

# RESPONSES TO THE INF TREATY CRISIS: THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION

## The European INF Initiative Project Meeting

May 3, 2019, Odessa, Ukraine



*Medium-range missile SS-4 "Sandal" (P-12), which put the world on the edge of nuclear war during the Cuban Missile Crisis (Picture from the Strategic Missile Forces Museum in Ukraine)*



# **RESPONSES TO THE INF TREATY CRISIS: THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION**

The European INF Initiative Project Meeting

May 3, 2019, Odessa, Ukraine

ODESSA  
ONU  
2019

UDC 341.238:623.454.86(063)

R45

**Responses to the INF Treaty crisis: the European dimension.** The European INF Initiative Project Meeting, May, 2019, Odessa, Ukraine/ Edited by Polina Sinovets and Odessa Center for Nonproliferation (OdCNP) with the support of Swedish Radiation Safety Authority (SSM). Odessa: I. I. Mechnikov National University, 2019. – 65 p.

Odessa I. I. Mechnikov National University Press is a unit of the I. I. Mechnikov National University.

Odessa I. I. Mechnikov National University  
Dvoryanska, 2  
65082 Odessa, Ukraine  
Tel: +38/048/723-52-54  
Fax: +38/048/723-35-15  
E-mail: [rector@onu.edu.ua](mailto:rector@onu.edu.ua)  
<http://onu.edu.ua/en/>

Published in Ukraine by Odessa I. I. Mechnikov National University Press, Elisavetinska, 12 Odessa, 65082.

ISBN 978-617-689-292-2

© Odessa I. I. Mechnikov National University Press, 2019

## Contents

FOREWORD.....	5
INTRODUCTION.....	9
The British position on the INF Treaty <i>Douglas Barrie &amp; James Cameron</i> .....	12
French statements on the current INF crisis <i>Tiphaine de Champchesnel</i> .....	18
A French assessment of the end of the INF Treaty and its implications for Europe <i>Corentin Brustlein</i> .....	23
The German position on the INF Treaty <i>Julia Berghofer &amp; Katarzyna Kubiak</i> .....	29
The Italian Position on the INF Treaty <i>Giordana Pulcini</i> .....	38
Poland’s Position on the INF Treaty <i>Artur Kacprzyk</i> .....	45
Ukraine’s Position on the INF Treaty Suspension <i>Polina Sinovets &amp; Oleksii Izhak</i> .....	52
About the authors .....	59
Odessa Center for Nonproliferation (OdCNP) .....	62

## FOREWORD

One of the most troubling tendencies of the XXI century is the gradual decline of international security regimes. Although not comprehensive, they nonetheless defined the “rules, norms, and decision-making procedures”<sup>1</sup> among states – not only great powers but also among great powers and smaller states – helping enhance international stability and facilitate the peaceful resolution of conflicts. As the role of international norms and institutions declines, the role of power in international relations increases. The first to suffer are weaker states, which can no longer rely on protection under international law or the application of internationally accepted procedures of conflict resolution. In the meantime, tensions among great powers grow as the chances for peaceful resolution of these conflicts diminish.

The decline of international security regimes is, to an extent, inevitable. The vast majority of them was created during the Cold War and intended at addressing the reality that no longer exists: the bipolar world dominated by two superpowers, which jealously guarded their respective spheres of influence and sought to prevent the expansion of the opponent’s influence into the Third World (the nonaligned states). The entire body of international law and the rules for creating new regimes was built around the consensus of great powers and embodied in the UN Security Council with its five permanent members and the right of veto. After the Cold War ended, for a while, it seemed that the world would become unipolar, dominated by the United States together with its allies and friends. There was an attempt to adjust Cold War regimes to the new environment and to create new ones that could fill in the gaps inherited from the previous period. Yet, dispersion of power continued. New major players such as China and India emerged; Russia recovered from the 1990s recession and joined the new “great game.” The regimes that were intended at regulating East-West relations are simply poorly fit to regulate the new reality while those new or returning players increasingly challenged the innovations of the 1990s and early 2000s. In addition, the post-Cold War period has seen the increasing popularity of ad-hoc regimes that are not legally binding. In general, the world has become much less manageable. Nowadays, a country does not even need to be a great power to pursue own policies without much regard to the interests of others or international law.

As for great powers, the world witnesses deterioration of arms control regimes between the United States and Russia as well as the refusal of China to seriously engage in arms control efforts. There are numerous signs of the former:

- US withdrawal from the 1972 ABM Treaty, which limited missile defense capabilities, in 2002;

---

<sup>1</sup> International regimes, ed. by Stephen Krasner and Peter Katzenstein, Cornell Univ. Press, 1984

- the failure to bring the 1996 Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) into force;
- Russian suspension of the 1991 US and Soviet unilateral statements about the reduction of tactical nuclear weapons in 2004;
- Russian “freeze” of (de facto withdrawal from) the Conventional Forces in Europe (CFE) Treaty in 2007;
- the suspension of the INF Treaty by the United States and Russia with the almost certain end of the Treaty;
- the general deadlock of US-Russian nuclear arms control, which could result in the expiration of the New START Treaty that limits US and Russian strategic nuclear arms. This would be tantamount to the overall collapse of arms control.

In the end, all these regimes had one common feature: they were Cold War arrangements concluded by two superpowers, which militarily dominated the world. They addressed either strategic nuclear balance or military balance in Europe. None of these regimes was adapted to the post-Cold War environment (the CFE adaptation concluded in 1999 never entered into force, which served as the main pretext for Russia to withdraw from the original treaty).

The fate of the INF Treaty is particularly instructive in this regard. The primary motivation for the Treaty was the reduction of tensions in Europe. It was bilateral, and the transition to the five-party format after the end of the Cold War did not substantively change its nature. Three decades later, all significant players in Eurasia, such as China, India, Pakistan, North Korea, Israel, Iran, have intermediate-range missiles. In the meantime, Russia was accused of violating INF. The state seriously considered withdrawing from the INF Treaty in 2006-2007 but decided not to. Although it does not admit the violation, there is a NATO-wide consensus that the evidence is damning. While the sorry fate of the INF Treaty is the evidence of the arms control regimes system erosion in itself, perhaps even more important is the failure of the parties to properly utilize the mechanisms for the resolution of disagreements the Treaty provided. Concerns and even suspicions emerge often, but all treaties have built-in mechanisms to resolve them, and until the INF Treaty these mechanisms worked. Today the world witnesses a repetition of the same scenario with regard to New START.

The New START Treaty is the only major arms control regime that remains in force and addresses the US and Russian strategic nuclear weapons. Not coincidentally, this is also the only regime that was updated relatively recently. After the expiration of the 1991 START I Treaty, the parties concluded New START in 2010 (it will expire in 2021). However, the fate of this regime is also uncertain. The prospects for a new treaty are blocked by Russian insistence that the next treaty should also address missile defense and long-range conventional weapons – a demand that Washington has resisted. At the same time, the extension of New START depends on whether the United States meets Russian

concerns over the accounting of strategic weapons (a demand that Washington rejects as well).

Furthermore, traditional arms control regimes have been overtaken by technological developments – the advent of long-range dual capable weapons (including soon hypersonic ones), the emergence of new kinds of strategic systems in Russia, and others – as well as proliferation of technologies, which add new countries to the increasingly complex military balance at the global and regional levels.

There are few ideas on whether and how to address new kinds of weapons or dual-capable weapons, and how they could fit into future arms control treaties. This was perhaps one of the main reasons for the collapse of the CFE Treaty. Simply put, the categories of weapons it covers no longer matter as much as they used to in the 1980s. Traditional principles of constructing nuclear arms reduction treaties cannot capture more recent developments, and their frameworks are rapidly becoming obsolete. In the meantime, US-Russian strategic stability consultations, which could have become a forum for an in-depth discussion of the basics, have been discontinued.

Even worse, key states with advanced military capabilities, many of which also possess nuclear weapons, remain outside of any or most international regimes and show no intention to join. A joint US-Russian initiative to make the INF Treaty multilateral did not elicit any response whatsoever from states with intermediate-range missile capability at the Conference on Disarmament in 2007. This development undoubtedly contributed to the sorry state of the Treaty today. The US proposal to negotiate a new trilateral INF Treaty met flat refusal from China. It possesses many times fewer nuclear weapons than the US and Russia but conveniently overlooked the fact that the INF Treaty covered not only nuclear but also conventional missiles. China has at least the same amount of the latter as the other two.

The process of deterioration of arms control regimes took a quarter of a century and developed so gradually that the world tended to overlook it until it has probably become too late. It is possible – perhaps, even likely – that in just a few years, in early 2021, the United States and Russia will not have a functioning strategic arms treaty and will not be even negotiating a new one for the first time since the late 1960s. That is, the world is very close to a logical conclusion of a long period of deterioration of the international security framework.

In hindsight, the sorry state of international security today can be ascribed to the lack of interest. Previously, new international systems emerged as a result of major wars. The conclusion of new treaties also gave a start to the development of new international institutions. The fear of a new war – especially nuclear war – was overwhelming and forced both superpowers and their allies to look for ways to stabilize the strategic relationship even at the cost of concessions. However, the end of the Cold War was peaceful, and, it seems, no one seriously thought

about the need to adapt Cold War institutions to the new environment, and those few who did were not heard. Yet, old institutions cannot survive in a new system without proper adjustment. Besides, the fear of World War III has receded, and domestic politics took over the survival instinct. Today, the world is reaping the results of that oversight. It might be too late to salvage the remains, although it is worth trying. At the very least, it is worth an effort to build new regimes and institutions. Otherwise, the world could descend into security chaos, which will be dangerous for all states, big and small.

***Nikolai Sokov, Polina Sinovets***



## INTRODUCTION

The European INF Initiative Project appeared as the result of international cooperation of experts aimed at exploring the consequences of the INF Treaty's collapse for European security. The scholars sought to look at the problem from inside Europe treating the region as a potential actor capable of defining and pursuing its own agenda along with the United States and Russia rather than being a mere object of great power politics.

Another key goal of the project was to generate fresh and out-of-the-box ideas, as well as to discuss Europe's possible contributions to strategic stability on the continent as the system of arms control regimes continues to deteriorate. Central to that issue is to decide whether the collapse of the INF Treaty is a part of a broader phenomenon, where the dismantlement of the old system of international regimes is a result of insufficient adjustments after the end of the Cold War. Alternatively, does it rather indicate the replacement of the old system with a new one? The difference may seem subtle but is, in fact, significant. Devolution of the old system of international regimes will likely result in chaos when the balance of power primarily determines the relations among states. In contrast, if the world witnesses the emergence of a new system – and such transitions are by definition characterized by periods of crisis and low predictability– then, after a period of tumult, the system will once again stabilize and hopefully become more secure than the old one.

Moreover, the future is not predetermined: the situation can develop one way or another. Much will depend on the actions of all relevant actors or, more precisely, the actors who want to be relevant in the choice between anarchy and order.

The difference is all-important for Europe. The future of a system dominated by power relationships is not particularly enticing. The region has a good chance of feeling secure and prosperous within a system of new or reinvented international regimes. Much will depend on Europe's ability to take on a more proactive role in shaping the future. The first step is to recognize that the degradation of old international regimes is inevitable, and there is little sense in trying to hold on to them. The second related step is to assume greater responsibility than Europe was prepared to assume during the Cold War, including with regard to arms control.

The suspension and the eventual next-to-certain collapse of the INF Treaty have given us such an opportunity. On the one hand, the withdrawal of intermediate and short-range missiles from the US and Russian nuclear arsenals marked the end of the Cold War and removed a major threat to Europe. At the same time, it is important to recognize that throughout the entire period, starting in 1979 when NATO made a decision on the dual-track approach to the INF

Treaty, Europe didn't play a leading role. It was West Germany that first raised concerns about the Soviet deployment of SS-20 missiles, but it was left to Washington to lead NATO on that issue. It was the United States who negotiated, deployed its intermediate-range weapons in Europe, and then negotiated again. European allies were kept in the loop and consulted, but INF was a bilateral treaty.

Similarly, Europe was not actively engaged in the events that led to the suspension of the INF Treaty and will hardly be able to save it. Yet, it can have a role in shaping the post-INF future of Europe. First and foremost, in making sure that the departure of the INF Treaty does not leave the scene empty. Clearly, unlike in the 1980s, Europe is now more prepared for such a role. Chancellor Merkel echoed the call by President Macron for creating "the real true European army: the time we could rely on others is in the past.

A major arms control conference convened by the German Ministry of Foreign Affairs in March 2019 also indicates the interest in exploring a new arms control agenda from a European perspective.

The degree to which Europe can form and implement an independent position is perhaps the most challenging question. Since the probability of serious US-Russian dialogue is low, Europe can hardly afford the same attitude as in the 1980s; the post-Cold War environment makes greater autonomy more feasible. At the same time, Europe needs to be careful not to undermine the Atlantic solidarity either. It will need to walk the fine line between the former and the latter.

The present study sought to explore individual European countries' perspectives on the threat of a new arms race in Europe, together with possible responses. The study covers six states and provides an analysis of their positions by experts from respective countries. These states are the two nuclear powers of Europe: Great Britain and France; the states that were involved in the "dual-track decision" and "Euro missiles crisis" of the 1980s: Germany and Italy; and, finally, "the frontline states" of the Eastern flank: Poland and Ukraine. While Ukraine, unlike other countries in the study, is not a member of NATO or the European Union, it is a member of the INF Treaty as a successor state to the USSR. It is also a country capable of producing INF Treaty-range missiles and a buffer zone between Russia and NATO.

Case studies present each country's position with regard to the impending end of the INF Treaty and their preferences in terms of shaping the post-INF future. The studies proceed from an in-depth analysis of on- and off-the-record interviews and statements of government officials and parliamentarians and the assessment of public opinion and mass media reactions to content analysis of the politicians' speeches and the opinions of the experts in the field.

The case studies demonstrate that European countries are still divided on whether they need to or can afford a more proactive, more segregated position. The debate is ongoing while the crisis continues to worsen. A better understanding of the substance of the issues at stake, as well as of the views of individual European countries, should support an informed debate with an eye at enhancing stability and security on the continent.

***Polina Sinovets, Nikolai Sokov***

## **The British position on the INF Treaty**

This paper outlines the British Government's public position concerning US and NATO allies' claims that Russia is in serious breach of the Intermediate-Range Nuclear forces (INF) Treaty. It also outlines British government thinking with regard to a post-INF environment, relations with its close ally in this area, possible NATO responses, and wider arms control concerns.

This brief paper is based on a number of publicly available hearings transcripts, non-attributable government briefs, personal meetings, and broader 'Chatham House rule' events.

While the fate of the INF Treaty remains a 'special interest' with little wider purchase with the public, nor indeed in the British Parliament, there is an increased awareness of the deteriorating relationship with Russia more generally. In the UK context the pending collapse of the INF also plays into broader arms control discussions, and the renewal of Britain's 'independent nuclear deterrent'. While the Conservative Government and the Conservative Party are committed to acquiring a successor to the Vanguard class of SSBN, the main opposition party, Labour, has a more ambivalent position. Labour Party Leader Jeremy Corbyn is a committed unilateralist, though this is not a position shared by all within the party.

### **British Government Position on the INF Treaty**

London's view is that Moscow has deployed a dual-capable ground-launched cruise missile in a range-category that contravenes the INF Treaty. It publicly supports the U.S. decision to suspend participation and to begin the formal withdrawal process.

The UK is a member of the 'Five Eyes' intelligence sharing community along with the U.S., Canada, Australia and New Zealand. It is then perhaps unsurprising that the government was an early supporter of the U.S. position, possibly as a result of intelligence community assessments based on access to U.S. classified material. The British government has been unwilling to discuss in public in any detail how it reached its position on the alleged breach.

When asked during a Parliamentary Defence Committee hearing whether London has 'independently verified Russian non-compliance' Sir Alan Duncan, Minister of State at the Foreign and Commonwealth office replied: 'It is not appropriate for us to comment on individual intelligence-gathering exercises of

that sort, but what I would say is that we have monitored things very carefully. We agree with the U.S. assessment that Russia is in violation...I will not go into any more detail, other than to say that, in our view, the intelligence is absolutely clear.<sup>1</sup>

During the same hearing Duncan identified the SSC-8 Screwdriver as the basis of the allegations. ‘We think Russia’s development of the SSC-8 not only is a risk to our security but erodes the foundations of the sort of effective arms control...Together with other NATO allies we would support the preservation of the treaty if it could be made to work, but it requires Russia to return to full verified compliance.’<sup>2</sup>

The SSC-8 Screwdriver, also identified as the 9M729 (the missile’s Russian GRAU designator) is associated with the Yekaterinburg-based Novator design bureau. Novator is also the developer of the 3M14 (SS-N-30A) naval land-attack cruise missile, which the 9M729 may well be related to. Alluding to the range of the Screwdriver, Duncan told the committee: ‘The SSC-8 could potentially put at risk targets across of most of Europe.’ While Duncan recognised that this capability ‘depends on where [the missiles] are deployed,’ assuming the SSC-8 was sited in western Russia, this would require a cruise missile with a range in excess of 2,000 kilometers.<sup>3</sup> Unclassified reports from the U.S. Air Force National Air and Space Intelligence Center suggest the 3M14 has a range of 2,500km.<sup>4</sup>

The UK has not taken a clear public position regarding Russian motivations for deploying the SSC-8. Duncan speculated as to the possible political imperatives, suggesting that the SSC-8 is part of a broader project to reassert Moscow’s military power after the collapse of the Soviet Union. On the military-technical level, Duncan stated that the Russians may ‘see a ground-launched system as more mobile, cheaper and perhaps less vulnerable’, presumably compared with air- or sea-launched variants. Ben Fender, then Head of the FCO’s Security Policy Department, Defence and International Security Directorate, pointed to the clandestine nature of the Russian deployment. If the primary motivation were to split NATO politically, Fender postulated, then Moscow would have ensured that its moves were clearly visible. While dividing NATO may have been a secondary objective, according to Fender, ‘the very fact that [the Russians] have sought to conceal [the deployment] suggests that their primary objectives in pursuing this system have been military ones.’ The UK government has not gone into any further detail regarding the nature of the SSC-8’s military applications. Fender has said that its development should be seen as ‘one tiny sliver’ of the

---

<sup>1</sup> Oral evidence: The Consequences for UK Defence of INF withdrawal, HC 1734, 12 December 2018, House of Commons Defence Committee (<http://data.parliament.uk/writtenevidence/committeeevidence.svc/evidencedocument/defence-committee/consequences-for-uk-defence-of-inf-withdrawal/oral/95031.html>, accessed 23 April 2019).

