security concept that includes the military policy dimension, the human dimension (democracy and human rights) and the dimension of economy and the environment.

The tasks are comprehensive and include everything from human rights observation to election observation, police training, prevention of armed conflicts, disarmament of conventional weapons, limitation of cross-border organized crime and various forms of silent diplomacy.

✓ Since the Cold War has returned to Europe as a result of NATO’s confrontation policy, the focus of security policy - if we want to avoid war - should be shifted from confrontation logic to cooperation logic. For this the OSCE is an excellent forum. It represents according to many competent advocates of peace a broad platform for an inclusive peace process as a counterpart to NATO’s conflict and tensions increasing acting. The OSCE can also be a platform for increased trade between nations.

✓ In 2025, it will be 50 years since the CSCE/OSCE Final Act was signed in Helsinki. For this reason, the President of Finland, Sauli Niinistö, in March 2021 proposed to hold a new summit of major powers in the spirit of the CSCE in connection with the 50th anniversary of OSCE (Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe) in 2025.

The President believes that a new summit could calm the growing tensions between the major powers. Niinistö believes that in this situation Finland could have the capacity to act as a mediator because the country has a direct discussion relationship with all major powers.

The Finnish Prime Minister Sanna Marin has expressed support for the proposal.

In January 2021, Sweden assumed the chairmanship of the OSCE. Foreign Minister Ann Linde then stated that Sweden will during the year work to strengthen the organization’s important role in contributing to security in the region.

In June 2021 over 130 representatives of non-governmental organizations in the Nordic and Baltic Sea region (over 40 from Germany), warmly welcomed the extremely urgent proposal of the President of Finland to organize a new summit by signing a letter of support for the summit.

The letter was sent to all presidents, ministers and members of parliament in all the countries mentioned in the headline of the letter, as well as to the OSCE secretariat the OSCE delegations in the Baltic Sea countries and to the president, vice president and foreign minister of the US.
At the Ambassadors’ Conference (Helsinki) 24.8.2021 Niinistö returned to the issue and devoted a central part of his speech to the idea of a summit in 2025 and the importance of a resurrected Helsinki spirit.

In his speech he built on his previous hope for a broad summit in Helsinki in four years. He sees it as natural that Finland should also shoulder the chairmanship of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) during the anniversary year. Niinistö indicated that the issue will be raised later in the week when OSCE Secretary-General Helga Maria Schmid visits Helsinki.

According to the President, there is a great need to reaffirm the Helsinki Principles of 1975 and to restore the functioning of the entire organization. The final declaration from Helsinki contains, among other things, formulations on sovereign equality, inviolability of borders, peaceful resolution of disagreements, cooperation between states and respect for human rights.

The need for real dialogue, even across bloc borders, is necessary. A certain amount of trust should be built up regardless of how frosty some relationships right now seem to be.

Niinistö claimed that comments about the summit have been encouraging, from Berlin to Moscow, from Washington to Beijing. Foreign Minister Pekka Haavisto (Green Party) has also promoted the President’s thoughts in his contacts with Foreign Minister colleagues.

At the same time, the Finnish government wants to see the EU as a major power factor and expresses concern about the anonymous and withdrawn role of EU in today’s world - most recently in connection with the events in Afghanistan. At the Ambassadors’ Conference 2021, this was an issue in several speeches. President Niinistö stated that he has long been concerned about how Europe has lost ground compared to other centers of power. According to him, more power, unity, determination and commitment in a jointly chosen line are required.

In her speech at the Ambassadors’ Conference Prime Minister Sanna Marin (SDP), the one who really has the EU issues on her table, also pointed out that in an uncertain and constantly changing playing field, the European Union must be capable of promoting the interests of Europeans. Strengthening Europe’s capacity to act should be systematically improved irrespective of the changes that affect the political situation in other states, including our allies. The EU must be able to act when it is deemed necessary. The Prime Minister emphasized that Europe appreciates the value of partnerships and should try to become a better partner through strategic autonomy. The capacity to act goes hand in hand with greater European responsibility.

Regarding Russia the Prime Minister called for the EU to show initiative vis-à-vis Russia in engaging in selective cooperation. She added that the success of Finland policy over Russia also requires practical cooperation, and that Finland relies on it to maintain good working relations. It is also a matter of security policy.

In the autumn 2021 Finland will also begin a two-year presidency of the Barents Council at the same time chairing the last months of the presidency of the Nordic Council of Ministers.

