

Peter Huessy, President of GeoStrategic Analysis

MISSILE DEFENSE & NATO AFTER UKRAINE
PRESENTED TO THE 5TH ANNUAL IAMD SYMPOSIUM
JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY
JUNE 12, 2014

NATO AFTER UKRAINE: THE SETTING

- NATO faces a challenge to modernize and sustain its nuclear posture and missile defense deployments in Europe at a time of declining defense budgets on the one hand and expanded threats on the other. The threats from Russia, the Middle East and North Africa are serious and growing from both ballistic missile arsenals and nuclear programs.
-
- At the same time, there are political pressures within NATO pushing for the adoption of a “zero nuclear” posture as well as efforts to delay significantly US and allied missile defense and nuclear modernization deployments. This comes as threat countries have adopted military and political doctrines that emphasize the use of nuclear weapons and ballistic missiles as instruments of state power.

ROCKETS OF COERCION, TERROR, WAR-FIGHTING AND BLACKMAIL

- Ballistic missiles and nuclear weapons are weapons of terror, coercion and blackmail.
- In short, such weapons have diplomatic, political and military dimensions which must be taken into account when assessing NATO policy in both arenas
- Hamas, Hezbollah, Iran, North Korea, Syria

With Love from the Mullahs

- Missile threats to NATO come primarily from ballistic missiles deployed in Russia, Syria and Iran. While current Iranian missiles are thought to have a range of 2000 kilometers and are capable of striking most of Eastern Europe...
- A senior Iranian official has recently claimed Tehran's missiles can now reach Diego Garcia in the Indian Ocean, which required a missile range of 4670 kilometers.

Missiles on the Table?

- Last year, a study of global missile threats by the National Air and Space Intelligence Center assessed that Iran "could develop and test an ICBM capable of reaching the United States by 2015."
- "Iranian Defense Minister Hossein Dehghan : 'Iran's missiles are not up for discussion under any circumstances,' Mr. Dehghan told the country's official Fars news agency. 'Iran's missiles are only our concern...We don't accept any intervention from anybody on this issue.'"

Moscow in the Mix?

- But while the US and NATO have repeatedly emphasized that NATO defenses against Iranian or other rogue state missiles in no way can effect Russia's central strategic missile force (absolutely true)...
- Russia has continually threatened US European allies with strikes not only with Askander missiles launched from Kaliningrad, but with its violation of the INF treaty, Russia could again have medium range missiles with which to target Eastern and Central Europe.

THE PUTIN DOCTRINE

- One analyst has written the Putin strategy is borrowed from the Chinese strategy of “kill the chicken to scare the monkey.” This strategy goes after lesser powers to diminish the role or prevent the involvement of a greater power. Think Ukraine and Georgia.

GLOBAL ZERO: DISARMAMENT FANTASY

- “The trouble with disarmament was (it still is) that the problem of war is tacked upside down and at the wrong end.... Nations don’t distrust each other because they are armed; they are armed because they distrust each other. And therefore to want disarmament before a minimum of common agreement on fundamentals is as absurd as to want people to go undressed in winter... Disarmers would avoid wars by reducing armaments. They run to the wrong end of the line. The only way...consists in dealing day by day with the business of the world...the true issue is the organization of the world on a cooperative basis.”

NATO MISSILE DEFENSE FRAMEWORK

- The underlying framework of NATO's embrace of missile defense is to avoid the coercive or blackmail capabilities of missile armed states by wrapping countries that want to be bound to NATO in a missile defense cloak. In a conversation I had in 2011 with former Czech President Vaclav Havel he told me that a missile defense cooperative effort with the US and NATO would forever end the idea of Russian hegemony over what used to be referred to as "captive nations".

Not with the program...

- Not everyone is on board with such a policy. One arms control critic, Phil Coyle, a former DOD bureaucrat, complained in May remarks at the Atlantic Council that should the US build missile defenses in Europe Iran would see this as an insult and an indication that the US and its allies were not serious about a nuclear agreement with Tehran.

NATO MISSILE DEFENSE

- In the missile defense area, senior US leaders believe NATO members need to upgrade their current missile defense systems specifically Norway, Poland, Germany and Netherlands, with sensors, more THAAD batteries and adding a missile defense capability to NATO ships including sensors and shooters. The administration's 2015 budget request asks for more funds for missile defense radars, integrated missile defense work and test targets.

US and Romania

- US Defense Secretary Chuck Hagel explains "Following a successful recent test, we are on track for the Aegis Ashore ballistic missile defense system to be installed in Romania next year. This new system will be part of Phase II of the European Phased Adaptive Approach.

Congress Proposes.....

- Two top Senators, Kelly Ayotte (R-NH) and her colleague, Democrat Senator Joe Donnelly of Indiana, have both proposed additional funding for a tactical missile defense in Central Europe. The House recently added nearly \$100 million for more Standard Missile production.
- Critics have assumed that support for new missile defenses in Europe is going back to the 2008 deployment proposed by President Bush in Poland and the Czech Republic.

Is Russia in the Mix?

- But as the Vice Chairman of the JSC noted recently, "Aegis Ashore sites in Poland and Romania are designed to counter long-range ballistic missiles that may be launched from other nations outside the Euro-Atlantic area against our European NATO partners," precisely the purpose of the original Bush proposed deployments in Poland and the Czech Republic."
- Additional theater systems could be part of a package that includes either a 2 stage GBI or Aegis Ashore in Europe that could shoot down Iranian missiles aimed at London or New York but would have no capability against strategic Russian rockets.

Third Site....

- In the absence of such a capability against long range rocket threats from Iran, for example, it is imperative then for the United States to build an additional site or sites on the East coast of the United States and equally important combine the deployment of Aegis ashore interceptors and appropriate radars (including those looking south) to deal with both long range and maritime missile threats launched in an EMP mode.

House and HASC Action...

- This requirement was echoed by the House in the recently passed defense bill, as it also required MDA to consider whether the Aegis ashore deployments in Poland and Romania could be partially reconfigured to also deal with the threat from cruise missiles, as well as requiring MDA to test the Aegis ashore capability against intermediate-range ballistic missiles no later than the end of 2015.

Dr. Henry Kissinger

- “A free standing diplomacy is an ancient American illusion. History offers few examples of it. The attempt to separate diplomacy and power results in power lacking direction and diplomacy being deprived of incentives.” (July 2007)

The Future Roadmap.....

- Missile defense and nuclear modernization are two critical tools for the NATO alliance to keep the peace on the continent of Europe, which it has done with remarkable (not perfect) success for nearly three quarters of a century. As we face the challenges of an aggressive Russia and its allies, there is hope that we will find the wisdom to “provide for the common defense” as our constitution so requires and as a result keep the peace for which NATO was founded.