<sup>2</sup> Oral evidence: The Consequences for UK Defence of INF withdrawal, HC 1734, 12 December 2018.

<sup>3</sup> Oral evidence: The Consequences for UK Defence of INF withdrawal, HC 1734, 12 December 2018.

<sup>4</sup> National Air and Space Intelligence Center, *Ballistic and Cruise Missile Threat Report 2017*, 37 (<https://fas.org/wp-content/uploads/media/NASIC2017.pdf>, accessed 23 April 2019).

growing Russian military threat, including the deployment of SS-26 Iskander missiles and the modernisation of Moscow's strategic forces.<sup>5</sup>

Irrespective of the British government view that Russia is in 'material breach' of the INF, it wants to see the treaty sustained, but only if Moscow returns to compliance. While UK officials hope that Russia will do so, they admit it is likely a forlorn one. Duncan told the committee: 'I don't think many people think they will,' a view echoed by Fender. In private officials are, if anything, even more pessimistic. British officials are also dismissive of Moscow's counter-allegations concerning what it claims are U.S. violations. According to Fender: 'if this treaty does sadly collapse, it does so with responsibility and blame lying where it properly should—with Russia...we have seen a number of Russian attempts to confuse that, and we have attempted to address those by making sure that NATO is very clear about what its position is.' Fender characterised Moscow's counter-allegations as 'complete nonsense'.<sup>6</sup>

Gavin Williamson, the British Secretary of State for Defence, told Parliament in a Feb. 12 written answer that the 'six-month withdrawal process offers Russia a final opportunity to return to full and verified compliance and respect its Treaty obligations.'<sup>7</sup> From a government perspective the U.S. remaining in compliance with the INF Treaty while Russia had developed and continued to deploy a system that contravened the arms control accord was 'not sustainable'.<sup>8</sup>

Implicit within this statement is the government assumption that should Moscow admit that it is in breach of the INF, and make a convincing case that it will return to compliance, then the UK assumes that Washington would halt the withdrawal process.

Even though today's strategic landscape differs considerably from when the INF Treaty was signed in 1987, the UK remains a supporter. The Defence Ministry contends: 'we believe that the Treaty has made a valuable contribution to European security, and along with other NATO Allies, we would support its preservation, if Russia returns to full, verified compliance.'<sup>9</sup>

There remain differing perspectives in the wider body politic. An early day motion submitted by the Parliament's only Green Party MP, Caroline Lucas, on

<sup>5</sup> Oral evidence: The Consequences for UK Defence of INF withdrawal, HC 1734, 12 December 2018.

<sup>6</sup> Oral evidence: The Consequences for UK Defence of INF withdrawal, HC 1734, 12 December 2018.

<sup>7</sup> 'Question asked by Dr Matthew Offord (Hendon): Ministry of Defence: USA: INF Treaty', 4 February 2019 (<https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-questions-answers/?house=commons%2Clords&max=100&member=4108&page=1&questiontype=AllQuestions>, accessed 23 April 2019).

<sup>8</sup> 'INF Treaty: Written question - HL13465', 5 February 2019 (<https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-question/Lords/2019-02-05/HL13465/>, accessed 23 April 2019).

<sup>9</sup> Written Evidence Submitted by the Ministry of Defence (INF0013), 11 January 2019, House of Commons Defence Committee

(<http://data.parliament.uk/WrittenEvidence/CommitteeEvidence.svc/EvidenceDocument/Defence/Consequences%20for%20UK%20Defence%20of%20INF%20withdrawal/written/95371.html>, accessed 23 April 2019).

February 12, called for a debate on the suspension of the treaty by the US and Russia. Only a few EDMs, however, actually result in a debate.<sup>10</sup>

The UK House of Commons Defence Committee recommended in a recent report that the United Kingdom should press the United States to be more forthcoming in its public case for Russian violation, a course of action that, it argued, ‘could significantly influence world opinion... so long as it is accompanied by a full-spectrum communications strategy’. UK government witnesses stressed that the decision on such a policy was the sole preserve of Washington, pointing out that U.S. Director of National Intelligence Dan Coats had already made the public case for Russian violation ‘as far as he could’ without compromising intelligence sources and methods.<sup>11</sup>

### **Future Military Measures**

The British Government has not as yet stated any preference for a military response should, as appears ever more likely, Russia fail to return to what the US and its allies consider to be compliance. Beyond commenting that it is ‘working closely with all our NATO allies on the implications for European security,’ it has said little. One parliamentary exchange, however, did provide a glimpse into government thinking. Asked how it would respond were Washington to ask to ‘relocate ...nuclear weapons on UK soil,’ Mark Field, a Minister of State at the FCO, did not exclude the possibility that the government would accept:

‘I am not going to speculate on too many hypotheticals for the future. This issue will obviously be discussed at very senior levels, and I think that it would be wrong for me to say any more at this stage.’<sup>12</sup>

The UK Ministry of Defence has stated that ‘any future basing decision’ would need to be taken in the light of NATO’s assessment of the evolving Russian threat and it is currently ‘too early’ to make a definitive judgment in that regard.<sup>13</sup> In short, nothing has been ruled in, but nothing has been ruled out either.

Moscow’s introduction into service of a range of land-attack cruise missiles, including the SSC-8, has renewed British interest in ballistic and cruise missile defence in terms of protecting critical national infrastructure and deployed forces.

<sup>10</sup> ‘Suspension of the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty’ EDM #2073, 12 February 2019 (<https://edm.parliament.uk/early-day-motion/52567/suspension-of-the-intermediaterange-nuclear-forces-treaty>, accessed 23 April 2019).

<sup>11</sup> House of Commons Defence Committee, ‘Missile Misdemeanours: Russia and the INF Treaty’, 4 April 2019 ([https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201719/cmselect/cmdfence/1734/173407.htm#\\_idTextAnchor030](https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201719/cmselect/cmdfence/1734/173407.htm#_idTextAnchor030), accessed 23 April 2019); Oral evidence: The Consequences for UK Defence of INF withdrawal, HC 1734, 15 January 2019.

<sup>12</sup> ‘Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty’, *Hansard*, 12 February 2019, Vol. 654 (<https://hansard.parliament.uk/commons/2019-02-04/debates/B91FB191-95F3-4354-AF9A-D7BDDBF69FE2/Intermediate-RangeNuclearForcesTreaty>, accessed 23 April 2019).

<sup>13</sup> Written Evidence Submitted by the Ministry of Defence (INF0015), 5 February 2019, House of Commons Defence Committee

([https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201719/cmselect/cmdfence/1734/173407.htm#\\_idTextAnchor030](https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201719/cmselect/cmdfence/1734/173407.htm#_idTextAnchor030), accessed 23 April 2019).

While it has endorsed the government's support of military countermeasures should NATO deem them necessary, the House of Commons Defence Committee also underlined 'that the same solutions' employed during the Cold War, such as 'like-for-like ground-launched missile deployments', may not be 'the right ones for today'.<sup>14</sup>

### **Future Arms Control Options**

The UK remains a nuclear power 'maintaining a minimum credible nuclear deterrent'. It will replace its four Vanguard-class SSBNs that provide continuous at sea deterrence with the Dreadnought-class in the early 2030s. By the mid-2020s it will hold a stockpile of 'no more than 180 warheads'.<sup>15</sup> The UK warhead is assessed to be a version of the U.S. W76-1.<sup>16</sup>

The Conservative government asserts it 'remains committed... to preserving effective arms control agreements, but we are also clear that for arms control to be effective, all signatories must respect their obligations'.<sup>17</sup> The Labour Party leader, Jeremy Corbyn, is at the personal level a unilateralist, while party policy is to support the renewal of the deterrent.

Labour Shadow Defence Minister Fabian Hamilton has condemned Russian and U.S. actions, departing from Conservative government policy by blaming both sides for damaging the international arms control regime:

'What we see in these actions by the United States and Russia is the erosion of the system of multilateralism and the rules-based international order which underpins global peace and security. Leaving the INF treaty is a dangerous unravelling of part of the architecture of trust and understanding that has prevented nuclear conflict—an architecture that was begun 50 years ago with the signing of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, which I strongly support.'<sup>18</sup>

The Labour Party has also raised the possibility of replacing the INF Treaty with a 'multilateral framework'.<sup>19</sup> The government has not made any public comment on the likelihood of extending the treaty to include other parties, save to note that, 'for that to happen such countries would need to be persuaded of the

---

<sup>14</sup> UK House of Commons Defence Committee, 'Missile Misdemeanours: Russia and the INF Treaty', 4 April 2019.

<sup>15</sup> Defence Nuclear Organisation, Ministry of Defence, 'Policy Paper: The UK's nuclear deterrent: what you need to know', 19 February 2018 (<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/uk-nuclear-deterrence-factsheet/uk-nuclear-deterrence-what-you-need-to-know>), accessed 23 April 2019).

<sup>16</sup> Hans M. Kristensen, 'British Submarines to Receive Upgraded US Nuclear Warhead', *Federation of American Scientists*, 1 April 2011 (<https://fas.org/blogs/security/2011/04/britishw76-1/>), accessed 23 April 2019).

<sup>17</sup> 'Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty', *Hansard*, 4 February 2019, Vol. 654 (<https://hansard.parliament.uk/commons/2019-02-04/debates/B91FB191-95F3-4354-AF9A-D7BDDBF69FE2/Intermediate-RangeNuclearForcesTreaty>), accessed 23 April 2019).

<sup>18</sup> 'Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty', *Hansard*, 4 February 2019.

<sup>19</sup> 'Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty', *Hansard*, 4 February 2019.



benefits of eliminating their missiles.’<sup>20</sup> There remains scepticism – at least among some officials – over the prospects for a broader treaty that could include China, given that country’s apparent disinterest in any such approach. (Ma Shengkun, the deputy director general within the Department of Arms Control in China’s Ministry of Foreign Affairs, dismissed this idea, repeatedly, during a recent MFA-hosted conference in Berlin.)

UK officials view the likely collapse of the INF as damaging to the wider arms control architecture. Moscow’s development and deployment of the SSC-8, coupled with its continued denials, ‘undermine the foundations of effective arms control...if you don’t have trust and transparency, then the deals don’t work.’ The issue of verification is also being placed in the context of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. The Conservative government’s view is that Russia’s violation of the INF ‘perhaps makes it harder to go as far as countries like the UK would like to in terms of disarmament.’<sup>21</sup>

## **Conclusion**

The British Government remains closely aligned to the U.S. with regard to the cause of the pending collapse of the INF. It has been reticent to publicly discuss potential measures in a post-treaty environment, beyond saying that it continues to ‘work closely’ with NATO allies on the European security implications of the failure of the INF Treaty.

Given, however, the politically fluid UK environment, there is the possibility of a Labour, or Labour-led coalition government. Such an administration would likely take a more distanced approach to the U.S. generally, while more pursuing arms control more vigorously, and perhaps less rigorously.

---

<sup>20</sup> Written Evidence from the Foreign and Commonwealth Office (INF0010), 8 January 2019, House of Commons Defence Committee (<http://data.parliament.uk/WrittenEvidence/CommitteeEvidence.svc/EvidenceDocument/Defence/Consequences%20for%20UK%20Defence%20of%20INF%20withdrawal/written/94763.html>, accessed 23 April 2019).

<sup>21</sup> Oral evidence: The Consequences for UK Defence of INF withdrawal, HC 1734, 12 December 2018.

## **French statements on the current INF crisis<sup>1</sup>**

This paper aims to offer an outline of the French official views on the INF Treaty crisis based on publicly available sources. It focuses on the period of 2018-2019. More precisely, the period starts from the U.S. president Donald Trump's announcement of the decision to put an end to the INF treaty in response to the Russian violation (October 2018). It ends with Washington initiating the withdrawal procedure (February 2019).

The crisis of the Intermediate Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty is undoubtedly a milestone in the history of arms control. Its most likely outcome will be the end of the Treaty in August 2019. We now have to envisage the world without the INF Treaty. This situation, marked by great uncertainty, raises many questions about the future of international security for those observing. What was the reasoning behind the Russian decision to develop the SSC-8 missile and what should we expect in terms of deployment? How will the situation affect the U.S. and NATO defense posture? What about the consequences in Asia, as China is now a part of this equation? These questions will come in the form of policy choices for the practitioners – officials. The leading players are obviously the two parties to the treaty, Russia and the United States. At the same time, other countries will be affected by the demise of this Treaty, which was a pillar of the European security architecture. As NATO Allies repeat in their statements, “for 30 years, the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty has been crucial to Euro-Atlantic security.”<sup>2</sup>

### **Who is talking about the INF crisis?**

In France, as in other European countries, the issues related to the INF Treaty crisis are not necessarily of interest to the public. The Minister of Europe and Foreign Affairs Jean-Yves Le Drian said that “this question does not stir the opinion much, but it is a major one” during a recent National Assembly hearing open to the press.<sup>3</sup> *De facto*, it appeared in French newspapers very rarely. Only a few articles of the national daily press dealt with the U.S. withdrawal announcement. Their focus on a potential revival of the nuclear arms race was clearly linked to the memory of the Euromissile crisis that triggered the INF

---

<sup>1</sup> *The views expressed in this article are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the French Ministry of armed forces.*

<sup>2</sup> See, for instance: Statement by the North Atlantic Council on the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty, 15 December 2017, [https://www.nato.int/cps/fr/natohq/news\\_150016.htm?selectedLocale=en](https://www.nato.int/cps/fr/natohq/news_150016.htm?selectedLocale=en).

<sup>3</sup> National Assembly hearing open to the press, 12 December 2018, <http://www.assemblee-nationale.fr/15/cr-cafe/18-19/c1819028.asp>. (Non-official translation)

Treaty negotiations. At this stage, unlike in other European countries, the issue does seem neither controversial nor caught into domestic political debates in France.<sup>4</sup>

Journalists interviewed French think tank experts who regularly work on arms control issues. The experts did not publish articles specifically on the INF Treaty at that time with only a few exceptions.<sup>5</sup> This is certainly due to the fact that the researchers do their work with a long-term perspective and not in reaction to current events. In any case, it should not be perceived as a lack of interest in the subject.<sup>6</sup>

To a certain extent, governmental communication is in keeping with the picture described above. France, whose “independent strategic nuclear forces..., which have a deterrent role of their own, contribute to the overall deterrence and security of the Allies”<sup>7</sup> cannot do without careful thought on this subject. However, governmental communication is sober, which does not reflect the importance of the issue on the agenda: official declarations are rare and brief, although France is genuinely concerned. First, it should be noted that even if the presidential communication on INF was rare, it occurred at crucial moments, very soon after the U.S. President announced his decision to “terminate” the Treaty because Russia had not “honored the agreement” for the first time.<sup>8</sup> The ‘Elysée’ press release reported a phone conversation between president Emmanuel Macron and his American counterpart. The subject of the conversation was Syria (after the assassination of a Saudi journalist Jamal Khashoggi). The statement said that the two presidents “also raised the question of the future of the INF Treaty. The President of the Republic recalled the importance of this Treaty in particular for European security and our strategic stability.”<sup>9</sup> At the ministerial level, the subject is publicly reported by the Minister of Foreign Affairs. Although the Ministry of the Armed forces is also involved, it is more guarded<sup>10</sup> and does not actively comment on this issue.

---

<sup>4</sup>Nevertheless, the INF treaty is clearly a matter of concern for French parliamentarians (as shown by questions raised during some hearing published).

<sup>5</sup>See Bruno Tertrais, The death of the INF Treaty or the end of the post-Cold war era, Note de la FRS n°2/2019. <https://www.frstrategie.org/publications/notes/the-death-of-the-inf-treaty-or-the-end-of-the-post-cold-war-era-03-2019>. Articles were also published on INF in the FRS's newsletter on deterrence (Observatoire de la dissuasion) but they mostly dealt with regional approaches.

<sup>6</sup> A half-day seminar on INF and the future of arms control will take place in Paris on May 14<sup>th</sup> 2019, organized by the Foundation for strategic research (Fondation pour la recherche stratégique).