Finland is also aspiring for membership of the United Nations Human Rights Council for the next three-year term. The election is due to take place in mid-October 2021.
A NUCLEAR-WEAPON-FREE ZONE; FINLAND - SWEDEN – THE BALTIC SEA REGION

- Today, there are several areas in the world that are nuclear-weapon-free zones (NWFZ): Latin America and the Caribbean, the South Pacific, Southeast Asia, Mongolia, Central Asia and Africa. Currently, nuclear-weapon-free zones (8) cover more than 50% of earth’s land area (of which 99 per cent of all land in the southern hemisphere), and 119 of the world’s approximately 195 countries and 18 other areas. 1.9 billion people live within the zones.
In 1959 Antarctica became a demilitarized and nuclear-weapon-free zone.

In 2002, the so-called Tlatelolco Agreement for a nuclear-weapon-free zone covering Latin America, the Caribbean as well as large parts of the South Atlantic and the East Pacific came into force.

In 1985, a nuclear-weapon-free zone from Latin America to the west coast of Australia and the Antarctic region was established, the so-called Rarotonga Agreement.

In 1990 the so-called 4 + 2 agreement was made. Second World War winners and the two then German states agreed that the area of former East Germany would be nuclear-weapon-free whilst the present Germany is a member of the NATO nuclear weapons alliance. It should be noted that in former West Germany about 20 U.S. nuclear bombs of the type B61 are deployed.

In 1995, 10 ASEAN countries agreed to form a nuclear-weapon-free zone. It includes the Philippines, Indonesia, Thailand, Malaysia, Vietnam and Cambodia.

In 1996, Africa became a nuclear-weapon-free zone on the basis of the so-called Pelindaba agreement.

In 2002, Mongolia became a nuclear-weapon-free zone.

In 2009, the Semipalatinsk Agreement on a nuclear-weapon-free zone, comprising Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan, Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan, entered into force.

In addition, there are various agreements covering smaller areas such as the demilitarized areas of Svalbard (1920) and Åland Islands (1921), the Outer Space Treaty (1967) and the Seabed Treaty (1971). There are also municipalities, research institutions, etc. which have declared themselves nuclear-weapon-free zones.

Many other proposals for nuclear-weapon-free zones/areas have been made over the years. They have been rejected due to political interests of the superpowers. All proposals in Europe have been rejected since NATO's defense concept includes nuclear weapons.

In Europe efforts to create nuclear-weapon-free zones began in the late 1950s with several proposals to establish such a zone in Central and Eastern Europe. Poland offered the first proposal called the Rapacki Plan 1958. The aim was to reject nuclear weapons from being deployed in Poland, Czechoslovakia, West Germany, and East Germany, and reserving the right for other European countries to do so.

In 1958, the then Soviet premier Nikolai Bulganin made the first in a long series of proposals to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone in northern Europe, to include the Nordic and Arctic waters. The proposal was not implemented because the Soviet Union did not specify the size of areas in western Russia to be included.

In 1963, Finland's then President Urho Kekkonen proposed that Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden would form a nuclear-weapon-free zone, but the proposal was not implemented because of the NATO membership of Denmark and Norway.

In 1978, Kekkonen renewed his proposal since also the Faroe Islands, Iceland and Greenland had shown interest in the zone. Also this proposal was rejected.
In 1987 President Gorbachev’s Murmansk speech relaunched the Nordic NWFZ project, now to include the Baltic fleet and Norwegian seas.

In 1995, Belarus proposed the nuclear weapons of NATO and Russia to be separated by a nuclear-free corridor from the Baltic Sea to the Black Sea, i.e. an area that encompasses virtually the territory of the former Warsaw Pact. The proposal was rejected since the vast majority of these states planned to become members of NATO.

In 2000 a Russian admiral suggested that a system of international relations should be created for the Baltic region which would ‘be based on good neighbourliness, on partnership and directly or indirectly on principles of non-participation in military alliances aimed at other parties. Also important would be the consent of all the Western countries to the recognition of the Baltic Sea as a nuclear weapon-free zone and that the access of both nuclearpowered and nuclear-armed vessels to Baltic waters would be prohibited’.

(Territorial Disarmament in Northern Europe- The Epilogue of a Success Story? - SIPRI Policy Paper No. 13 – August 2006)

A nuclear-weapon-free zone of the Arctic has also been suggested.

