



ACADEMIA DIPLOMATICA EUROPAEA

EUROPEAN INSTITUTE FOR INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

MINISTRY OF NATIONAL DEFENCE

Moscow

23-24 MAY 2014

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE

GLOBAL SECURITY, MULTIPOLARITY, CURRENT AND INTERNATIONAL SYSTEM THREATS AND VULNERABILITIES IN THE GLOBAL SECURITY ENVIRONMENT

Irnerio SEMINATORE

President of the European Institute for International Relations

Director of the Academia Diplomatica Europaea

Brussels

**This summary has been presented to the third Moscow Conference on International Security (MCIS),
on the 23rd and 24th of May, 2014.**

Institut Européen des Relations Internationales
27/A, Boulevard Charlemagne
1000 – Bruxelles (Belgique)
Tel. : +32.2.280.14.95
Web : www.ieri.be

SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION.....	3
SYSTEMIC TRANSFORMATIONS AND STRATEGIC CYCLES.....	3
FLIPPING THE WORLD AXIS OF GRAVITY AND BREACHING THE COMMITMENTS.....	4
EUROPE – RUSSIAN FEDERATION A NEW PAN EUROPEAN SECURITY AND STABILITY TREATY AN INCLUSIVE, GLOBAL AND SUSTAINABLE "COMMON ROOF"	6
THE UNITED STATES, INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AND THE NEW AMERICAN NUCLEAR DOCTRINE, DETERRENCE AND NON- PROLIFERATION.....	8
CHINA AND ITS FOREIGN POLICY BETWEEN MULTILATERALISM AND MULTIPOLARITY.....	9
LINKAGE AND INTERDICTION STRATEGY.....	9
FROM A TREND REVERSAL OF THE “STATUS QUO” TOWARDS THE “LOGIC OF MOVEMENT”	10
ONGOING TRANSFORMATIONS.....	11

INTRODUCTION

This lecture , examines the structure and the political morphology of the present international system and draws its main assessments.

From a military point of view, it describes the succession of three strategic cycles since 1990.

In terms of global security, it describes the transition from the “collective defense” concept, to the “collective security” one, as a consequence of the transition from bipolarity to multipolarity.

About this transition, it points to a significant reversal trend, the way from the “status quo” to the “logic of change”.

Then, after drawing a broad analysis of geopolitical and strategical relations between the major actors of the international system, Europe, Russia, the United State of America and China, this presentation reaches conclusions focusing on an increase of the threats and the worsening of risks and conflicts impacting the system globally.

SYSTEMIC TRANSFORMATIONS AND STRATEGIC CYCLES

Since the nineties, we are witnessing a deep transformation of the international system, in particular the transition from bipolar to an accomplished multipolar system.

This transition, systemic, geopolitical and strategic is characterised by three major structural changes:

The end of the monopolistic status of the West over the rest of the World, and thus, the undisputed dominance of the northern hemisphere over the southern hemisphere, performed during four centuries

The evolution towards a "shared power" or towards a global distribution of power, in other terms, towards a world of "relative powers"

The emergence, after September-11, of a kind of "global leadership", instead of the

earlier "global dominance".

From a military point of view, this transition generated three strategic cycles and therefore different types of use of the armed violence and adapting the military tool to the dialectic of war.

- The cycle of transformations (1990 - 2003): “peacekeeping” Land Forces and strategic use of aviation.
- The "cycle of small wars" (2007 – 2014) of counterinsurgency use of ground forces and air support .
- The cycle of conflict between large areas (2008 (Georgia) - 2030): offensive comeback of regional powers in the major maritime and continental areas. This cycle which will be the one of the strategic use of the cyberspace and the outer-space on the "off-limits" type of war (or the "no-rules war") punctuated by strategic raids.

Starting with the collapse of bipolarity the logic of defence, succeeded the collective defence one, and adopted as main target, the stability of the political-strategic order along with the constructive dialogue as a regulatory principle.

But the frailty of this principle should justify the creation of a collective security system. However, all security logic must face two challenges:

The first one is based on the impossibility of conceiving and enforcing a security system which covers the international community as a whole.

The second challenge to collective security corresponds to its own cyclical nature, mainly due to States which have neither political stability nor permanent strategies. This requires from every actor to be vigilant and a permanent adaptation to the ever renewed capabilities of rival players, within the same region or the same system.