<https://www.frstrategie.org/evenements/2019/2019-05-14/>

<sup>7</sup> NATO Strategic Concept §18, 2010, [https://www.nato.int/strategic-concept/pdf/Strat\\_Concept\\_web\\_en.pdf](https://www.nato.int/strategic-concept/pdf/Strat_Concept_web_en.pdf)

<sup>8</sup> Remarks by President Trump, 20 October 2018, <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/remarks-president-trump-air-force-one-departure-4/>

<sup>9</sup> Press communiqué, Elysée, 22 October 2018, [https://www.elysee.fr/emmanuel-macron/2018/10/22/communique-de-presse-entretien-telephonique-du-president-de-la-republique-avec-le-president-des-etats-unis-d-amerique-donald-trump\(Non-official translation\)](https://www.elysee.fr/emmanuel-macron/2018/10/22/communique-de-presse-entretien-telephonique-du-president-de-la-republique-avec-le-president-des-etats-unis-d-amerique-donald-trump(Non-official translation))

<sup>10</sup> Obviously, the Ministry of Armed forces is involved on the matter related to INF. It is not something visible at national level because there is almost no communication from the MOD but NATO's work makes clear that MODs are working on this issue. For example, on February 13, 2019, Alliance Defense Ministers met to discuss the violation of the FNI Treaty. A press release was subsequently published:

[https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/news\\_163445.htm?selectedLocale=en](https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/news_163445.htm?selectedLocale=en)

## Discussing the ‘violation’

French governmental communication is cautious both in form and substance. Two points are particularly sensitive: the assessment of missile development by Russia and the use of the word ‘violation.’ As the February 1 (2019) communiqué by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs shows, there is an emphasis on the fact that France’s conclusion on Russian violation was drawn “alongside with its partners and allies.”<sup>11</sup>

Official French statements are in line with those of NATO (NATO statements result from an agreement among the 29 Allies). Thus, the characterization of Russian violation is the same in NATO’s communiqués and those of France. For the record, NATO only started using the term ‘violation’ after the Brussels Summit of July 2018. Still, it remains rather cautious: “Allies believe that, in the absence of any credible answer from Russia on this new missile, the *most plausible assessment* would be that Russia is in violation of the Treaty.”<sup>12</sup> The accusation became much more explicit after the meeting of NATO Foreign Ministers on December 4, 2018: “Allies have concluded that Russia has developed and fielded a missile system, the 9M729, which *violates* the INF Treaty and poses significant risks to Euro-Atlantic security.”<sup>13</sup> NATO press release of February 1, 2019, also clearly stated: “Following nearly six years of U.S. and Allied engagement with Russia, on 4 December 2018, NATO Allies declared that Russia has developed and fielded a missile system, the 9M729, which *violates* the INF Treaty, and poses significant risks to Euro-Atlantic security.”<sup>14</sup> Since then, France also referred specifically to a ‘violation’ of the INF treaty but continued to show great caution in the choice of terms.

## No blame game

As far as French communication on INF is concerned, the desire to mark France’s independence and autonomy in the assessment of Russian capabilities incriminated is striking.<sup>15</sup>

It is clear that NATO’s cohesion matters, but it does not prevent France from demonstrating a more nuanced approach than that of NATO, even if the substance of the message is the same. Thus, the French statement clearly

---

<sup>11</sup>French communiqué on INF, 1<sup>st</sup> February 2019, <https://www.diplomatie.gouv.fr/en/french-foreign-policy/disarmament-and-non-proliferation/events/article/intermediate-range-nuclear-forces-treaty-01-02-19>. This communiqué served as talking points. See for example, the plenary statement of the Permanent representative of France to the conference of disarmament, Ambassador Yann Hwang, on 4<sup>th</sup> February 2019: <https://cd-geneve.delegfrance.org/Conference-du-desarmement-4-fevrier-2019>

<sup>12</sup>Brussels Summit declaration, paragraph 46, 11 July 2018, , [https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official\\_texts\\_156624.htm?selectedLocale=en](https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official_texts_156624.htm?selectedLocale=en) (emphasis added).

<sup>13</sup>Statement on the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty, issued by the NATO Foreign Ministers, Brussels, 4 December 2018, [https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official\\_texts\\_161122.htm](https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official_texts_161122.htm) (emphasis added)

<sup>14</sup>Statement on Russia’s failure to comply with the INF Treaty, issued by the North Atlantic Council, Brussels, 1 February 2019, [https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/news\\_162996.htm](https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/news_162996.htm) (emphasis added).

<sup>15</sup>See Corentin Brustlein’s paper on the historical ground of the French concerns about an independent assessment on the Russian violation.

deplores the “situation:” “France regrets reaching a situation, in which the United States has had to provide a notice of its withdrawal from the INF Treaty.”<sup>16</sup> France makes sure that it marks its support for the US position mentioning, in particular, the lack of Russian response to the requests for explanations. However, this reasoning is based on facts and not on speculations. France is not entering any blaming game. By the way, its statement regarding Russian responsibility also seems less direct than that of NATO. The latter specified that in the absence of its return to compliance with the Treaty, Russia would then “bear sole responsibility for the end of the treaty” (§4)<sup>17</sup>. The French communiqué does not even deal with this question of guilt. How could Paris enter this kind of judgment while affirming its will to promote “an in-depth dialogue” with Russia? A balanced position clearly serves the search for a diplomatic solution.

The desire to seek a diplomatic solution despite low chances of success at this stage of the crisis may indeed explain (at least in part) caution in the official statements, especially in their characterization of the violation and of the responsibilities of both parties. During the National Assembly hearing mentioned above, the Minister of Europe and Foreign Affairs talked about the German-French ‘demarche’ to buy time: “The acceleration of the process was avoided thanks to a Franco-German approach, which the Chancellor and President Macron discussed in Buenos Aires a fortnight ago. At NATO Foreign Ministers’ meeting a week ago, we were able to obtain a sixty-day period – which is very little – that should be used to pursue exchanges with our allies and continue to encourage Russians to be more transparent and to return to their commitments.”<sup>18</sup>

### **The risk of decoupling**

This bilateral approach is a concrete initiative reflecting the view that the INF Treaty is crucial for Europe and international security. The Minister of Foreign Affairs recalled this when he alluded to the dreaded consequences of the potential termination of the Treaty: “indeed, if the INF Treaty were broken, we would enter a logic that could lead to a nuclear decoupling in Europe and to a form of rearmament. This is not yet relevant but I would like to call your attention to this essential risk for our own safety, which is currently difficult to measure in all dimensions.”<sup>19</sup>

The Head of the MFA’s Department for Strategic Affairs, Security, and Disarmament Nicolas Roche explained the decoupling effect at a National Assembly hearing last March. He noted that it had already been identified as a major risk in the 80s and was twofold: “The existence of an intermediate-range

---

<sup>16</sup> French communiqué on INF, 1<sup>st</sup> February 2019,

<sup>17</sup> Statement on Russia’s failure to comply with the INF Treaty, issued by the North Atlantic Council, Brussels, 1 February 2019,

<sup>18</sup> National Assembly hearing open to the press, 12 December 2018,

<sup>19</sup> National Assembly hearing open to the press, 12 December 2018,

surface-to-surface [...] missile presents a risk of decoupling Europeans from each other, that is, dividing in case of a conflict. A much more classic second decoupling was at the heart of the fears that we harbored in the 1980s: the decoupling between the two shores of the Atlantic in a conflict concerning defense and security in Europe.”<sup>20</sup>

Finally, recognizing the importance of INF for NATO and Europe, France also highlights that it is a bilateral issue. Paris makes links the current situation and the upcoming deadline for the New START Treaty: “As such, France encourages Russia and the United States to extend the New Start Treaty on their nuclear arsenals beyond 2021 and to negotiate a replacement treaty”<sup>21</sup> To a lesser extent, it also brings China into the equation mentioning that China might be “an essential element of the U.S. problematic.”<sup>22</sup>

## **Conclusion**

Concluding the analysis of French official statements on the INF crisis, it is worth noting that they never deal with the potential military requirements and the adaptation of NATO’s defense posture, which are discussed by non-governmental experts abroad. There undoubtedly are several reasons for such silence. First, it is too soon to talk about the post-INF situation because INF is not dead yet. It seems that for now, the official stance is that the end of the Treaty is still only one of the probable outcomes. Secondly, it is also clearly premature to publicly assess possible steps for NATO after the demise of the Treaty. In the coming months, France will presumably remain very cautious in its comments about the consequences of the INF death, although the issue will certainly remain high on the agenda. Finally, official statements never deal with potential changes to the French defense posture. However, France has clearly stated that “nuclear deterrence strategy, as defined in the Military Planning Act, is sufficient to deal with all the potential threats to our vital interest.

---

<sup>20</sup>National Assembly hearing, M. Nicolas Roche, director Department of Strategic, Security and Disarmament Affairs, Ministry of Europe and Foreign Affairs, 20 March 2019,

<http://www.assemblee-nationale.fr/15/pdf/cr-cdef/18-19/c1819029.pdf> (Non-official translation)

<sup>21</sup> French communiqué on INF, 1<sup>st</sup> February 2019,

<sup>22</sup>Jean-Yves Le Drian, hearing above-mentioned.

*Corentin Brustlein*

## **A French assessment of the end of the INF Treaty and its implications for Europe<sup>1</sup>**

What will the end of the INF treaty mean for European security, NATO, and strategic stability? As a nuclear-weapon state, France was a key actor of the 1980s Euromissile crisis, even though it remained outside of NATO's integrated command structure. While the political and strategic contexts have tremendously changed, the ever-growing importance of European security to French strategic interests should lead Paris to play an active role in the current crisis of the European security architecture and the adaptation of the Alliance's deterrence and defense posture.

### **How did we get there?**

The "Euromissile crisis" was a turning point for France's foreign and defense policy vis-à-vis the Alliance. While France remained within the Alliance after it had withdrawn from NATO's integrated command structure back in 1966, its national strategy and defense policy drew a clear line between what it needed to protect national interests and the efforts for the defense of allies. The crisis itself proved to be an essential test of French solidarity with NATO allies, particularly with Germany, and ultimately brought Paris to affirm a stronger commitment within the Alliance.

The French government's initial stance on the threat posed by Soviet theater-range nuclear forces such as the SS-20 was very prudent. Prime Minister Barre thus stated that France was "unaffected" by NATO's 1979 dual-track decision and was neither in favor of nor against the modernization of NATO theater nuclear forces in response to the Soviet deployments.<sup>2</sup> During the first years of negotiations, an important part of the French national security community was skeptical about the long-term strategic benefits of the dual-track approach and the removal of US theater-range nuclear systems from Europe.<sup>3</sup> This was in large part due to the fact that France possessed its own nuclear deterrent and was no longer hosting US nuclear weapons.

Still, ultimately France shared the other NATO members' concerns about the risks of strategic decoupling associated with the deployment of theater-range nuclear forces. Although some concerns appeared in 1981 when Socialists came to power, President Mitterrand turned out to be firmer than his predecessor vis-à-

---

<sup>1</sup> This article was prepared as a complement to Tiphaine de Champchesnel's paper, which provides extensive coverage and analysis of the official statements coming from the French government over the past year.

<sup>2</sup> Bruno Racine, *La France et les FNI, Politique étrangère*, vol. 53, №1 (1988), p. 79-91.

<sup>3</sup> Philip H. Gordon, *A Certain Idea of France. French Security Policy and the Gaullist Legacy*, Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press, 1993, p. 148-151.

vis the Soviet Union during the crisis. He then played a central role in the negotiation within the Alliance, particularly by expressing support for the deployment of US INF-range systems in Europe before the Bundestag in 1983.

Throughout the negotiations within NATO and in direct discussions with the US, France pursued a second objective, which was to make sure that a treaty covering INF-range capabilities would not be multilateral and constrain France's own capabilities. At that time it possessed eighteen own siloed S-3 intermediate-range ballistic missiles (IRBMs). France was already making the case that due to its posture of strategic sufficiency and minimal deterrence, it should not be the subject to arms control agreement concluded by two superpowers with vastly larger arsenals. During the first years, the USSR repeatedly tried to include British and French nuclear forces (not only IRBMs but all forces that could potentially target Soviet territory) in the negotiation, attempting to score either a strategic success in case its pressure worked, or a diplomatic success by blaming Paris and London for the failure to reach an agreement. However, over the years Moscow became less adamant about including third parties in the treaty and stopped making such requests in 1986 opening the way to the conclusion of the Washington Treaty.<sup>4</sup>

Twenty-five years later, when the US accused Russia of violating the INF Treaty, several European allies, including France, were slow in making the same accusation. As a matter of fact, French statements refrained from confirming or denying the Russian violation until late 2018.<sup>5</sup> Even though the US brought the case for a Russian violation to their NATO allies a few years ago, it seems only to have shared credible intelligence very late. The issue of whether or not to acknowledge a violation struck a sensitive chord in France, which prides itself in being a strategically autonomous country. In Paris's view, strategic autonomy not only goes far beyond possessing an independent nuclear deterrent but also means that it should be able to make its foreign policy decisions based on its own intelligence collection and analytic capabilities.<sup>6</sup> The 2003 transatlantic rift over the issue of weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, during which French intelligence services disagreed with the US assessment, was such an example of strategic autonomy and diplomatic caution, including when much pressure was coming from its closest allies. Ultimately, after many consultations, more intelligence sharing, and a thorough national analysis process, the uncertainty about the violation disappeared, or most probably had become small enough to allow for a common NATO statement in support of the US case.

---

<sup>4</sup>George L. Rueckert, *Global Double Zero. The INF Treaty from Its Origins to Its Implementation*, Westport, CT, Greenwood Press, 1993, p. 30-32, 50-51.

<sup>5</sup>See Tiphaine de Champchesnel's paper on that point.

<sup>6</sup>See *Revue Stratégique de Défense et de Sécurité Nationale*, Paris, Ministère des armées, 2017, p. 56, 75. For some practical examples for force projection operations, see Corentin Brustlein, *Entry Operations and the Future of Strategic Autonomy*, Focus stratégique, Ifri, 70bis, December 2017.



## Assessing the SSC-8 and its implications for European security

Despite having joined the choir of NATO countries admitting the existence of a Russian violating weapon system, France refrained from publicly offering its own technical assessment of the SSC-8 ground-launched cruise missile. A representative from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) commented on the death of the INF treaty and the consequences of the Russian violation during a parliamentary hearing. He stressed that the French government assessed the political consequences of the deployment of SSC-8 missiles by Russia as exceeding the military consequences.<sup>7</sup>

As was the case in the 1980s during the Euromissile crisis, the main concern remains the prospect of strategic decoupling between Europe and the US. The assumption behind the fear of strategic decoupling is that the prospect of Russian strikes on the European theater might discourage Washington from fulfilling its article 5 commitment and provide Moscow with an ability to dominate the escalation process. Russia's ability to equip theater-range missiles with either conventional or nuclear payloads offers greater flexibility to Moscow and only adds to the challenge. Another layer of challenges derives from NATO's enlargement that happened after the Cold War and Russia's flexible deployment options exploiting its strategic depth. Such deployment could allow Russia to pose a second threat of strategic decoupling, this time within Europe itself, between secure Western allies and vulnerable Eastern allies.

Although the French government has published no official analysis, when it comes to assessing the violation in military terms, one can offer some hypotheses about why they are considered to be of lesser importance than the political ramifications of the deployment for the Alliance as a whole. The SSC-8 should be assessed within the broader context of Russia's growing interest in long-range conventional strike capabilities. For Moscow, a GLCM is just one more option in an already robust and growing portfolio of long-range strike capabilities, whether they are sea-launched cruise missiles like the *Kalibr*, air-launched cruise missiles like the Kh-101/102, short-range surface-to-surface missiles like the SS-26 and SSC-7, or even the recently revealed *Kinzhal* air-launched ballistic missile.

In theory, SSC-8 GLCMs could offer Russia at least three potential comparative advantages:

- Survivability: because mobile ground launchers can rather easily be dispersed and concealed;
- Mass: can be useful to saturate defense or achieve greater effects on the ground using conventional precision weapon systems;

---

<sup>7</sup>Compte rendu de l'Audition de M. Nicolas Roche, directeur des affaires stratégiques, de sécurité et de désarmement au ministère de l'Europe et des Affaires Etrangères, Assemblée nationale, Commission de la défense nationale et des forces armées, 20 mars 2019.

- Flexibility in mission allocation: the SSC-8 launch platforms are strictly dedicated to long-range strikes. Most of other existing long-range conventional strike options in Russia's possession rely on multipurpose platforms like attack submarines or strategic bombers. By relying on single-purpose systems such as ground launchers to hold targets at risk, Russia can keep other platforms in reserve or assign them other more important operational or strategic duties (attack submarines can be focused on intelligence collection or antisubmarine warfare, long-range aviation can be focused on strategic deterrence, and others).

Adding mass, survivability, and flexibility to the Russian strike capabilities portfolio would certainly be very significant. Will it be the case in reality? The key variables here will be the number of systems deployed and how fast this number grows in the future. It begs many questions, such as the unitary cost of an SSC-8 missile (which might be cheaper than other options like Kh-101), the capacity of the Russian industry to produce many of them per year depending on prioritization and possible industrial bottlenecks.