U.S. NUCLEAR WEAPONS TO BE REMOVED FROM EUROPE

Five Non Nuclear- Weapon States (NNWS) parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) – Belgium, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands and Turkey – participate in nuclear sharing agreements with NATO and the U.S. These countries host approximately 50 US B61 ‘gravity’ bombs.

In peace time, the nuclear weapons stored in non-nuclear countries are guarded by US forces, with a dual code system activated in a time of war. Both host country and the US would then in time of war need to approve the use of the weapons, which would be launched on the former’s airplanes.

Having US nuclear bombs in Europe conflicts with the legal obligations of the signatories to the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). Articles 1 and 2 of the NPT forbid the transfer of nuclear weapons to non-nuclear weapon states, but Belgium, Germany, the Netherlands, Italy and Turkey are all non-nuclear.

Article VI of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT) requires all of its state parties to "pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament, and on a treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control."

- Extracts of articles in the Frankfurter Allgemeine newspaper regarding the U.S. nuclear weapons in Germany:
23.8.2017 in an article with the headline: "Schulz demands that US nuclear weapons are removed from Germany," the SPD chancellor candidate was quoted as follows:

"Types like Donald Trump represent a policy that allows all kinds of disrespect ... The belittling of entire national groups and the purposeful humiliation of individuals is deliberate ... This leads to rough behavior in politics ... It cannot be that Germany without commenting or doing something is accepting how the rearmament spiral desired by Trump is being further developed... The North Korea conflict shows more clearly than ever that restricting rearmament, and especially nuclear weapons rearmament, is more necessary than ever before...”

30.8.2017 in an article with the headline: ”Gabriel supports the initiative of Schulz regarding withdrawal of nuclear weapons from Germany” foreign minister Siegmar Gabriel (SPD) supports Schulz’s demand and refers to the INF agreement.

Reports began to emerge in 2013 and 2014 that the United States had concerns about Russia’s compliance with the INF Treaty. In July 2014 the U.S. State Department officially assessed Russia to be in violation of the agreement by producing and testing an illegal ground-launched cruise missile.

Russia denies that it is breaching the agreement and has raised its own concerns about Washington’s compliance.

Gabriel warns that the US accusations against Russia might quickly lead to the question whether Europe should develop its own nuclear weapons strategies.

(The 1987 Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty required the United States and the Soviet Union to eliminate and permanently forswear all of their nuclear and conventional ground-launched ballistic and cruise missiles with ranges of 500 to 5,500 kilometers.

The treaty marked the first time the superpowers had agreed to reduce their nuclear arsenals, eliminate an entire category of nuclear weapons, and utilize extensive on-site inspections for verification. As a result of the INF Treaty, the United States and the Soviet Union destroyed a total of 2,692 short-, medium-, and intermediate-range missiles by the treaty’s implementation deadline of June 1,1991.)

• The Conversation 23.10.2019 - Why the US has nuclear weapons in Turkey – and may try to put the bombs away:

As the Syrian crisis pits Turkish troops against former U.S.-allied Kurdish forces, Pentagon officials have been reviewing plans to remove 50 nuclear bombs stored at a U.S air base in Turkey.

A congressional directive to the Pentagon to quickly assess alternative homes for U.S. “personnel and assets” currently stationed at Incirlik Air Base is part of a broader bipartisan bill, still being debated, that proposes sanctions against Turkey. President Donald Trump has been forced to issue public reassurances that the weapons are secure.
The Brussels Times 17.1.2020 - Belgium narrowly rejects removal of US nuclear weapons

✓ A resolution to remove US nuclear heads from Belgian territory was narrowly voted down by lawmakers on Thursday, with some arguing they were strategic to bolster Belgium’s international standing.

✓ The resolution... was rejected after a starkly polarised debate (that) culminated in a 74-66 vote.

The debate over the presence of nuclear weapons in the country was reignited last year, after a leaked document from the NATO Parliamentary Assembly essentially confirmed that Belgium was one of several NATO countries storing nuclear warheads for the US, doing away with years of “neither confirm nor deny” policy on the matter... . Additionally, it also aimed to push Belgium to become a signatory of the United Nations’ Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons (TPNW), ...

Europa today 17.1.2020 - “No alle bombe nucleari Usa a casa nostra”. Scoppia il caso in Belgio, ma riguarda anche l’Italia ("No to US nuclear bombs in our home". The issue breaks out in Belgium, but it also concerns Italy):

✓ A parliamentary resolution, rejected by a handful of votes, for a removing nuclear weapons. The debate arose after an internal NATO document revealed where the weapons are kept in Europe, confirming their presence also at two Italian bases.