FLIPPING THE WORLD AXIS OF GRAVITY AND BREACHING THE COMMITMENTS

Since 1990, relations between Russia and Europe are sourcing a lot of complaints about breaking the commitments regarding further enlargements and attempts to isolate Moscow geopolitically. The rupture of the agreements has been interpreted by Moscow as a "threat" to the former Soviet preserved area of influence and as an attempt to weaken and destabilise "their" near neighbourhood."

For the Kremlin, Western policies have betrayed the formal guarantees given by Bush Senior, confirmed by the former Ambassador to Moscow from 1987 to 1991, Jack Matlock to the "Washington Post", not to take advantage of Gorbachev concessions accepting the reunification of Germany, the dissolution of the "Warsaw Pact".

As a proof of these allegations, Russia argues of the implementation of NATO bases in some of the former Soviet republics instead of the transformation of the Atlantic Alliance into a Global Alliance.

Moreover, the new NATO concept that appears as a compromise between the "collective defence strategy" into the Euro-Atlantic area and a "global stabilisation strategy", progressively extended to Central, Eastern and Southern Europe (Georgia, Ukraine ..) but also to the crisis in the Greater Middle-East, Gulf and Mediterranean areas to the Eurasian junction zones (Afghanistan).

European Union countries can act militarily only in both cases of "collective defence" and "collective security".

"Collective defence" is part of the U.S. strategy of which it represents now one of the two components and is enforced by and within NATO.

The "collective security" directly results from the multipolar vision of the USA and is translated into actions of international police, crisis management and peacekeeping.

In addition, the project of deploying an Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) system hides a will of intimidation and one may doubt of its sole defensive purpose.

From a diplomatical and geopolitical point of view, the entrance of the Baltic and Eastern European countries into NATO, the signature of the Oriental partnership in 2007 with six former socialist republics, the multiple supports to the "colour revolutions" in Ukraine and Georgia have not kept into account the large continental balances and the defence and security interests of Russia in Europe.

EUROPE – RUSSIAN FEDERATION
A NEW PAN EUROPEAN SECURITY AND STABILITY TREATY
AN INCLUSIVE, GLOBAL AND SUSTAINABLE "COMMON ROOF"

The reinstoration of an area of cooperation and dialogue between the Russian Federation and Europe, shattered by the Ukrainian crisis, involves the cooperation of both parties around a pan-european political order in the border zone of East and South Europe.

This area was a geostrategic one in which East and Western power struggles were exacerbated at the time of bipolarity and remain tense, nowadays. This is why a pan-European order has a function of equilibrate, include, partly integrate the European Nations and Russia in a multipolar spirit.

Can we build today a strictly regional international order taking over the post-Cold War political fragmentation not yet stabilized ?

The answer is no .

Indeed, the possible adoption of a "Treaty of security and stability in Europe" should aim at establishing the European security on Nations' order and, in addition, on the guarantee of the Atlantic Alliance .

This project aims to overcome the logic of differentiated safety areas (Eastern and South East Europe, Caucasus, Gulf , Middle East , etc..).

The safety purpose of an open global order is to promote an atmosphere of confidence allowing the de-escalation along with the diplomatic dialogue in Ukraine. The antagonistic approach to conflict prevention in the Baltic axis and the project of creating an anti missile shield and its counterpart cannot be isolated from the global context.

The cornerstone of a new "indivisible security" agreement between Europe, the United States and the Russian Federation on the continent and in the northern hemisphere, is based on the adoption of a common framework that oversees all security organizations, only focusing on the "hard" issues.

This agreement could be felt by all parties as the "common framework" for a system of collective security and cooperation from Vancouver to Vladivostok, a "common roof" for the other organizations across the Eurasian space.

The ground for this project would be pretend to respond to universal safety concerns without eliminating the notions of "areas of responsibility" or "special interests" that can make compatible the objectives of the "Eastern Partnership" (27 +6) with those foreseen in a EU-Russia "strategic partnership" perspective.

Thus, the essential function of a newfound global security would be a better

Coordination of the activities of these organisations on the basis of common and accepted principles, without substituting, replacing or deleting what already exists, by the creation of new structures.

THE UNITED STATES, INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AND THE NEW AMERICAN NUCLEAR DOCTRINE, DETERRENCE AND NON- PROLIFERATION

Thus, the United States must combine two major regional strategies in Eurasia, the Euro-Atlantic strategy and trans-Pacific strategy.

In the Euro-Atlantic area, despite the divisions between the European Union States on the major geopolitical and geostrategic orientations towards the Russian Federation since 1990, the “confrontation” mentality has been rejected, but without not prohibiting the roll back of the former Soviet Union on its western previous borders.

But ,the “rollback” policy has strengthened the ideological multilateralism, the doctrine of exporting democracy, the human rights policy and the war on terrorism on a global scale.