Most importantly, numbers become critically important in the light of the potential concept of operations. Would Russia aim at maximizing the political effects or the military effects of a conventional strike? Would it favor using the SSC-8 as a warning shot to force NATO – or some allies – to back down, or as a part of a disabling first strike that should knock NATO forces out at the beginning of a conflict? The use of a conventional strike for political purposes is not necessarily easy *per se*. Russia does not know for sure if a strike has the desired political effect of scaring allies, it might well have the exact opposite effect. At the same time, the capacity to do so is relatively easy to possess since it only requires a few dozen cruise missiles. On the other hand, the use of a conventional strike for military purposes is neither simple nor cheap, particularly against NATO. When it comes to the use of conventional munitions in a great power conflict, a huge gap appears between the numbers required to achieve a limited political objective and those needed for a massive coordinated strike meant to deliver a lasting military effect against a set of modern and resilient infrastructures such as air and naval bases, sea points of debarkation, major communications and logistical nodes.<sup>8</sup>

To sum up, SSC-8 does not seem to change Russia's ability to conduct conventional punishment strikes dramatically. Such capabilities had existed before Moscow possessed a ground-launched option but did not seem to provide it with an ability to launch large-scale conventional denial strikes, which would require massive numbers of missiles. If Russia harbors that kind of ambition, NATO allies' intelligence services should be able to see those hundreds of systems

---

<sup>8</sup>It might be helpful to keep in mind figures such as the numbers of cruise missiles fired during the first days of the 2011 Libya campaign (more than 200) and during the joint US-UK-France air strike against Syrian facilities in April 2018 (more than 100 cruise missiles). Russia would face a much more formidable and well-defended target set to try to achieve a significant military objective against NATO.

progressively produced and deployed in the field over the next years. More importantly, perhaps, according to the nuclear policies of both NATO and the P3 countries, such a massive conventional strike could elicit a nuclear response – a possibility that is certainly not taken lightly in Russia.

At the national level, whatever the credibly assumed range of SSC-8 is, the military threat posed does not appear a game changer itself. At the lower end of the spectrum, France is already vulnerable to a very limited conventionally-armed SLCM strike; at the higher end of the spectrum, the French president can rely on the threat of nuclear retaliation to deter any major direct attack against the country's vital interests. Alternatively, the SSC-8 could also be a threat for France and for French forces either in a scenario, in which a large volume of French forces would be deployed in Eastern Europe, or in another scenario in which Russia would project and deploy those systems abroad. Since the SS-26 SRBM was deployed in Syria, one can assume that the SSC-8 GLCM will be deployed abroad. France, as an expeditionary power, might face that threat in the coming years.

### **NATO and national potential responses to the SSC-8**

There have been very few statements from French officials on the future of arms control and theater-range systems in Europe. The priority remains, as exposed by the aforementioned MFA official in a parliamentary hearing, to save the INF Treaty by requesting that Russia comes back into compliance. Though, there is also no illusion in France about the ultimate fate of the INF Treaty: “We need to prepare for what *will* be the security and defense landscape in Europe after the 2nd of August, without the INF Treaty.”<sup>9</sup> France has used its bilateral channel of communication with Russia to discuss Russia's compliance and the SSC-8 but did not, apparently, receive any answer.<sup>10</sup>

When considering potential collective responses to the deployment of Russian SSC-8 systems West of the Urals, France's priority is likely to remain NATO cohesion. In a context where Russia actively tries to undermine that very cohesion through information warfare and the US leadership sends troubling signals to its European partners, the Allies should do their best to avoid issues that are prone to cause tensions within the Alliance. In this regard, some of the possible paths in response to Russian moves appear potentially very divisive. Basing options for new US intermediate-range missiles, whether conventional or nuclear-tipped, rank first in this list of divisive issues. Again, this should be seen in the light of the French government's assessment of the SSC-8 as a political problem more than a military problem. On top of that, it is not a satisfactory option to respond to a political problem by creating an even bigger one.

---

<sup>9</sup>Hearing of Nicolas Roche, op. cit., p. 5. Emphasis added.

<sup>10</sup>Ibid.

At a national level, it seems very unlikely that France will take specific measures meant to respond to the SSC-8, either defensive (i.e. greater reliance on missile defense) or offensive (development of new strike systems). Beyond the fact that budgetary constraints might make a substantial national response unfeasible, there does not seem to be any strategic rationale for that kind of a national option as France already possesses nuclear and conventional retaliatory capabilities.<sup>11</sup> The main line of effort at a national level will likely be more diplomatic than military in nature. They will focus on identifying the steps necessary to preserve what will remain of the arms control and confidence-building architecture (New START, Open Skies, Vienna document, and others).<sup>12</sup>

At a collective level, one key variable is the pace of production and deployment of additional Russian strike systems, either SSC-8 or other systems that would have been prohibited by the INF Treaty. The indicators of a major Russian build-up would tremendously affect the character of the debates within NATO about the response. They also might open the way to a much more aggressive NATO strategy combining new deployments and a much more ambitious missile defense policy.

---

<sup>11</sup>On the renewal of France's nuclear deterrent, see Corentin Brustlein, France's Nuclear Arsenal: What Sort of Renewal?, *Politique étrangère*, Autumn 2017, available at: [https://www.cairn-int.info/article-E PE 173 0113--france-s-nuclear-arsenal-what-sort.htm](https://www.cairn-int.info/article-E_PE_173_0113--france-s-nuclear-arsenal-what-sort.htm)

<sup>12</sup> In 2007, the French government issued a proposal to start consultations on a new treaty banning short- and intermediate-range surface-to-surface missiles. This proposal was later included in the EU action plan for disarmament adopted by the EU Council in December 2008. This treaty would have de facto multilateralized the INF treaty and expanded the range of systems prohibited. Conseil de l'Union européenne, *Déclaration sur le renforcement de la sécurité internationale*, Bruxelles, 11 December 2018, p. 3.

## **The German position on the INF Treaty**

This paper discusses the German position on the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty, post-INF strategies in Europe and their implications for wider security, and transatlantic ties. In particular, it analyses the governmental and parliamentary perspectives and narratives.

The views reflected are deduced from six personal background interviews, open source statements made by governmental officials in the Foreign Federal Office (AA), Ministry of Defense (MoD), and MPs representing most political parties in the German Bundestag, as well as statements made in Bundestag debates on 8 November 2018 and 1 February 2019. Data collection for this paper took place between November 2018 and March 2019.

For two reasons open discussions often turned difficult. There is an open conflict between the AA and MoD regarding the deployments of nuclear INF Treaty-range missiles. Similarly, the ongoing intra-alliance talks on the potential specific responses to a “no-INF” situation are sensitive.

As one parliamentary interviewee put it, the awareness of the INF is already “vanishing.” This may account for the limited number of parliamentarians available for an interview on the issue. In contrast, a comparably large number of cross-party public statements were issued in the days following the United States’ suspension notice.

### **German governments’ position on the INF Treaty**

There is an interagency agreement in the German government that Russia “clearly” violated the INF Treaty, derived from an intelligence-led exchange. Nevertheless, Berlin “regrets” the US withdrawal decision viewing the INF Treaty as an important arms control instrument and a crucial element of European and German interests <sup>1</sup>

The government sides with the US in its claim that the European-based Aegis Ashore MK-41 launchers do not violate the INF Treaty. The government

---

<sup>1</sup> Zur Ankündigung der USA, sich aus dem INF-Abkommen zurückzuziehen, Die Bundesregierung, 21 October 2018, <https://www.bundesregierung.de/breg-de/suche/zur-ankuendigung-der-usa-sich-aus-dem-inf-abkommen-zurueckzuziehen-1540744/>; Regierungspressekonferenz vom 22. Oktober 2018, Die Bundesregierung, 22 October 2018, <https://www.bundesregierung.de/breg-de/suche/regierungspressekonferenz-vom-22-oktober-2018-1541072>.

believes that Washington made a “convincing case including in bilateral talks with Moscow.”<sup>2</sup>

Berlin actively supports a diplomatic solution to the INF Treaty dispute.<sup>3</sup> Following German Chancellor Angela Merkel’s (CDU) pressure, President Donald Trump postponed notifying Russia of its intention to withdraw from the INF Treaty for 60 days to give Moscow yet another chance to come back to compliance.<sup>4</sup> Berlin believes that it is now Russia’s turn to come up with a convincing solution: full and verifiable destruction of the Russian missile in question.<sup>5</sup>

Germany also insisted on putting the INF Treaty on the agenda for what appeared to be an ad-hoc NATO-Russia Council (NRC) meeting in January 2019.<sup>6</sup> The German-Russian High Level Working Group on Security discussed the INF Treaty in November 2018 and March 2019.<sup>7</sup> During his trip to Moscow, Federal Foreign Minister Heiko Maas (SPD) urged Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov to avert an arms race in Europe,<sup>8</sup> and pushed the topic again in a bilateral meeting at the 2019 Munich Security Conference.<sup>9</sup>

Additionally, Heiko Maas “proposed very concrete criteria against which to test Russian transparency proposals,”<sup>10</sup> but the attempt has not been received well in either Moscow or Washington. According to some sources, Germans also unsuccessfully sounded the opportunity to open up NATO Aegis Ashore for Russian inspections with Washington. The United States assured the German government that it would consider every “serious” Russian offer to return to INF Treaty compliance until August 2, 2019. This is the date when the six-months’ period after the notification ends, and the US withdrawal takes effect. There are, however, no parameters of what “serious” means.

---

<sup>2</sup> Regierungspressekonferenz vom 5. Dezember 2018, Die Bundesregierung, 5 December 2018,

<https://www.bundesregierung.de/breg-de/suche/regierungspressekonferenz-vom-5-dezember-2018-1557620>

<sup>3</sup> Neues Wettrüsten verhindern, Die Bundesregierung, 23 October 2018, <https://www.bundesregierung.de/breg-de/suche/neues-wettruesten-verhindern-1541050>.

<sup>4</sup> Regierungspressekonferenz vom 5. Dezember 2018, Die Bundesregierung, 5 December 2018, <https://www.bundesregierung.de/breg-de/suche/regierungspressekonferenz-vom-5-dezember-2018-1557620>.

<sup>5</sup> Regierungspressekonferenz vom 1. Februar 2019, Die Bundesregierung, 1 February 2019, <https://www.bundesregierung.de/breg-de/suche/regierungspressekonferenz-vom-1-februar-2019-1576382>.

<sup>6</sup> NATO-Russia Council meets in Brussels, NATO, 25 January 2019, [https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/news\\_162680.htm?selectedLocale=en](https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/news_162680.htm?selectedLocale=en).

<sup>7</sup> Joint press release by the Federal Foreign Office and the Russian Foreign Ministry on the 13th plenary meeting of the German-Russian High Level Working Group on Security, Federal Foreign Office, 12 November 2018, <https://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/en/newsroom/news/high-level-working-group-on-security/2160350>; The Federal Foreign Office on the meeting of the sub-working group on the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and arms control of the German-Russian High Level Working Group on Security, Federal Foreign Office, 5 March 2019, <https://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/en/newsroom/news/ffo-meeting-non-proliferation/2196798>.

<sup>8</sup> Regierungspressekonferenz vom 21. Januar 2019, Die Bundesregierung, 21 January 2019, <https://www.bundesregierung.de/breg-de/suche/regierungspressekonferenz-vom-21-januar-2019-1570848>.

<sup>9</sup> Regierungspressekonferenz vom 20. Februar 2019, Die Bundesregierung, 20 February 2019, <https://www.bundesregierung.de/breg-de/suche/regierungspressekonferenz-vom-20-februar-2019-1582628>.

<sup>10</sup> Arms control is pure realpolitik, Federal Foreign Office, 2 February 2019, <https://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/en/newsroom/news/maas-funke/2186272>.

The government intends to use the remaining months “to do everything possible to save the treaty.”<sup>11</sup> However, informally, neither the German MoD nor AA judge a positive outcome to be plausible.

While the NATO military is currently undertaking an assessment of the implications of the new Russian missile for European security, the German government is keeping a low profile in discussing possible answers publicly. Nevertheless, Berlin claims engagement in looking at the possibilities of “no INF” and “INF modifications.”

### *Military countermeasures*

While Federal Minister of Defense Ursula von der Leyen (CDU) does not want to exclude any option at the early negotiation stage,<sup>12</sup> Heiko Maas believes that the deployment of nuclear weapons in Europe would be the “wrong answer.”<sup>13</sup> Chancellor Angela Merkel, Ursula von der Leyen and Heiko Maas have agreed that the answer must not be the “tit-for-tat strategy practiced in the 1980s.”<sup>14</sup>

The Government is now expected to make two decisions, in which the INF Treaty violation and subsequent demise might play a role. The first one relates to the ground-based Tactical Air Defense System (TLVS) that could replace the Patriot systems. It is designed for protecting troops in out-of-area missions, assets, and areas in alliance and national-defense contexts, and, in particular, to combat all airborne targets, including cruise missiles.<sup>15</sup> After long negotiations regarding capability expectations,<sup>16</sup> MBDA and Lockheed Martin, the defense companies in charge of developing the new system, are expected to make an offer in June 2019.<sup>17</sup> If the government accepts the offer, it will then be passed to the German Bundestag for a budgetary discussion.<sup>18</sup>

<sup>11</sup> Pressekonferenz von Bundeskanzlerin Merkel und dem armenischen Ministerpräsidenten Nikol Paschinjan, Die Bundesregierung, 1 February 2019, <https://www.bundesregierung.de/breg-de/suche/pressekonferenz-von-bundeskanzlerin-merkel-und-dem-armenischen-ministerpraesidenten-nikol-paschinjan-1576390>.

<sup>12</sup> Alexandra Brzozowski, „NATO bereitet sich auf eine INF-freie Welt vor“, *Euractiv*, 14 February 2019, <https://www.euractiv.de/section/eu-aussenpolitik/news/nato-bereitet-sich-auf-eine-inf-freie-welt-vor/>.

<sup>13</sup> Arms control is pure realpolitik, Federal Foreign Office, 2 February 2019, <https://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/en/newsroom/news/maas-funke/2186272>.

<sup>14</sup> Keynote Speech by Federal Minister of Defence Dr Ursula von der Leyen at the Opening of the 55th Munich Security Conference, Federal Ministry of Defense, 15 February 2019, <https://www.bmvg.de/resource/blob/32548/55509659e4b51afb5df21ee62f5577/20190215-rede-ministerin-msc-engl-data.pdf>; <http://www.the-security-times.com/slaying-dragon-must-re-address-arms-control/>; Speech by Federal Chancellor Dr Angela Merkel on 16 February 2019 at the 55th Munich Security Conference, The Federal Chancellor, 16 February 2019, <https://www.bundeskanzlerin.de/bkin-en/news/speech-by-federal-chancellor-dr-angela-merkel-on-16-february-2019-at-the-55th-munich-security-conference-1582318>.

<sup>15</sup> TLVS, MBDA, access: 7 May 2019, <https://www.mbda-systems.com/product/tlvs/>.

<sup>16</sup> 8. Bericht des Bundesministeriums der Verteidigung zu Rüstungsangelegenheiten“, Bundesministerium der Verteidigung, December 2018, <https://www.bmvg.de/resource/blob/29586/9c5a53095d16e8b603244bb2623aa4dd/20181207-achter-ruestungsbericht-data.pdf>.

<sup>17</sup> Sebastian Sprenger, Tom Kington, „Germany’s long-awaited anti-missile program is about to face politics“, *Defense News*, 20 May 2019, <https://www.defensenews.com/global/europe/2019/05/20/germanys-long-awaited-antimissile-program-is-about-to-face-politics/>.

<sup>18</sup> Meads/TLVS: Die Entscheidung rückt näher, *Schrobenhausener Zeitung*, 11 March 2019, <https://www.donaukurier.de/lokales/schrobenhausen/DKmobil-wochenn112019-Meads-TLVS-Die-Entscheidung-rueckt-naeher;art603,4110499>.

The second decision relates to the replacement of the German dual-capable aircraft participating in NATO's nuclear mission. Currently deployed Tornado multirole aircraft is expected to be fully operational until 2035.<sup>19</sup> Ahead of the Franco-German-Spanish Future Combat Air System development, the F/A-18 and/or the Eurofighter are considered a potential bridging solution.<sup>20</sup> The final decision on the intermediate replacement will depend, however, on the US certification of either aircraft for the nuclear role.

### *Arms control options*

The German MoD supports arms control efforts but believes they will by no means be sufficient.<sup>21</sup> At the same time, there is a concern that any arms control measures would be seen as a 'reward' for the Russian INF Treaty violation.

Both the German AA and the MoD<sup>22</sup> support the multilateralization of the INF Treaty, especially by bringing China on-board. Although Beijing does not see own responsibility in the INF Treaty context, the German government intends to keep putting pressure on China<sup>23</sup> by using the "responsible nuclear weapon state argument."<sup>24</sup>

The German AA and MoD aim to focus on sustaining the existing nuclear arms control instruments. The New START Treaty is especially important for European NATO allies. First, it remains the only nuclear arms control treaty between Russia and the United States after an INF Treaty demise. Second, its ratification by the US Congress committed the US government to incorporate talks on the disparity in non-strategic nuclear weapons in future negotiations on a strategic follow-up treaty with Russia. The AA intends to put arms control back on the international agenda<sup>25</sup> and used its nonpermanent seat on the United Nations Security Council in April 2019 for this purpose.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup> 8. Bericht des Bundesministeriums der Verteidigung zu Rüstungsangelegenheiten, Bundesministerium der Verteidigung, December 2018, <https://www.bmvg.de/resource/blob/29586/9c5a53095d16e8b603244bb2623aa4dd/20181207-achter-ruestungsbericht-data.pdf>.