✓ For a world without nuclear weapons

✓ The SPD parliamentary group has clearly rejected the proposal by French President Macron to consider an own nuclear defense for the European Union. "We are resolutely opposed to irresponsible mind games about the creation of a European nuclear power," a parliamentary group decision stated on Tuesday. In the position paper, the SPD parliamentary group affirmed the goal of a world without nuclear weapons. No other security threat is as serious as the proliferation and use of weapons of mass destruction. One of the most important goals of the social democratic foreign and security policy is therefore to prevent the spread and use of nuclear, biological and chemical weapons. "Our ultimate goal is the complete global disarmament of the existing arsenals of weapons of mass destruction," so the resolution. The SPD parliamentary group supports Foreign Minister Heiko Maas in his political efforts to promote international disarmament, arms control and non-proliferation as well as rejection of new types of weapon systems.

Der Tagesspiegel 3.5.2020 - "It is time for Germany to exclude deployment in the future":

✓ SPD parliamentary group leader Rolf Mützenich is against nuclear weapons in Germany. He refers to Donald Trump's nuclear strategy - and the coronavirus. In addition, one has to ask: Almost two trillion US dollars are spent on armaments worldwide - don't we need at least part of it in times of corona to fight the pandemic and rebuild the economy? Who or what is currently the real enemy of humanity?
Trump’s government has announced that nuclear weapons are no longer just a deterrent, but are weapons that can be used to wage war. The USA reserves the right to respond to threats, including cyber attacks, with retaliatory nuclear attacks. Even first use is not off the table. Trump’s government has also announced that it will replace the nuclear weapons stored in Germany with modernized, more targeted nuclear warheads. The risk of escalation has thus become unmanageable.

TAZ 3.5.2020 - Nuclear weapons? No thank you

Germany has been violating the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, NPT, for 45 years. Now Mützenich is calling for US nuclear weapons to be withdrawn... . As early as March 2010, the Bundestag almost unanimously called on the Federal Government to “advocate the withdrawal of nuclear weapons from Germany”.

ICAN homepage August 2021 - NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN THE NETHERLANDS:

In November 2018, the Dutch parliament called on the government to re-examine the treaty (TPNW) and to work to increase the support for the treaty among NATO members. The parliament also sought legal advice on the legislative requirements of becoming a state party... . In response to the parliament’s request, the Dutch foreign minister, Stef Blok, and defence minister, Ank Bijleveld, wrote in January 2019 that no changes would be needed to existing Dutch legislation if the Netherlands were to adhere to the treaty, but additional implementing legislation would be needed.

Pressure is mounting on the government to work for the removal of US nuclear weapons deployed in Dutch territory and to sign the treaty. The city of Amsterdam added its voice to the cause in January 2021 as the treaty entered into force.

Mayors for Peace – starting point for the Baltic Sea as a Sea of Peace

Mayors for Peace is an international organization founded in 1982 on the initiative of Hiroshima’s mayor Takeshi Araki. The organization strives to raise awareness about nuclear weapons in the international society and aims at a nuclear weapons free world. Mayors for Peace adopted the Vision for Peaceful Transformation to a Sustainable World (PX Vision): Peacebuilding by Cities for Disarmament and Common Security at the 12th Executive Conference in July 2021. Based on this, the aim is to build cities where citizens act with a strong sense of solidarity for the ultimate goal of realizing lasting world peace.

As of August 1, 2021 there were worldwide 8.043 members of Mayors for Peace in 165 countries & regions.

In Europe the number of members was 3.125 in 41 countries.

In the Baltic Sea region 969 cities have signed the above aims:
- Belarus: 2 cities
- Denmark: 12 cities
- Estonia: 4 cities
- Finland: 4 cities
- Germany: 721 cities
- Latvia: 5 cities
- Lithuania: 12 cities
- Norway: 105 cities
- Poland: 12 cities
- Russia: 67 cities
- Sweden: 25 cities
THE BALTIC SEA - A SEA OF PEACE - PEACE BETWEEN PEOPLES AND PEACE WITH NATURE

NONGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS MUST STRENGTHEN AND ENLARGE COOPERATION IN THE BALTIC SEA AREA AND THE WHOLE WORLD

There are lots of encouraging examples of extremely valuable NGO efforts to create environmental responsibility and peace in the world. All around Europe and the world tens of millions of people are engaged.