Thus, the "gravity center" of the USSR *containment* has moved from the heart of Eurasia to eastern and southern Europe, along the new geopolitical rift line that starts from the Baltic countries to the Black Sea and from Ukraine to Central Asia through the Caucasus and the Confederation of independent States as a key access from the west to the axis of the world, the “Heartland” of Halford Mackinder. This unstable gravity center announces the emergence of a space of pressure, intimidation and geopolitical influence games along on the Vilnius-Kiev-Donetsk-Tbilisi-Tehran axis.

How deter Iran, North Korea, Al Qaeda and other terrorist groups?

How stabilise Pakistan, persuade China, Russia, Turkey and other emerging countries which favor the path of dialogue? How to reduce the stocks, completely stop nuclear tests and fight against proliferation?

CHINA AND ITS FOREIGN POLICY BETWEEN MULTILATERALISM AND MULTIPOLARITY

In the new international configuration, China presents a dual face, one of a " proactive conservative " power, a "moderate perturbator" and manages its geopolitical centrality in Eurasia through a mix of oblique bundle strategies, prevention of encirclement, opposition and power projection. Indeed, The Middle Kingdom operates towards the Pacific, the South China Sea, Indian Ocean and Africa.

In Asia and for the first time in History, Japan and China, are simultaneously regional powers.

In this context, the sudden opening of a crisis in Taiwan by Beijing would provoke a confrontation with the United States and, in its maritime supply absolute need, also with India.

Thereby, a movement perspective affects the Asian chessboard.

Indeed, the Chinese activism deeply influences the strategic issues of key regional actors in the South China Sea, where natural resources are challenged by Taiwan, the Philippines, Malaysia, Indonesia , Brunei, Singapore and Vietnam.

LINKAGE AND INTERDICTION STRATEGY

In addition, the Linkage between South China Sea and the Pacific coastline is a part of the extension of Chinese security interests.

One of the keys in order to understand this interdependence between geopolitical areas of high strategic impact is the development of naval capabilities, sub-maritines and surface, of the Chinese fleet that fit into a trend towards a global maritimisation, at the risk of exclusion strategies and of access-denial, adopted by the BRICS.

Chinese strategic linkage thus define, at the sea level, a broad prohibition-strategy that is no longer only focused on Taiwan and includes the Yellow Sea in which Japan and South Korea fleets patrol.

Although the current prohibition capabilities of the Chinese fleet can stay away the foreign fleets from the Chinese maritime border, the development of the largest Asian submarine and amphibious fleet, has not yet filled deficiencies of a satellite coverage support for identifying moving targets.

From a global point of view, Beijing has set a foreign policy doctrine presented as "asymmetrical diplomacy" , that cannot ignore the classical morphology of geopolitical and strategic alliances , aimed at:

- Reducing the American preponderance, while avoiding any military confrontation
- Challenging hierarchies and the global distribution of power.
- Contain the role of Japon in Far East and restricts it international ambitions

In regional terms, these indications command the Chinese leaders to avoid any form of significant conflict with their neighbors and indirectly continue the quest for regional supremacy, making China's sphere of influence a sphere of deference, respect and understanding towards Beijing choices. The central objective of the two lines is to reduce the role of Japon in the Far East and to curb its international ambitions.

So, the South China Sea becomes a geopolitical theater among the most critical in the world. Indeed, overlap here projections influence of China expansiveness and the defensive regional role of the U.S. . The first challenge regional stability, the second foreshadows a "soft containment" of a new type.

FROM A TREND REVERSAL OF THE “STATUS QUO” TOWARDS THE “LOGIC OF MOVEMENT”

From a cyclical point of view, the relative "status quo" that followed the collapse of the bipolarity system is no longer the best option to meet the needs of change as we have now entered in a "movement phase", in an acceleration of the historical process.

ONGOING TRANSFORMATIONS

Under these conditions, the essential characteristics of this transformation requirement of global relations are based on:

- The growing volume of unsatisfied claims often irreconcilable
- A wide distribution of latent tensions and open crises
- An extension of rivalries at all poles and to most of the key actors
- The multiplication of asymmetrical conflicts, of ethnic, cultural and separatists wars and an almost "regular" intrusion of interposed thirds.
- The heterogeneity of values, interests and principles of action, making it difficult to compromise
- A questioning of the legitimacy of political regimes, of the principles of sovereignty and autonomy, at least in the West.

Should we be the witnesses of an acceleration of History, that drive us to always experience its precarious and tragical nature?