<sup>20</sup> Thomas Wiegold, Tornado-Nachfolge: Entscheidung zwischen Eurofighter und F/A-18 – F-35 aus dem Rennen, *Augen Geradeaus!*, 31 January 2019, <https://augengeradeaus.net/2019/01/tornado-nachfolge-entscheidung-zwischen-eurofighter-und-f-a-18-f-35-aus-dem-rennen/>.

<sup>21</sup> Keynote Speech by Federal Minister of Defence Dr Ursula von der Leyen at the Opening of the 55th Munich Security Conference, Federal Ministry of Defense, 15 February 2019, <https://www.bmvg.de/resource/blob/32548/55509659e4b51afbf5df21ee62f5577/20190215-rede-ministerin-msc-engl-data.pdf>.

<sup>22</sup> Joachim Käppner, Mike Szymanski, Von der Leyen möchte China in neuen INF-Vertrag einbeziehen, *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 14 February 2019, <https://www.sueddeutsche.de/politik/leyen-inf-china-1.4331365>.

<sup>23</sup> Germany to press China on arms control, foreign minister tells newspaper, Reuters, 7 November 2018, <https://uk.reuters.com/article/uk-usa-nuclear-germany-china/germany-to-press-china-on-arms-control-foreign-minister-tells-newspaper-idUKKCN1NC02K>.

<sup>24</sup> Speech by Federal Foreign Minister Heiko Maas at the conference 2019 Capturing Technology. Rethinking Arms Control, Federal Foreign Office, 15 March 2019, <https://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/en/newsroom/news/maas-conference-2019-capturing-technology-rethinking-arms-control/2199902>.

<sup>25</sup> Außenminister Maas fordert neue Gespräche, *Die Bundesregierung*, 5 December 2018, <https://www.bundesregierung.de/breg-de/suche/aussenminister-maas-fordert-neue-gespraech-1557510>.

<sup>26</sup> Warum steht der INF-Vertrag vor dem Aus?, *Auswärtiges Amt*, 1 February 2019, <https://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/de/aussenpolitik/themen/abruestung-ruestungskontrolle/inf-vertrag/2185722>.



Regarding the INF Treaty, Heiko Maas has pledged to make “proposals for a comprehensive regime that creates transparency for missiles and cruise missiles” and to “advance discussions on an international set of rules that will, for example, also include cruise missiles.”<sup>27</sup> For this purpose, he established the Missile Dialogue Initiative.<sup>28</sup>

Having such limited room for maneuver in driving nuclear arms control forward, the AA is attempting to switch the international arms control narrative to the issues that are not yet tainted but are, nonetheless, pressing – such as new emerging technologies (missiles, cyber, LAWS and bio-weapons). The AA has organized the “2019. Capturing Technology. Rethinking Arms Control” Conference<sup>29</sup> as a first step toward this aim. With ca. 300 international experts participating, the conference provided food-for-thought on effective arms control<sup>30</sup> that shall nourish further work in international fora. A 2020 follow-up conference shall assess progress and necessary steps forward.<sup>31</sup>

### **The German Bundestag on the INF Treaty**

#### *The question of guilt and responsibility*

The German Bundestag was not issued with first-hand intelligence from the Federal Intelligence Service (Bundesnachrichtendienst, BND) about INF related concerns. It relies on information provided by the AA, BND and the MoD, based on information delivered by the US and, probably, Dutch intelligence services. There remains a subtle criticism of Germany and NATO Allies’ dependence on US intelligence and the lack of their own data regarding the Russian breach of the treaty. Left party members, in particular, are using such absences of original data as a reason to question the evidence on Russia’s full responsibility for the demise of the INF Treaty, or at least mourn the lack of willingness on both sides to preserve the treaty.<sup>32</sup> Some have also used this point to express the view there was no clear evidence on either side being in violation of the treaty;<sup>33</sup> another criticism being the US’ alleged rejection of a Russian offer to inspect the 9M729 system.

<sup>27</sup> We need to talk about disarmament, Federal Foreign Office, 6 November 2018, <https://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/en/newsroom/news/maas-disarmament/2157994>.

<sup>28</sup> Grußwort von Außenminister Heiko Maas zum Jahresabrüstungsbericht 2018, Federal Foreign Office, 30 April 2019, <https://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/de/newsroom/maas-jahresabruestungsbericht-2018/2214142>.

<sup>29</sup> 2019. Capturing Technology. Rethinking Arms Control, Federal Foreign Office, 15 March 2019, <https://rethinkingarmscontrol.de/>.

<sup>30</sup> Regierungspressekonferenz vom 6. Februar 2019, Die Bundesregierung, 6 February 2019, <https://www.bundesregierung.de/breg-de/suche/regierungspressekonferenz-vom-6-februar-2019-1577876>.

<sup>31</sup> Bundesaußenminister Heiko Maas Rede IFSH Auftakt, 21 May 2019, [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Cv\\_1LtOEz8M](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Cv_1LtOEz8M).

<sup>32</sup> Aktuelle Stunde/INF-Vertrag bewahren, Bundestag, 1 February 2019, <https://www.bundestag.de/mediathek?videoid=7322796#url=L21lZGhhdGhla292ZXJsYXk/dmlkZW9pZD03MzlyNzk2JnZpZGVvaWQ9NzMyMjc5Ng==&mod=mediathek>.

<sup>33</sup> INF-Vertrag: „Europa muss Druck machen“, SWR-Tagesgespräch mit Linken-Politikerin Sevim Dagdelen, 1 February 2019, <https://www.swr.de/swr2/programm/sendungen/tagesgespraech/swr-tagesgespraech-mit-linken-politikerin-sevim-dagdelen-inf-vertrag-europa-muss-druck-machen/-/id=660264/did=23035168/nid=660264/waec6k/index.html>.

Among MPs representing the Social Democratic Party (SPD), the Liberal Free Democratic Party (FDP) and the parliamentary group of the Christian Democratic Union and Christian Social Union (CDU/CSU) there is a wider consensus that Russia is indeed in breach of its INF obligations. However, CDU/CSU politicians are more likely to warn of naiveté towards Russian intentions than their Social Democratic counterparts are. There is, in general, far more sympathy for the US' decision to suspend the INF from the Conservatives than from SPD, FDP, Green, and Left party members. Nevertheless, there are also voices in the CDU/CSU that claim the INF Treaty should not be called “dead” before the end of the six-month notice period – a position presented by the Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the German Bundestag, Norbert Röttgen, who criticized NATO for this approach.<sup>34</sup>

### *Possible approaches to solving the INF crisis*

Although the vast majority of Bundestag members concerned with the INF Treaty issue are yet to come up with clear or innovative proposals, a range of possible approaches have been put on the table by members of all parties.

Among Green and Left Party parliamentarians, there is a longstanding tendency to promote a German withdrawal from NATO's nuclear sharing arrangement, including the removal of American tactical nuclear weapons from Büchel Air Base, a renouncement of the Tornado dual-capable aircraft modernization programme, as well as a German ratification of the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons (TPNW).<sup>35</sup> Jürgen Trittin of the Green Party, for instance, called for a removal of tactical nuclear weapons and ballistic missile defence systems from European soil in order to incentivize Russia to withdraw its Iskander and 9M729 systems – efforts usually communicated to prevent Europe being exposed to a new arms race between the US and Russia. By contrast, many CDU/CSU politicians have complained about attempts to tie the INF Treaty cause to unilateral disarmament moves. One explained that Germany “could not promote disarmament while the Russian side is building up its arsenals.” In their view, disarmament (at least in the current situation) would be a concession to Russia's aggressive behavior.

Any deployment of additional forces by the United States on German territory would require a majority vote in the Bundestag and a Stationing of Forces Agreement (SOFA).

---

<sup>34</sup> Röttgen sieht noch Verhandlungschancen für den INF-Vertrag und kritisiert die Nato, Phoenix Interview, <https://www.phoenix.de/sendungen/gespraechе/roettgen-sieht-noch-verhandlungschancen-fuer-den-inf-vertrag-und-kritisiert-die-nato-a-881249.html>.

<sup>35</sup> Atomwaffen abziehen statt INF-Vertrag kündigen, Linksfraktion im Bundestag, 23 October 2018, <https://www.linksfraktion.de/themen/nachrichten/detail/atomwaffen-abziehen-statt-inf-vertrag-kuendigen/>

### *Political alignment*

Within parts of the CDU/CSU, a new stationing of US intermediate-range missiles in Europe is regarded as an effective answer to Russia's violation of the INF Treaty. Paul Ziemiak, secretary-general of the CDU and Johann Wadepuhl, vice-chair of the CDU/CSU parliamentary group, would like to see "all options on the table"<sup>36</sup> should Russia cease to withdraw the 9M729. Others within the SPD do not expect new US INF Treaty-range missiles, whether conventional or nuclear-armed, to be deployed on European soil, even if testing (and perhaps subsequent development) of these systems start in August 2019.<sup>37</sup> Left and Green Party MPs want the Federal Government to announce it would not want to support hosting of new US missile systems in Germany or in Europe. Omid Nouripour, a Green MP and member of the Foreign Affairs Committee is calling for stronger European unity and for Germany pushing for mutual inspections of the systems in question.<sup>38</sup> Left party MP Alexander Neu, member of the Defence Committee, suggested a new inspection effort made up of a German-South African team to inspect the 9M729, as well as a Russian-South African team to give evidence about the US MK-41 system.<sup>39</sup>

Members of all parties are calling for more dialogue with Russia, initiated either by Germany or Europe. Revitalizing the NATO-Russia Council (NRC) is often mentioned as a viable path towards enhanced mutual trust and understanding, especially when given greater military-to-military and military-to-diplomat exchanges.

Views among experts within the ruling coalition (CDU/CSU and SPD) are not quite falling apart on the INF Treaty. Roderich Kiesewetter, a CDU MP and member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and SPD MP Rolf Mützenich, member of the Foreign Affairs and Defence Committees, independently raised proposals to remove the 9M729 system behind the Urals so that its missiles cannot reach European territory, giving Russia the opportunity to come back into compliance.

Roderich Kiesewetter called for new bridges of dialogue or "controlled armament" should this strategy fail.<sup>40</sup> The latter understood to be an agreement

<sup>36</sup> CDU-Generalsekretär Ziemiak: SPD spielt Putin in die Hände, Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, updated 3 February 2019, <https://www.faz.net/aktuell/politik/inland/cdu-generalsekretaer-ziemiak-spd-spielt-putin-in-die-haende-16022396.html>.

<sup>37</sup> U.S. Begins Work on New Missiles as Trump Scraps Treaty with Russia, Foreign Policy, 14 March 2019,

<https://foreignpolicy.com/2019/03/14/u-s-begins-work-on-new-missiles-as-trump-scraps-treaty-with-russia/>

<sup>38</sup> Aktuelle Stunde: INF-Vertrag, Fraktion Bündnis 90/Die Grünen im Bundestag, 1 February 2019, <https://www.gruene-bundestag.de/parlament/bundestagsreden/2019/februar/omid-nouripour-aktuelle-stunde-inf-vertrag.html>.

<sup>39</sup> Aktuelle Stunde/INF-Vertrag bewahren, Bundestag, 1 February 2019, <https://www.bundestag.de/mediathek?videoid=7322796#url=L211ZGlhdGhla292ZXJsYXkdmkZW9pZD03MzIyNzk2JnZpZGVvaWQ9NzMyMjc5Ng==&mod=mediathek>.

<sup>40</sup> Roderich Kiesewetter, Nato: Abschreckung und Dialog glaubhaft machen, Neue Zürcher Zeitung, 29 March 2019, <https://www.nzz.ch/meinung/abschreckung-und-dialog-glaubhaft-machen-ld.1463796>.

on specific limitations for INF Treaty-range sea-, air-, and ground-launched missiles.

*Possible multilateralization of the INF Treaty*

Multilateralization of the INF Treaty is widely discussed among German politicians and experts, seen as a possible strategy to counter its looming demise and mitigate any effects on the future of New START, and arms control more broadly. The underlying assumption being that countries such as China, India and Pakistan, who possess INF Treaty-range missiles, should join a multilateral or even global INF Treaty to make the framework more attractive for Russia and the United States, who both raised concerns that Chinese arsenals are not subject to any limitation.

Despite widespread consensus that multilateralizing the treaty is a good idea in theory, there are doubts as to whether this would be a realistic path towards preserving the INF, at least in the short- to mid-term. Norbert Röttgen made clear that this could only happen “one day” and that a functioning INF Treaty between the US and Russia would be a necessary precondition for any agreement with China. While SPD members are skeptical, but at the same time generally in favor of multilateralization, FDP foreign affairs expert Alexander Graf Lambsdorff clearly rejects the idea, noting that the proposal would be nothing but a “placebo” and that “China would not join such [a] treaty and [...] neither would the Brits or the French.”<sup>41</sup>

## **Conclusions**

The German government has invested a lot political capital to pursue a diplomatic solution to the INF Treaty dispute. Yet, despite the wish to retain the accord, it seems unlikely that Berlin will engage in any further campaigns towards this goal. While it remains unclear what military countermeasures the German government would support; it may well oppose the stationing of nuclear INF Treaty-range missiles in Europe and ensure that any new force deployments would not go against the NATO-Russia Founding Act. At the same time, Berlin will put a high value on maintaining NATO unity. Simultaneously, the AA may condition its support for particular military responses, or at least try to win its NATO partners for its idea to establish better transparency on worldwide missile capabilities.

---

<sup>41</sup>Bundesregierung muss sich aktiver für einen Erhalt des Vertrages einsetzen, Portal Liberal, 4 February 2019, <https://www.liberale.de/content/bundesregierung-muss-sich-aktiver-fuer-einen-erhalt-des-vertrages-einsetzen>

There is no clear picture of whether Bundestag MPs generally expect new conventional or nuclear missile deployment in European countries, or whether they would agree to such stationing. Indeed, only a small number called for keeping this option on the table. More active government engagement in deepening European unity alongside with a renewed dialogue with Russia is seen as more desirable. The leftist party spectrum calls for (unilateral) disarmament initiatives and is less likely to promote a more decisive approach towards Russia. The US's suspension of the INF Treaty is widely seen as a mistake, except by those in the CDU/CSU. Few individual MPs came up with concrete ideas on how to preserve the INF Treaty. There is an extensive debate about a possible multilateralization of the INF Treaty. However, largely it includes subtle acknowledgment that this is not an approach that could prevent the demise of the treaty in the short-term (i.e. until the end of the notice period in August 2019).

## **The Italian Position on the INF Treaty**

This report analyzes Italian position on the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty, in light of the US and Russia suspension announcements. It will specifically highlight the reactions of the Italian Government and Parliament and will assess the recent public debate in Italy.

The report is based on a number of publicly available sources, personal meetings, and transcripts of parliamentary debates and government statements.

### **The Position of the Italian Government – an Overview**

The Italian government has not yet explicitly acknowledged Russian violation of the INF Treaty. At the same time, it is conscious of and worried about the violation. The government is also aware that several other countries in the world are developing and deploying Intermediate-Range Missiles.<sup>1</sup>

By aligning itself with the NATO position and adhering to the “Statement on the INF Treaty” issued by the NATO Foreign Ministers on December 4, 2018, it has implicitly endorsed the Alliance’s official posture on the violation.<sup>2</sup>

In this light, experts in the Italian government claim that the INF Treaty is indeed an outdated instrument. The government, nevertheless, does not consider the collapse of the INF a welcomed outcome. According to its view, the treaty should be updated or integrated to adjust to the current situation.

It is believed that the risks involved in the demise of the INF Treaty would be the following:

- One important pillar of the European security framework would disappear. NATO could preserve its superiority in Europe through the INF Treaty thanks to the NATO sea-based systems as well as French and British arsenals. Without the INF, NATO’s dominant position in Europe is less secure.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Non-attributable source.

<sup>2</sup>Statement on the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty, Issued by the NATO Foreign Ministers, Brussels, 4 December 2018, [https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official\\_texts\\_161122.htm](https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official_texts_161122.htm)

<sup>3</sup>Non-attributable source and Giancarlo Aragona, “L’Europa e il legame transatlantico dopo due anni di Trump”, ISPI, 24 ottobre 2018, <https://www.ispionline.it/it/pubblicazione/leuropa-e-il-legame-transatlantico-dopo-due-anni-di-trump-21486>

- The end of the INF Treaty indicates a renewed US-Russia competition over Europe and might entail permanent militarization of the continent. This could jeopardize the interests and goals of both the EU and single European countries.<sup>4</sup>

Italy has been steadily reaffirming its support for the INF Treaty in different international fora and has stressed the importance of compliance with the Treaty.<sup>5</sup> Last October, Italian Prime Minister Giuseppe Conte visited Russia and confirmed Italy's concerns over the demise of the INF Treaty to Russian President Vladimir Putin.<sup>6</sup> There were no other public reactions or statements on this topic.

The Italian government is also concerned about the following:

- New tensions with Russia usually make NATO's eastern flank a priority and consequently decrease the importance of the southern flank. Italy considers the latter more relevant to its national interest. In this context, the end of the INF Treaty will be a particularly critical development as it could virtually reshuffle the security balance in Europe, thus requiring augmentation of NATO presence in Eastern Europe. Italy sees NATO as an indispensable instrument to ensure the security of its southern borders, especially in light of increased tensions in Northern Africa.
- As a NATO member, Italy would have to contribute personnel and funds to the reinforcement of NATO eastern flank, which would divert resources and attention from Italy's main concerns in the Mediterranean Sea.<sup>7</sup>

The Italian government, therefore, favors the survival of the INF Treaty and strongly supports future arms control negotiations. It also takes the military implications of the post-INF environment into account.