As revealed in the above chapters there are also lots of suggestions for how peace, security and sustainable development could be achieved in the Baltic Sea region and the world.

Finland once held a significant position as a peace builder. Sweden has purposefully worked for disarmament. Finland and Sweden are not yet full members of NATO. It is high time to call upon a conference to be held that involves all Baltic States to transform the Baltic Sea into a Sea of Peace - peace between peoples and peace with nature.

The Baltic Sea region should become an example of a devoted will and a convincing ability for cooperation - a step towards a secure world order that respects UN resolutions and conventions as well as all kinds of international treaties and agreements securing peace and sustainable development, that acts on the basis of democratically functioning institutions and that values the opinions of the citizens.

Possible co-operation projects for NGOs in the Baltic Sea area in the near future:

- supporting OSCE initiatives
- even stronger efforts to arrange common seminars, conferences and meetings in different forms
- common positions for the re-distribution of military money
- suggestions for the establishment of peace ministries that take into account peace as well as sustainable development
- joint appeals and letters to decision makers
- a Nordic peace council
- a Baltic Sea Council for Peace and Sustainable Development, cooperation on Arctic Sea issues
- stronger cooperation with Mayors for Peace cities in the Baltic Sea region
- and much more...
SPEECHES OF JOHN F. KENNEDY AND VLADIMIR PUTIN - AND OTHER WISE WORDS

- John F. Kennedy’s Commencement Address at the American University in Washington on June 10, 1963 provides comprehensive and wise guidance for the work of peace. The speech was held at a time when the Soviet Union/Russia and the U.S. - just as today - had enough nuclear weapons that could quickly be launched and destroy the earth several times.

But back then, in 1963, only those two countries had nuclear weapons - not 9 countries as today - and there were significantly fewer nuclear power plants in the world than today. Furthermore there were in those days no modernized nuclear weapons that are considered more useful, effective and “less harmful.”

- Kennedy described peace as “the most important topic on earth”

- Unlike many other former presidents in the U.S. and today’s two major political parties, Kennedy distanced himself from the idea of “a Pax Americana enforced on the world by American weapons of war”. He spoke about “—not merely peace for Americans but peace for all men and women— not merely peace in our time but peace for all time...”

- Kennedy spoke about our own attitude toward peace. “Too many of us think it is impossible. Too many think it unreal. But that is a dangerous, defeatist belief. It leads to the conclusion that war is inevitable—that mankind is doomed—that we are gripped by forces we cannot control. We need not accept that view. Our problems are manmade—therefore, they can be solved by man... There is no single, simple key to this peace—no grand or magic formula to be adopted by one or two powers. Genuine peace must be the product of many nations, the sum of many acts. It must be dynamic, not static, changing to meet the challenge of each new generation. For peace is a process—a way of solving problems. With such a peace, there will still be quarrels and conflicting interests, as there are within families and nations. World peace, like community peace, does not require that each man love his neighbor—it requires only that they live together in mutual tolerance, submitting their disputes to a just and peaceful settlement.”
Kennedy returned many times to the meaninglessness of the Cold War, which was true then and is true also today: “Today, should total war ever break out again--no matter how--our two countries would become the primary targets. It is an ironic but accurate fact that the two strongest powers are the two in the most danger of devastation. All we have built, all we have worked for, would be destroyed in the first 24 hours. And even in the cold war, which brings burdens and dangers to so many countries, including this Nation’s closest allies--our two countries bear the heaviest burdens. For we are both devoting massive sums of money to weapons that could be better devoted to combating ignorance, poverty, and disease. We are both caught up in a vicious and dangerous cycle in which suspicion on one side breeds suspicion on the other, and new weapons beget counter-weapons.”

Regarding the situation of both the Great Powers, Kennedy noted: “So, let us not be blind to our differences - but let us also direct attention to our common interests and to the means by which those differences can be resolved. And if we cannot end now our differences, at least we can help make the world safe for diversity. For, in the final analysis, our most basic common link is that we all inhabit this small planet. We all breathe the same air. We all cherish our children’s future. And we are all mortal.”

Extracts from Vladimir Putin’s speech at the Meeting of the Valdai International Discussion Club in Sochi, October 2014, theme: The World Order: New Rules or a Game without Rules?