### *Future Arms Control Negotiations*

Until the US and Russian February suspension announcements, the Italian government believed that the soundest solution for the INF Treaty crisis was the

---

<sup>4</sup> Paolo Valentino, "Trattato Inf, cosa succede all'Europa dopo il ritiro di Trump?", *Corriere della Sera*, 19 February 2019, <https://www.corriere.it/esteri/19-febbraio-01/europa-stretta-due-fuochi-il-ritiro-trump-trattato-ing-e8e32724-2663-11e9-9b5e-1a58eb1d569a.shtml?intcmp=googleamp>

<sup>5</sup> See for example: Dichiarazione G7 sulla Non-Proliferazione e il Disarmo, 11 April 2017, <http://www.g7italy.it/it/news/i-documenti-del-g7-esteri-di-lucca/index.html>

<sup>6</sup> Andrea Carli, "Conte in Russia, domani vedrà Putin: sul tavolo intese commerciali e Libia", *Il Sole 24 ore*, 23 October 2018, <https://www.ilsole24ore.com/art/notizie/2018-10-23/conte-russia-domani-vedra-putin-tavolo-intese-commerciali-e-libia---114906.shtml?uuid=AE4rIBUG> and "Conte: inquietudine su trattato Inf, evitare escalation", *Askaneews*, <http://www.askaneews.it/politica/2018/10/24/conte-inquietudine-su-trattato-inf-evitare-escalation-pn-20181024-01212/>

<sup>7</sup>Non-attributable source and Gianluca Pastori, "USA verso il ritiro dall'INF: cosa cambia per l'Europa", ISPI, 22 October 2018, <https://www.ispionline.it/it/pubblicazione/usa-verso-il-ritiro-dallinf-cosa-cambia-leuropa-21471>

employment of the negotiation channel established by the Treaty itself, namely the Special Verification Commission.<sup>8</sup> The government believed that the resumption and implementation of updated, advanced, and credible verification practices could have encouraged confidence between Russia and the United States. At the same time, it is aware that with the suspension confirmed by the US and Russian governments, it is unlikely that the INF Treaty verification measures will ever resume.<sup>9</sup>

According to the Italian government, multiple channels should now be considered and tested. Italy supports the following:

- European Union: the European Union should promote dialogue with Russia and keep the discussion over arms control open.<sup>10</sup>
- Bilateral initiatives: states-members of the EU should reinforce the aforementioned efforts with meetings and discussions with Russian officers at any level to promote arms control dialogue. Italian Prime Minister Conte visited Putin in October and invited Russian President to Italy.<sup>11</sup> During the visit, he raised his concerns about the future of the INF Treaty.
- NATO-Russia Council: given NATO-Russia tensions after 2014, low-key contacts among officers and diplomats could take place in this format and create the basis for wider negotiations.

The Italian government clearly prefers the initiatives that could keep Europeans involved either through the EU or NATO. It also hopes that other US-Russia bilateral arms control negotiations (in particular the New START renewal agreement) can have a positive effect on the post-INF talks.<sup>12</sup>

It was not possible to observe additional high-level Italian comments other than Conte's declarations during his visit to Russia. Again, the Italian government seems to align with the EU and NATO public position and is not willing to or interested in presenting an autonomous, proactive position.

### *Military Implications*

The Italian government is considering military implications of the demise of the INF Treaty. However, the representatives of both the government and the

---

<sup>8</sup> Treaty between the United States of America and the Union Of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles, 8 December 1987, <https://fas.org/nuke/control/inf/text/inf.htm>

<sup>9</sup>Non-attributable source.

<sup>10</sup>On the EU see for example "Mogherini, molto preoccupata per trattato sui missili Inf", 20 November 2017, ANSA, [http://www.ansa.it/europa/notizie/rubriche/altrenews/2018/11/20/mogherini-molto-preoccupata-per-trattato-sui-missili-inf\\_6b89ab69-f60e-44ef-bbe2-123347729aed.html](http://www.ansa.it/europa/notizie/rubriche/altrenews/2018/11/20/mogherini-molto-preoccupata-per-trattato-sui-missili-inf_6b89ab69-f60e-44ef-bbe2-123347729aed.html)

<sup>11</sup> "Putin visiterà Italia, data sarà concordata per via diplomatica", REUTERS, 1 November 2018, <https://it.reuters.com/article/topNews/idITKCN1N64IG-OITTP>

<sup>12</sup>Non-attributable source.



armed forces have limited their public statements and have not made any significant efforts to promote public debate.

The government might take the following possible outcomes or developments into account:

- The deployment of a new generation of nuclear-armed ground-based intermediate-range nuclear forces;
- Further consolidation of NATO conventional military forces on its eastern flank;
- The need to allocate additional budget resources on defensive and offensive systems.

Italian leadership considers the deployment of a new generation of INF forces a remote scenario.<sup>13</sup> However, the Italian public opinion and media have openly and repeatedly expressed their concerns over new possible deployments.<sup>14</sup> It was, actually, the only topic related to the INF that attracted some public attention. These concerns imply that it would be challenging for Italy to consider hosting INF forces on its territory in case the US ever considers this option. The Italian government intends to keep relying on the US sea- and air-launched nuclear forces in Europe to ensure deterrence and is not looking for or considering new deployments of ground-based offensive forces. On the other hand, it is conscious that the United States might be developing defensive and offensive systems that will reinforce the ones that are already deployed in Europe.<sup>15</sup>

A short-term Italian scenario contemplates further consolidation of NATO conventional forces on its eastern flank. The Italian government will respect its commitment within the Alliance but fears neglect of the southern flank that, Italian officers believe, should remain a primary concern for NATO.<sup>16</sup>

The government will have to face a number of choices on resource allocation for defensive and offensive systems. The death of the INF Treaty might promote a more proactive approach toward missile defense than in the past.<sup>17</sup> In recent years, Italy has participated in the development and deployment of the

<sup>13</sup>Ibidem.

<sup>14</sup> See for example Manlio Dinucci, "Italia e Ue votano per i missili Usa in Europa", 8 January 2019, <https://ilmanifesto.it/italia-e-ue-votano-per-i-missili-usa-in-europa/>, "L'incubo degli euromissili e la paura (30 anni dopo) di un'escalation nucleare", *Corriere della Sera*, 21 October 2018, [https://www.corriere.it/esteri/18\\_ottobre\\_21/incubo-euromissile-paura-30-anni-dopodi-un-escalation-nucleare-7e1f27a8-d564-11e8-aaed-2b3ed62ff47b.shtml](https://www.corriere.it/esteri/18_ottobre_21/incubo-euromissile-paura-30-anni-dopodi-un-escalation-nucleare-7e1f27a8-d564-11e8-aaed-2b3ed62ff47b.shtml), "Torna lo spettro degli euromissili", *AdnKronos*, 23 October 2018, <https://www.adnkronos.com/fatti/esteri/2018/10/23/torna-spettro-degli-euromissili-tIHIFxyVEvYprDyzzT2knN.html>, "Trump esce dal Trattato Inf: da agosto ritorneranno gli Euromissili", *Il Giornale*, 1 February, 2019, <http://www.ilgiornale.it/news/mondo/trump-esce-trattato-inf-agosto-ritorneranno-euromissili-1637552.html>

<sup>15</sup>Non-attributable source.

<sup>16</sup>Non-attributable source.

<sup>17</sup> Stefano Panato, "Parliamo di missili? Riflessioni su una capacità negletta", *Difesa online*, 15 October 2018 <http://www.difesaonline.it/evidenza/approfondimenti/parliamo-di-missili-riflessioni-su-una-capacita%C3%A0-negletta>

PAAMS (Principal Anti Air Missile System) and the SAMP/T (Famille de Sol-Air Futurs Sol-Air Moyenne-Portée / Terrestre) systems to honor its international commitments to the other developers (France and Great Britain), as well as within NATO.<sup>18</sup> However, Italy does not show the unambiguous commitment to or interest in investing more resources in missile defense. For instance, the inconclusive debate on the MBDA CAMM-ER (Common Anti-air Modular Missile – Extended Range) system, which is intended at modernizing the obsolete Skyguard and Spada missile defense systems, demonstrates such an approach. The Minister of Defense Elisabetta Trenta supports funding for the CAMM-ER. However, other members of the current government oppose it.<sup>19</sup> It is still unclear whether the debate on the INF Treaty inside the Parliament affects the final decision on the CAMM-ER, but the interest in investing resources into enhanced missile defense is clearly increasing.

Regarding the offensive system, the Italian government needs to express its final decision on the acquisition of the remaining F-35 Joint Strike Fighter batches. The issue of investing additional resources has ensued a harsh political debate.<sup>20</sup> It is unlikely that the government will be able to suspend the acquisition. F-35 is intended to replace Tornado and AMX aircrafts during the next 10-15 years and will play a crucial role in enhancing NATO fighting capabilities in a post-INF environment.<sup>21</sup> The public outburst of disagreement between the Italian Airforce and the Navy on the future allocation of the F-35 aircrafts demonstrated the significance of the interests at stake.<sup>22</sup>

A long-term implication associated with the demise of the INF Treaty is the development of EU defense policy and capabilities.<sup>23</sup> The political debate has recently been invigorated by French President Emmanuel Macron's statement on the need to establish a European army and maintain steady cooperation on the joint development of related hardware.<sup>24</sup> The Italian government has not indicated much enthusiasm for the proposal. Italy appears unwilling to alter the

---

<sup>18</sup> Senato della Repubblica, Autorizzazione e proroga missioni internazionali 2018 Gennaio 2018 DOC CCL n. 3 e DOC CCL-bis n. 1, schede 37-44,

[https://www.senato.it/japp/bgt/showdoc/17/DOSSIER/0/1063826/index.html?part=dossier\\_dossier1-sezione\\_sezione8-h2\\_h28](https://www.senato.it/japp/bgt/showdoc/17/DOSSIER/0/1063826/index.html?part=dossier_dossier1-sezione_sezione8-h2_h28)

<sup>19</sup> Gianandrea Gaiani, "A rischio il programma per la difesa aerea CAMM ER?", 28 September 2018, <https://www.analisdifesa.it/2018/09/a-rischio-il-programma-per-la-difesa-aerea-camm-er/>

<sup>20</sup> "Riparte l'azione NO F-35: "Governo e Parlamento non spendano 10 miliardi per nuovi caccia da guerra", *Sbilanciamoci*, 11 April 2019, <http://sbilanciamoci.info/riparte-lazione-no-f-35-governo-e-parlamento-non-spendano-10-miliardi-per-nuovi-caccia-da-guerra/>, Rachele Gonnelli, "Caccia F35, il governo chiamato al Sì definitivo", *Il Manifesto*, 12 April 2019, <https://ilmanifesto.it/caccia-f35-il-governo-chiamato-al-si-definitivo/>

<sup>21</sup> Non-attributable source.

<sup>22</sup> Gianandrea Gaiani, "Da Roma ad Ankara a Berlino, quante liti intorno all'F-35", *Analisi Difesa*, 16 April 2019, <https://www.analisdifesa.it/2019/04/da-roma-ad-ankara-a-berlino-quante-liti-intorno-all-f-35/>,

<sup>23</sup> Maurizio Caprara, "Un pericolo i missili russi. Così Mosca punta a dividere l'America dall'Europa", 23 November 2018, [https://www.corriere.it/esteri/18\\_novembre\\_23/i-missili-russi-pericolocosi-mosca-punta-dividere-l-america-dall-europa-e88a3018-ef6f-11e8-adae-c6c1226ef971.shtml](https://www.corriere.it/esteri/18_novembre_23/i-missili-russi-pericolocosi-mosca-punta-dividere-l-america-dall-europa-e88a3018-ef6f-11e8-adae-c6c1226ef971.shtml)

<sup>24</sup> Alessandro Marrone e Paola Sartori, "Recenti sviluppi verso la difesa europea: opportunità e sfide per l'Italia", *Studi per il Parlamento*, IAI, January 2019, <https://www.iai.it/it/pubblicazioni/recenti-sviluppi-verso-la-difesa-europea-opportunita-e-sfide-litalia>

established European defense environment as well as rethink its reliance on the US-led NATO amid its defense budget cuts.<sup>25</sup>

### **The Debate Inside the Parliament**

The parliamentary debate confirms the low-profile approach or the lack of interest, which shapes the Italian attitude towards the end of the INF Treaty. Such lack of initiative indicates the parliament's intention to express the Italian political contribution mostly within the EU context.

Hence, the involvement of the parliament has been so far limited to a parliamentary question inside the Italian Senate and the adoption of the EU resolution on the impact of the demise of the INF Treaty on the European Union.

On March 27, 2019, eleven senators addressed a parliamentary question to the Minister of European Affairs requesting the Italian government to act "in the appropriate international institutions and agencies" to verify whether it is still possible to avoid the INF denunciation. They also called for an Italian initiative inside the EU to support non-proliferation and promote the resumption of arms control initiatives.<sup>26</sup> There was no public follow-up on these requests, and the Minister has not responded yet.

The second initiative focused on the adoption of the EU resolution approved by the European Parliament last February.<sup>27</sup> The resolution was officially transmitted to the Italian Senate on April 16 and is now under consideration of the 4<sup>th</sup> Standing Committee. No public debate is available to date.<sup>28</sup>

On February 12, a member of the Italian House of Representatives (Camera dei Deputati) publicly expressed his hope that the parliament will acquire a more proactive role in the future.<sup>29</sup> No on-the-record reactions followed

### **Conclusion**

Italy's public approach to the INF Treaty demise is marked by a lack of debate and autonomous initiatives. The public does not appear to be aware or interested, and the media mirrors such an attitude. Despite being a remote outcome, the only issue that has received some public attention, as well as

---

<sup>25</sup> Marco Galluzzo, "Esercito Ue: un bottino da 60 miliardi di euro che l'Italia rischia di perdere", *Corriere della Sera*, 2 February 2019, <https://roma.corriere.it/notizie/politica/19-febbraio-02/esercito-ue-bottino-60-miliardi-euro-che-l-italia-rischia-perdere-385d37a0-26ea-11e9-a470-fc09ad5adcf6.shtml>

<sup>26</sup> Senato della Repubblica, Legislatura 18 Atto di Sindacato Ispettivo n° 3-00646, 27 February 2019, <http://www.senato.it/japp/bgt/showdoc/frame.jsp?tipodoc=Sindisp&leg=18&id=1105547>

<sup>27</sup> European Parliament resolution on the future of the INF Treaty and the impact on the European Union, 12 February 2019, [http://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/B-8-2019-0129\\_IT.html](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/B-8-2019-0129_IT.html)

<sup>28</sup> Senato della Repubblica, Pareri espressi dalla 1a e dalla 5a Commissione permanente sul testo del disegno di legge n. 822-B e sui relativi emendamenti, 16 April 2019, [http://www.senato.it/japp/bgt/showdoc/frame.jsp?tipodoc=Resaula&leg=18&id=1107678&part=doc\\_dc-allegatob\\_ab](http://www.senato.it/japp/bgt/showdoc/frame.jsp?tipodoc=Resaula&leg=18&id=1107678&part=doc_dc-allegatob_ab)

<sup>29</sup> Camera dei Deputati, Resoconto stenografico, 12 February 2019, <https://documenti.camera.it/leg18/resoconti/assemblea/html/sed0124/stenografico.pdf>, p.45.

contempt, is the potential deployment of new ground-based Intermediate-range missiles on Italian territory.

It is possible to conclude the following:

- Italy endorses NATO's position on Russian violations of the INF Treaty. The Italian government did not undertake any autonomous initiatives in this sphere but has been supporting and will support NATO's stance and statements on the issue.
- On the political level, Italy is mostly focused on the EU's ability to promote a new round of negotiations between Russia and the United States on the INF Treaty or broader arms control initiatives. It supports all the channels that guarantee a multilateral approach. The Italian government intends to coordinate every effort toward Russia together with other EU countries and would prefer being involved primarily through the European Union.
- Regarding military implications, Italian leadership will mostly rely on the US-led NATO. At this stage, it demonstrates a lack of interest in developing European initiatives in the EU context. The Italian government is moderately committed to the modernization of its anti-missile systems and acquisition of NATO integrated F-35 JSF aircrafts. However, there is not much enthusiasm among a number of Italian political forces. Thus, funding remains uncertain.
- The Italian parliament has not provided a substantial contribution to the public debate on the INF Treaty. At the same time, it appears most interested in the EU efforts to resume arms control negotiations.

## **Poland's Position on the INF Treaty**

This research is based on open sources and supplemented by off-the-record interviews with Polish officials, which were conducted for background purposes and are not quoted. Apart from official Polish statements and public remarks of Polish officials on the INF Treaty, the author also referred to the wider security policy of Poland and the views of Polish experts in order to present broader determinants of Polish position and outline the country's possible future choices.

### **Reaction to Russian Violation and U.S. Suspension and Withdrawal**

Poland supports U.S. suspension of obligations under the INF Treaty as a justified response to Russia's longstanding violation of the agreement.<sup>1</sup> This corresponds to earlier remarks by high-level Polish officials – including President Andrzej Duda, Prime Minister Mateusz Morawiecki, and Minister of Foreign Affairs Jacek Czaputowicz – who received the U.S. President Donald J. Trump's original announcement about the plans to withdraw from the INF Treaty with understanding.<sup>2</sup> Notwithstanding, Czaputowicz noted that Poland would prefer for the agreement to remain in force but only under the condition of compliance of all parties.<sup>3</sup>

While Poland still states that it expects Russia “to return to full and verifiable compliance,” neither Polish officials nor experts now assess such a scenario as plausible. Poland began to raise the issue on July 30, 2014, one day after the U.S. publicly accused Russia of violating the INF Treaty. Polish Ministry of Foreign Affairs expressed its concern in a statement. It stressed the role of the INF Treaty as “one of the foundations of the arms control and nuclear disarmament regime” and noted that it “made a significant contribution” to European security. The statement called on Russia to “provide comprehensive explanations” and “return to the observance of the treaty.”<sup>4</sup> Polish officials later delivered similar messages at other forums, including the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) review process.<sup>5</sup> In April 2019, Czaputowicz stated that

<sup>1</sup> Polish Foreign Ministry expresses support for Washington's INF move, Polish Press Agency, 1 February 2019, <https://www.pap.pl/en/news/news%2C398749%2Cpolish-foreign-ministry-expresses-support-washingtons-inf-move.html>.

<sup>2</sup> See: Remarks by President Duda (in Polish), Konferencja prasowa Prezydenta w Berlinie, Youtube, 24 October 2018, 14:30-16:35, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=b2dwX1fa-5A>; Prime Minister Mateusz Morawiecki in Hamburg: Poland is both pro-American and pro-European, The Chancellery of the Prime Minister, 17 November 2018, <https://www.premier.gov.pl/mobile/en/news/news/prime-minister-mateusz-morawiecki-in-hamburg-poland-is-both-pro-american-and-pro-european.html>.

<sup>3</sup> Polskie MSZ ze zrozumieniem o wycofywaniu się USA z traktatu INF, Defence24, 23 October 2018, <https://www.defence24.pl/polskie-msz-ze-zrozumieniem-o-wycofywaniu-sie-usa-z-traktatu-inf>.

<sup>4</sup> MFA statement on information about Russia's non-compliance with the INF Treaty, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Poland, 30 July 2014, [https://www.msz.gov.pl/en/news/mfa\\_statement\\_on\\_information\\_about\\_russia\\_s\\_non\\_compliance\\_with\\_the\\_inf\\_treaty](https://www.msz.gov.pl/en/news/mfa_statement_on_information_about_russia_s_non_compliance_with_the_inf_treaty)

<sup>5</sup> See, e.g.: Statement by H.E. Ambassador Adam Bugajski, New York, 1 May 2015, [https://www.un.org/en/conf/npt/2015/statements/pdf/main\\_poland.pdf](https://www.un.org/en/conf/npt/2015/statements/pdf/main_poland.pdf); Statement of the Republic of Poland, Geneva, 26 April 2018, [http://statements.unmeetings.org/media2/18559483/poland-printer\\_20180426\\_102826.pdf](http://statements.unmeetings.org/media2/18559483/poland-printer_20180426_102826.pdf).

the collapse of the INF Treaty will significantly impact the latter as well as Europe's strategic stability.<sup>6</sup>

### **Views on Military Consequences of Russian Violation**

The Polish government has not made any detailed public assessments of the military implications of SSC-8 ground-launched cruise missiles fielding by Russia. Nevertheless, there are two observations.

First, Polish statements concerning the INF Treaty seem to emphasize the nuclear dimension of the threat by explicitly mentioning the importance of NATO's nuclear deterrence, but Polish officials also alluded to the consequences for NATO's conventional posture<sup>7</sup>. In March 2019, Deputy Minister of National Defence Tomasz Szatkowski said that the INF Treaty breach "will have a fundamental meaning [for] the overall adaptation process." Szatkowski argued that NATO has not taken the violation into account in military decisions made so far. Thus, it should now be considered "with all peculiarities of NATO planning where you have nuclear and conventional [elements] treated in a separate way."<sup>8</sup> Earlier, Szatkowski had commented on the development of INF Treaty-violating systems as a part of growing missile threat from Russia. According to Szatkowski, these non-compliant missiles substantially increase the threat to whole European NATO territory and serve Russian attempts to boost military pressure on Europe and differentiate the level of security on both sides of the Atlantic.<sup>9</sup> Similarly, one Polish NATO diplomat wrote in his personal capacity that SSC-8 "must be seen in the context of Russia's broader defense strategy", including the build-up of non-nuclear anti-access/area denial (A2/AD) capabilities along NATO borders and the role that nuclear weapons play in Russian "escalation dominance" strategy.<sup>10</sup> These remarks and opinions correspond with widespread Polish concerns that in case of a conflict Russia might try to prevent NATO from reinforcing its eastern flank by using or threatening to use nuclear weapons and/or conducting conventional precision strikes. Most non-governmental comments on SSC-8 highlighted its nuclear capability, but some pointed to the missiles' importance for a conventional strike as well.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>6</sup> Minister Czaputowicz in New York on non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Poland, <https://www.gov.pl/web/diplomacy/minister-czaputowicz-in-new-york-on-non-proliferation-of-weapons-of-mass-destruction>.

<sup>7</sup> MFA statement on information about Russia's non-compliance, see fn. 4; MFA Statement, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Poland, 2 February 2019, <https://www.gov.pl/web/diplomacy/mfa-statement-regarding-the-interview-for-der-spiegel>.

<sup>8</sup> Session IV: 20 Years in NATO—Poland's Perspective Forward. Conversation with Tomasz Szatkowski, Youtube, 10:05-10:40, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9xD7xV2jekQ>.

<sup>9</sup> J. Graf, Szatkowski: Postanowienia szczytu NATO w Brukseli kluczowe dla strategii wzmocnienia [WYWIAD], Defence24, 17 July 2018, <https://www.defence24.pl/szatkowski-dla-defence24pl-postanowienia-szczytu-nato-w-brukseli-kluczowe-dla-strategii-wzmocnienia>.

<sup>10</sup> D.P. Jankowski, The Myths and Realities of European Security in a Post-INF World, World Politics Review, 14 February 2019, <https://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/27440/the-myths-and-realities-of-european-security-in-a-post-inf-world>.

<sup>11</sup> A. Kacprzyk, NATO's Options and Dilemmas After the INF Treaty, Council of Councils, 8 April 2019, [https://www.cfr.org/councilofcouncils/global-memos/p39199?utm\\_source=tw\\_iigg&utm\\_medium=social\\_owned](https://www.cfr.org/councilofcouncils/global-memos/p39199?utm_source=tw_iigg&utm_medium=social_owned). See also: J. Durkalec, Russia's Violation of the INF Treaty: Consequences for NATO, PISM Bulletin, no. 107 (702), The Polish Institute of International Affairs, 13 August 2014, [https://www.pism.pl/files/?id\\_plik=17932](https://www.pism.pl/files/?id_plik=17932).

Second, SSC-8 is usually seen in public debate as having indirect impact on Polish security by mainly improving Russian abilities to attack Western Europe. This is related to both the INF missiles' range and the fact that Poland has long been targeted by numerous INF-compliant systems of various basing modes (e.g. Iskander missiles based in Kaliningrad Oblast, which are capable of delivering both nuclear and conventional warheads).<sup>12</sup>

### **Position on NATO Military Response**

Since late 2018, the Polish government has been publicly emphasizing the need for a joint NATO response to Russia's violation.<sup>13</sup> In February 2019, Szatkowski hailed NATO's decision to work out such measures and stressed that the Alliance must not tolerate a "vacuum" and "weakness" in "an important segment of strategic balance."<sup>14</sup> He also noted that the lack of NATO reaction would be disadvantageous for Poland.<sup>15</sup>

#### *INF Missiles*

While Poland has not excluded any NATO response options, Polish officials never publicly requested deployment of American INF missiles in Poland, contrary to some media reports. In fact, in February 2019, Czaputowicz commented on such deployments of nuclear-armed missiles by saying "we don't wish that to happen at all."<sup>16</sup> Speaking later about INF systems more broadly, he said: "we are not very much in favor – we are definitely even against – the deployment of missiles on our soil." Czaputowicz has not ruled out deployments of such systems, including nuclear ones, in Poland or Europe in general but has underscored that they would be subject to the decision of all NATO allies.<sup>17</sup> Moreover, in October 2018 President Duda said that Poland had not considered hosting American INF missiles.<sup>18</sup> Earlier, in August 2017, then-Foreign Minister Witold Waszczykowski similarly noted that there had been no talks with the U.S. on deploying such missiles in Poland.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>12</sup> See, e.g.: J. Marson, NATO Defense Ministers Weigh Responses to Russian Missile Threat, *The Wall Street Journal*, 14 February 2019, <https://www.wsj.com/articles/nato-defense-ministers-weigh-responses-to-russian-missile-threat-11550169069>.

<sup>13</sup> Prime Minister Mateusz Morawiecki, see fn. 2.

<sup>14</sup> Rosja od wielu lat trwała w łamaniu traktatu INF. NATO musi odpowiedzieć, *TVP Info*, 17 February 2019, <https://www.tvp.info/41354257/rosja-od-wielu-lat-trwala-w-lamaniu-traktatu-inf-nato-musi-odpowiedzic>.

<sup>15</sup> Szatkowski: NATO zgodne, że potrzebna odpowiedź na łamanie przez Rosję INF, *Polsat News*, 14 February, 2019, <https://www.polsatnews.pl/wiadomosc/2019-02-14/szatkowski-nato-zgodne-ze-potrzebna-odpowiedz-na-lamanie-przez-rosje-inf/>.

<sup>16</sup> Will Europe Be Victim of Nuclear Power Plays?, *Spiegel Online*, 5 February 2019, <https://www.spiegel.de/international/world/arms-race-will-europe-be-victim-of-nuclear-power-plays-a-1251545-2.html>. The article was corrected after intervention by Polish MFA. See: MFA Statement, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Poland, 2 February 2019, <https://www.gov.pl/web/diplomacy/mfa-statement-regarding-the-interview-for-der-spiegel>.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibidem*; S. Taheran, Select Reactions to the INF Treaty Crisis, *Arms Control Now*, <https://www.armscontrol.org/blog/2018/select-reactions-inf-treaty-crisis>.

<sup>18</sup> Remarks by President Duda (in Polish), 14:30-16:35, see fn. 2. For unknown reasons, *Deutsche Welle* attributed Duda with words he never said and reported that Polish President had declared readiness to host American missiles. M. Sieradzka, Poland supports US withdrawal from INF, *Deutsche Welle*, 25 October 2018, <https://www.dw.com/en/poland-supports-us-withdrawal-from-inf/a-46049028>.

<sup>19</sup> Polish foreign minister in an interview with *Kommersant*, *Poland.pl*, 9 August 2017, <https://poland.pl/politics/foreign-affairs/polish-foreign-minister-interview-kommersant/>. In October 2018, Waszczykowski wrote that Poland might offer to host U.S. forces including conventional air- and sea-launched missiles or that NATO might even eventually "broaden"

The Polish government's insistence on a joint NATO response runs counter to concerns of some commentators<sup>20</sup> according to which Poland might seek U.S. missile deployments on a bilateral basis as it has been doing in regards to the bigger forward presence of other American forces. Polish government appears to treat INF missiles as a separate issue for several reasons. First, as Czaputowicz observed, this is an extremely sensitive problem for publics in some NATO states.<sup>21</sup> Second, Poland often underscores the importance of the transatlantic link and thus wants to avoid deepening the divides that could threaten NATO cohesion further. Third, as discussed above and below, Poland sees a military need for NATO involvement in response to the INF Treaty violation.

This official stance is in line with the majority of expert comments, which do not rule out INF missiles' deployments in Poland and elsewhere, while they also note the risks related to European sensitivities in that regard.<sup>22</sup>

### *Broader NATO Adaptation*

Poland sees Russian violation as a reason for the intensification of efforts to strengthen NATO's overall deterrence and defense capabilities, including force posture on the eastern flank. Krzysztof Szczerski, the Chief of the Cabinet of the President of Poland, said that if Russia does not return to compliance, NATO should expand its forward presence in Poland.<sup>23</sup> According to the opinion of one Polish NATO diplomat, the Alliance's response should include: "improved advanced defense planning, further streamlining of political and military decision-making processes, an increased number of forces and equipment on its eastern flank," and the "prioritization of capabilities" to counter Russian A2/AD systems in the NATO Defense Planning Process.<sup>24</sup> He added that "NATO must make clear to Russia through effective strategic communication that it is and will remain a nuclear alliance." Several non-governmental experts called for the improvement of NATO's theatre air and missile defenses and investments in passive defense.<sup>25</sup>

---

nuclear-sharing arrangements. He added that Poland should discuss those issues with Allies. W. Waszczykowski, Wyjście USA z porozumienia INF to szansa dla Polski, Onet, 27 October 2018, <https://wiadomosci.onet.pl/opinie/waszczykowski-wyjscie-usa-z-porozumienia-inf-to-szansa-dla-polski/0v88zel>.

<sup>20</sup> See, e.g.: P. Buras, State of disunion: Europe, NATO, and disintegrating arms control, European Council on Foreign Relations, 28 February 2019, [https://www.ecfr.eu/article/commentary\\_state\\_of\\_disunion\\_europe\\_nato\\_and\\_disintegrating\\_arms\\_control](https://www.ecfr.eu/article/commentary_state_of_disunion_europe_nato_and_disintegrating_arms_control); Ł. Kulesa, "Przyszłość kontroli zbrojeń - egzotyczny temat dla Polski?," Fundacja Batorego, 8 November 2018, [http://www.batory.org.pl/forum\\_idei/blog\\_idei/lukasz\\_kulesa\\_przyszlosc\\_kontroli\\_zbrojen\\_egzotyczny\\_temat\\_dla\\_polski](http://www.batory.org.pl/forum_idei/blog_idei/lukasz_kulesa_przyszlosc_kontroli_zbrojen_egzotyczny_temat_dla_polski).

<sup>21</sup> Ministerial Conversation with Ursula von der Leyen & Jacek Czaputowicz, Youtube, 15 March 2019, 41:05-44:00, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-6zyLuYch2U>.

<sup>22</sup> See, e.g.: J. Gotkowska, The end of the INF: the beginning of tough negotiations, Centre for Eastern Studies, 12 December 2018, <https://www.osw.waw.pl/en/publikacje/analyses/2018-12-12/end-inf-beginning-tough-negotiations>; S. Koziej, Europe stands to be the biggest loser of the INF Treaty's ending, Geopolitical Intelligence Services, 4 February 2019, <https://www.gisreportsonline.com/europe-stands-to-be-the-biggest-loser-of-the-inf-treatys-ending.expert-view.2792.html>; M.A. Piotrowski, Russia's Approach to the Development of Intermediate-Range Missiles, PISM Bulletin, no. 151 (1222), The Polish Institute of International Affairs, 14 November 2018, <http://www.pism.pl/publications/bulletin/no-151-1222>.

<sup>23</sup> Min. Szczerski: Chcemy, żeby wojska amerykańskie w Polsce służyły całemu NATO, Prezydent.pl, 8 March 2019, <https://www.prezydent.pl/kancelaria/aktywnosc-ministrow/art.1590.min-szczerski-chcemy-zeby-wojska-amerykanskie-w-polsce-sluzily-calemu-nato.html>.

<sup>24</sup> D.P. Jankowski, The Myths, see fn. 10.

<sup>25</sup> See, e.g.: M.A. Piotrowski, Russia's Approach, see fn. 22.



## Potential Acquisition of INF System

There have been no official Polish comments on a potential acquisition of ground-based INF-range missiles but there are strong indications that Poland might become interested in purchasing such conventional systems. Since the early 2010s, procurement of precision-guided missiles has been at the core of Polish military modernization and its approach to deterrence.<sup>26</sup> This has already included INF-range air- and sea-launched missiles. Under the 2016 deal, Poland is procuring 70 JASSM-ER missiles (with the range of up to almost 1,000 kilometers) for its F-16 fighters. The country also declared plans for purchasing submarines armed with cruise missiles (such as Tomahawk).

However, even though Poland is increasing its defense spending above 2% of GDP, acquisition of new ground-based missile systems would be financially challenging, at least within the current 2017-2026 modernization timeframe, in which Poland is already pursuing several major programs (e.g., purchase of 5<sup>th</sup> generation aircraft). The most plausible option for Poland would be to buy future INF-range missiles deployable on High Mobility Artillery Rocket System (HIMARS) since the country is already procuring these launchers. HIMARS is currently equipped only with INF-compliant weapons, but, after suspending the INF Treaty, the U.S. seeks to extend the range of future ballistic missiles for this system to more than 499 kilometers.

## Approach to Arms Control

Poland will likely take an active part in the debates on the future of arms control after the collapse of the INF Treaty given its involvement in discussions on arms control, non-proliferation, and disarmament in NATO and other forums to date.<sup>27</sup> In November 2018, Prime Minister Morawiecki said that a new treaty involving both Russia and China would be preferable.<sup>28</sup> Similarly, Foreign Minister Czaputowicz contemplated in March 2019 that maybe the best solution would be to “aim at a multilateral treaty” involving Russia, China and other countries possessing INF missiles.<sup>29</sup>

At the same time, the Polish government does not believe that one could reach effective post-INF arrangements quickly and easily. In March 2019, Czaputowicz rhetorically asked whether NATO could convince Russia and others to agree to

<sup>26</sup> See, e.g.: The Defence Concept of the Republic of Poland, Ministry of National Defence of the Republic of Poland, May 2017, pp. 47-51, <https://www.gov.pl/web/national-defence/defenceconcept-publication>; D.P. Jankowski, Beyond Air and Missile Defense: Modernization of the Polish Armed Forces, CEPA Issue Brief, no. 132, Center for European Policy Analysis, 5 September 2013, <https://cepa.ecms.pl/index/?id=d60642d771d69f91ab31dc215ab74b52>.