“As we analyse today’s situation, let us not forget history’s lessons. First of all, changes in the world order – and what we are seeing today are events on this scale – have usually been accompanied by if not global war and conflict, then by chains of intensive local-level conflicts. Second, global politics is above all about economic leadership, issues of war and peace, and the humanitarian dimension, including human rights...

Yes, many of the mechanisms we have for ensuring the world order were created quite a long time ago now, including and above all in the period immediately following World War II. Let me stress that the solidity of the system created back then rested not only on the balance of power and the rights of the victor countries, but on the fact that this system’s ‘founding fathers’ had respect for each other, did not try to put the squeeze on others, but attempted to reach agreements...

It is my conviction that we could not take this mechanism of checks and balances that we built over the last decades, sometimes with such effort and difficulty, and simply tear it apart without building anything in its place. Otherwise we would be left with no instruments other than brute force. What we needed to do was to carry out a rational reconstruction and adapt it to the new realities in the system of international relations...

The Cold War ended, but it did not end with the signing of a peace treaty with clear and transparent agreements on respecting existing rules or creating new rules and standards. This created the impression that the so-called ‘victors’ in the Cold War had decided to pressure events and reshape the world to suit their own needs and interests. If the existing system of international relations, international law and the checks and balances in place got in the way of these aims, this system was declared worthless, outdated and in need of immediate demolition...
During my conversations with American and European leaders, I always spoke of the need to fight terrorism together, as a challenge on a global scale. We cannot resign ourselves to and accept this threat, cannot cut it into separate pieces using double standards. Our partners expressed agreement, but a little time passed and we ended up back where we started...

What could be the legal, political, and economic basis for a new world order that would allow for stability and security, while encouraging healthy competition, not allowing the formation of new monopolies that hinder development? It is unlikely that someone could provide absolutely exhaustive, ready-made solutions right now. We will need extensive work with participation by a wide range of governments, global businesses, civil society, and such expert platforms as ours...

I am certain that if there is a will, we can restore the effectiveness of the international and regional institutions system. We do not even need to build anything anew, from the scratch; this is not a “greenfield,” especially since the institutions created after World War II are quite universal and can be given modern substance, adequate to manage the current situation...

Yes, of course, I have already said that building a more stable world order is a difficult task. We are talking about long and hard work. We were able to develop rules for interaction after World War II, and we were able to reach an agreement in Helsinki in the 1970s. Our common duty is to resolve this fundamental challenge at this new stage of development.”

Vladimir Putin

Interview with VGTRK (National State Television and Radio Company)

February 23, 2015

Other significant posts at the Valdai Meeting in Sochi, October 2014.

The speech by Russia’s President was positively reflected upon by both former Austrian Chancellor Schüssel as well as former French Prime Minister de Villepin. Both politicians stressed the need to restore confidence with Russia and underlined that we are living in a “multipolar” world where no country can dictate everything, a world in which Russia plays an important part.
Former French Prime Minister de Villepin, a Gaullist, described the actual situation as “a broken world in which the rules are broken down.” He underlined that rules such as those inscribed in the UN and Helsinki Charter are essential for a functioning world.

“Twenty years of unilateralism have on the one side created frustrations and impressions of marginalization in the Middle East as well as in Russia. Feeling of humiliation finally is the result of the fragility of nation states in globalization”.

Being a Gaullist he urged that the only one way out of this accumulation of crisis, is respect of one another and of international law, taking into account the interest of all sides. And that there must be consideration for the equal dignity of all people and of all nation states. “For me the dignity of nations, their memory, and their identity is the key to mankind’s history”.

He told the audience that at present the world needs Russia. “How could we find solutions on the Middle East, reaching an agreement with Iran without Russia? But Russia also needs the world, in particular for its economic recovery and industrial diversification. I am a European of conviction and I know Europe and Russia have a common destiny and a common future.”

CHARTER OR THE UNITED NATIONS

Article 1

The Purposes of the United Nations are:

1. To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace;

2. To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace;...”
Martin Luther King 1929–1968
“ A nation that continues year after year to spend more money on military defense than on programs of social uplift is approaching spiritual doom.”

Albert Einstein 1879 – 1955
“I know not with what weapons World War III will be fought, but World War IV will be fought with sticks and stones.”

Mahatma Gandhi 1869 – 1948
“There is no road towards peace - peace is the road.”

“Nuclear deterrence and the threat of mutually assured destruction cannot be the basis for an ethics of fraternity and peaceful coexistence among peoples and states.”

Pope Francis
Message to the World Peace Day 1.1.2017