<sup>27</sup> E.g., Poland chaired the 2020 NPT Review Conference Preparatory Committee in 2018 and The Hague Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation in 2017-2018. See: Statement of the President of the Republic of Poland Mr. Andrzej Duda High Level Debate of the UN Security Council, New York, 18 January 2018, <https://www.president.pl/en/news/art.652.statement-of-the-president-of-the-republic-of-poland-mr-andrzej-duda-high-level-debate-of-the-un-security-council.html>; J. Czaputowicz, S. Blok, Nuclear weapons: old dilemmas, new dangers, EUobserver, 31 October 2018, <https://euobserver.com/opinion/143257>.

<sup>28</sup> Poland is both pro-American and pro-European - Polish PM in Hamburg, The First News, 17 November 2018, <https://www.thefirstnews.com/article/poland-is-both-pro-american-and-pro-european---polish-pm-in-hamburg-3341>.

<sup>29</sup> Ministerial Conversation, 41:05-44:00, see fn. 21.

such an accord without stepping up military measures first.<sup>30</sup> The minister argued that the Soviet Union signed the INF Treaty because of the U.S. missiles deployed in Europe. Polish experts often made this reference, which confirms a widespread Polish belief that Russia will not engage in arms control talks seriously unless it faces military pressure.<sup>31</sup>

Insistence on reciprocity is another main feature of Polish approach to arms control and dialogue with Russia. Poland has long been against the undertakings that could lead to one-sided NATO concessions and undermine the credibility of Allied deterrence and defense. This position was fully displayed during 2009-2012 NATO discussions on the future of U.S. non-strategic nuclear weapons based in Europe. At that time, Poland proposed a number of mutual transparency and confidence building measures. It also stressed that any cuts to such weapons should be conditional upon similar Russian moves.<sup>32</sup> More recently, Poland has both criticized Russia for the lack of reciprocity in the NATO-Russia Council and the OSCE and made own proposals on mutual transparency and risk reduction.<sup>33</sup> Accordingly, Poland is likely to oppose the proposals of the arrangements that would allow Russia to maintain an advantage over NATO in INF forces, such as “freeze” of INF deployments in Europe.

### *Aegis Ashore and INF Treaty*

Similar to the U.S. and NATO, Poland repeatedly emphasized that Aegis Ashore site (to be launched in 2020) near the Polish town of Redzikowo is not aimed at Russia and can only be used to intercept limited ballistic missile attacks from the Middle East. Poland cited the 2008 deal with the U.S. (amended in 2010) provisions that stipulate the base’s defensive character. Poland also emphasizes that the facility will be used in accordance with NATO procedures since it will be a part of the NATO ballistic missile defense system.<sup>34</sup>

Polish officials have not commented publicly on the ideas of introducing additional transparency and confidence-building measures to counter Russian accusations that Aegis Ashore can launch medium-range cruise missiles. Poland may be skeptical in that matter in part because Russia already rejected such Polish offers made in the late 2000s as well as other U.S. proposals.

In 2008, then-Foreign Minister Radosław Sikorski said that Poland would be willing to allow frequent inspections and industrial monitoring to prove that no

---

<sup>30</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>31</sup> See e.g.: M. Menkiszak, Russia’s game of shadows around the INF, Centre for Eastern Studies, 6 February 2019, <https://www.osw.waw.pl/en/publikacje/analyses/2019-02-06/russias-game-shadows-around-inf>.

<sup>32</sup> See: Poland, in: PISM Database: The Central and Eastern European Resource Collection on Nuclear Issues, The Polish Institute of International Affairs, 8 May 2015, <https://www.pism.pl/publications/PISM-raports/The-Central-and-Eastern-European-resource-collection-on-nuclear-issues>.

<sup>33</sup> D.P. Jankowski, T.K. Kowalik, Zapad 2017: NATO Should Be Keeping an Eye on Russia’s Training Exercises, The National Interest, 7 May 2017, <https://nationalinterest.org/feature/zapad-2017-nato-should-be-keeping-eye-russias-training-20540>; FM Waszczykowski attends NATO meeting, questions sense of pursuing dialogue with Russia, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Poland, 7 December 2016, [https://www.msz.gov.pl/en/news/fm\\_waszczykowski\\_attends\\_nato\\_meeting\\_questions\\_sense\\_of\\_pursuing\\_dialogue\\_with\\_russia;jsessionid=41E95F276314D9CC5750E8860EB15688.cmsap1p](https://www.msz.gov.pl/en/news/fm_waszczykowski_attends_nato_meeting_questions_sense_of_pursuing_dialogue_with_russia;jsessionid=41E95F276314D9CC5750E8860EB15688.cmsap1p).

<sup>34</sup>T. Szatkowski, Odpowiedź na interpelację nr 3393, 27 June 2016, <http://www.sejm.gov.pl/Sejm8.nsf/InterpelacjaTresc.xsp?key=448B84C9>.

offensive capabilities or increased number of interceptors were present at the base.<sup>35</sup> In turn, Russia sought to convince the U.S. to drop its plans for a site in Poland. It also presented proposals on establishing limitations on the entire NATO missile defense system, which would most likely preclude a deployment of the site in Poland. Only after such efforts had failed and the U.S. had published its accusations regarding the INF Treaty violation in 2014 did Russia make public allegations regarding Aegis Ashore. The whole situation reinforced Polish view that Russian objections regarding the site had purely political grounds and aimed at preventing American military deployments in former Warsaw Pact countries.<sup>36</sup> In part for this reason, Poland might see potential mutual inspections of Aegis Ashore and SSC-8 missile units as not sufficiently reciprocal, given the different weight of underlying accusations made by Russia on one side and the U.S and NATO on the other. Moreover, Poland could be concerned about Russian attempts to both cheat under such arrangements and exploit them for propaganda purposes.

### **Conclusions and Perspectives**

Poland's position on the response to the INF Treaty demise is much more nuanced and balanced than is often assumed. While deterrence and defense are high on its agenda, Poland sees a need for engagement on arms control as well. Recent remarks on the INF Treaty and hitherto Polish security policy indicate that Poland sees both elements of NATO policy as interlinked in several ways, both in terms of maintaining allied cohesion and conducting effective policy towards Russia. That said, one can expect Poland to be wary of making any moves that could be seen as rewarding Russian violation. For Poland, a strong NATO military response should be the basis for further talks on arms control.

Poland appears to pursue, first and foremost, wider military adaptation to the threats exacerbated (but not solely created) by SSC-8, as the country seeks strengthening overall deterrence and defense on the eastern flank. By all indications, Poland would support or even participate in additional moves aimed at punishing the INF Treaty violation or pressuring Russia to negotiate new arrangements. While Poland would be keen to shape NATO consensus, it signals that it does not seek to circumvent it. A different situation could, however, arise if NATO failed to agree on any substantial position. In such a case, all options could be on the table, especially if the U.S. approaches Poland and seeks military measures outside of the NATO format.

---

<sup>35</sup> Transcript: Polish Foreign Minister Radoslaw Sikorski Talks to Council, Atlantic Council, 19 November 2008, <https://www.atlanticcouncil.org/news/transcripts/transcript-polish-foreign-minister-radoslaw-sikorski-talks-to-council>. Poland was ready for measures short of permanent stationing of Russian personnel. The offer had been made when U.S. and Poland had been pursuing a different type of missile defence site, but it had aimed at dispelling the same Russian concerns that were expressed later with regards to Aegis Ashore.

<sup>36</sup> Minister Witold Waszczykowski: Redzikowo base will significantly strengthen Poland's security, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Poland, 13 May 2016, [https://www.msz.gov.pl/en/foreign\\_policy/security\\_policy/minister\\_witold\\_waszczykowski\\_redzikowo\\_base\\_will\\_significantly\\_strengthen\\_poland\\_s\\_security](https://www.msz.gov.pl/en/foreign_policy/security_policy/minister_witold_waszczykowski_redzikowo_base_will_significantly_strengthen_poland_s_security).

## **Ukraine's Position on the INF Treaty Suspension**

### **Ukraine and the INF Suspension**

This paper examines the official Ukrainian position on the suspension of the INF Treaty. It sheds light on current debates about Ukraine: whether it should enhance own security by starting to produce missiles that were previously forbidden by the INF. Consequently, the paper suggests three alternative scenarios. They range from keeping the status quo with the missiles currently in production up to the production of new missiles or joining European missile defense under the auspices of NATO.

In general, there are two positions on Ukraine's membership in the INF. One is that according to the "Law on the succession of States in respect of treaties" adopted by Ukrainian parliament Verkhovna Rada, Kyiv is one of the successors of the Soviet Union in respect of INF along with other former republics involved in the production and deployment of short and intermediate-range missiles. This position also bases on the "Decision on the participation of the member states of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) in the Treaty between the USSR and the United States on the elimination of intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles (INF treaty)" signed in 1992.<sup>12</sup>

Since 1995 Ukraine also participated in the Special Verification Commission (SVC) on the INF Treaty along with Russia, Belarus, and Kazakhstan. SVC completed its mission in 2003. After the dissolution of the USSR, the US officially informed 12 former republics of the Soviet Union that it considers all the republics bound by the provisions of the Treaty<sup>2</sup>. Therefore, Ukraine was actively involved in the implementation and verification of the INF Treaty until 2003 when the parties agreed that the Treaty was implemented fully and irreversibly. In 2017-2018, the US summoned the SVC for resolving the problem of Russia's potential violation of the Treaty. Ukraine was one of the meeting participants together with the US, Russia, Kazakhstan, and Belarus.

Meanwhile, the other approach claims that Ukraine has never had any official obligations under the Treaty. This is because the Ukrainian parliament

---

<sup>1</sup> Decision on the participation of the states-members of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) in the Treaty between the USSR and the United States on the elimination of intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles (INF treaty) signed on 10 October 1992, [https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/997\\_079](https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/997_079)

<sup>2</sup> Agreement to End INF Inspections Signed, Arms Control Today, Arms Control Association, 1 January 2001, <https://www.armscontrol.org/node/2886>

has never ratified neither Kyiv's participation in the INF nor Ukraine's membership in CIS by a separate decision (unlike START-1)<sup>3</sup>.

Up to February 2019, this discussion could just have a symbolic meaning as Ukraine has always been in compliance with all INF provisions. However, as far as the United States and Russia, its main participants, suspended the Treaty, Ukraine runs the risk of being involved in an escalation between them.

Therefore, the idea that Ukraine needs to prepare for such a challenge affects the current position of state officials.

### **The President's position and the position of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) of Ukraine on the INF suspension**

At first, reacting to the US determination to withdraw from the INF in case Russia does not return to compliance, Ukrainian Foreign Minister Pavlo Klimkin tweeted that he regarded the US decision "with understanding... as it gives Russia a sign that its "hybrid" ignoring of own obligations will not be tolerated anymore."<sup>4</sup> Meanwhile, at that time, it was not clear whether Kyiv was going to take any steps regarding the possible death of the Treaty.

Still, as soon as the INF was suspended, on February 6 Pavlo Klimkin commented: "...In this situation, Ukraine will need to respond to new challenges. We must respond with dignity because we have the experience, we have the necessary intelligence, and we need to protect our country. We already have certain potential in the field of missile weapons, and it is up to us to decide what missiles we need in the future."<sup>5</sup>

President Poroshenko's statement followed: "Ukraine accepted the US's suspension of the Treaty with understanding. Meanwhile, following the collapse of the international arms control system, Ukraine will have to think over the additional enhancement of the state's defense." Poroshenko emphasized that Ukraine "has the right to create effective weapons systems for self-defense, including powerful missile complexes that will become the key element of strategic deterrence against Russian aggression. It also allows our military to hit targets at longer distances."<sup>6</sup> Blaming Russia for demolishing the INF Treaty, Ukrainian President hinted that creation of intermediate-range missiles should

---

<sup>3</sup> Round table "Denunciation of the INF Treaty and its consequences for Ukraine and international security", Kyiv, 5 March 2019. [https://www.gdip.com.ua/pages/view/krugliiv\\_stl\\_u\\_meda-tcentr\\_gdp\\_denonsatcya\\_dogovoru\\_rsmd\\_ta\\_nasldki\\_dlya\\_ukrani\\_mzhnarodno\\_bezpeki](https://www.gdip.com.ua/pages/view/krugliiv_stl_u_meda-tcentr_gdp_denonsatcya_dogovoru_rsmd_ta_nasldki_dlya_ukrani_mzhnarodno_bezpeki)

<sup>4</sup> Pavlo Klimkin's tweet on 22 October 2018, <https://twitter.com/pavloklimkin/status/1054309081220034560>

<sup>5</sup> Klimkin on situation with INF Treaty: We must use everything to protect ourselves, Interfax-Ukraine, 6 February 2019, <https://en.interfax.com.ua/news/general/564117.html>

<sup>6</sup> Ukraine has the right to create modern missile complexes for self-defense, Ukrinform, 6 March 2019, <https://www.ukrinform.ua/rubric-politics/2654518-vihid-rosii-z-raketnogo-dogovoru-znimae-pevni-zobovazanna-z-ukraini-prezident.html>

become one of the priorities of Ukraine's military policy and the cornerstone of its strategic deterrence.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs expressed its official position after the recent presidential speech. In particular, it unexpectedly supported the non-membership approach to the INF: “As far as the Verkhovna Rada has never ratified the mentioned Treaty, Ukraine, in fact, has been implementing the INF on a voluntary basis. In this regard, the breach of the Treaty by the Russian Federation as its full-fledged party is especially outrageous”. Having mentioned all the violations of the Treaty by the Russian Federation, the MFA stated that: “Ukraine retains the right to develop the weapons necessary for our defense capabilities, including relevant missile weapons”<sup>7</sup>.

**There is a range of scenarios, with which Ukraine may proceed:**

1. Ukraine enhances its deterrence posture by starting to produce intermediate-range missiles.
2. Ukraine supports its deterrence posture continuing the production of missiles that are already included in the military budget.
3. Ukraine develops missile defense against new Russian intermediate- and shorter-range missiles.

**Scenario 1. Ukraine enhances its deterrence posture by starting to produce intermediate-range missiles**

The idea of keeping a strong missile industry is inherited from Soviet times and has certain grounds in Ukrainian history. While giving a historic speech dedicated to the ratification of START-1 by Ukraine in 1993, Prime Minister Kuchma emphasized that "the only real and stable perspective [for Ukraine] could be found in the guaranteed deterrence and non-provocation defense doctrine."<sup>8</sup> For this purpose, the Prime Minister suggested preserving 46 Ukrainian produced ICBMs that Ukraine had to destroy according to START-1.

This plan did not work out as the US and Russia kept insisting on considering Ukrainian strategic missiles a part of the nuclear potential to be destroyed. Moreover, to be fair, Kyiv did not need ICBMs to deter its main rival, which never happened to be across the ocean but always stayed in the neighborhood. The awareness about the necessity to deter Russia came in 2014. Earlier Kyiv failed to develop defense components of the missile industry due to multiple reasons. The industry survived on international contracts, predominantly for space launches and for their components. Simultaneously,

---

<sup>7</sup>The comment of the MFA of Ukraine on the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty. Consulate General of Ukraine in Istanbul, 7 March, 2019, <https://istanbul.mfa.gov.ua/en/news/consular-news/71028-komentar-mzs-ukrajini-u-zvjazku-z-dogovorom-pro-likvidaciju-raket-serednyoji-i-menshoji-dalynosti>

<sup>8</sup> Kostenko, Yuriy. The History of Nuclear Disarmament of Ukraine. – K.: Yaroslaviv Val, 2015.

Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR), being sort of a pass to the international space market for Ukraine, kept Kyiv from developing combat missiles with the range bigger than 300 km.

The main parties to the INF, Russia and the US, were never in favor of Ukraine breaking the conditions of the INF (even if Kyiv found a formal reason not to consider itself a member state). Similarly, any violations of MTCR were impossible for Ukraine from a legal, political, and economic standpoint. Taking Ukraine's missile industry potential into account, any defense missile program, even fully compliant with INF and MTCR, might be seen as provocative.

The exception on the part of the US might be Ukrainian tactical missiles out of MTCR control that could compete with Russian ones on international markets. This line of activity led to the development of Grim-2 missile with a range of up to 280 km for Saudi Arabia. After the start of Russian aggression, Ukraine's defense ministry demonstrated a substantial interest in this missile while paying attention to a possibility of increasing its range.<sup>9</sup>

Ukraine has never developed or produced missiles with ranges less than 1 000 km (shorter-range by INF Treaty terms), except for the Soviet modifications of German V-2 in the 1950s. The state developed and produced a number of INF-range and ICBMs with much longer ranges.<sup>9</sup> Nowadays Ukraine approached this technology by developing Grim-2 missile, which is still far beyond MTCR and INF Treaty limitations. Yet, Grim-2 may well open the door to distances longer than 500 km for Ukraine both technically and politically. It should be noted that Grim-2 tactical missile development does not encounter pressure from Russia. Ukrainian tactical missiles inherited from the former USSR, including Tochka-U, were successfully employed against Russian troops in a conventional conflict in the Donbas. Russia perceives Ukrainian tactical missiles legitimate.

In fact, the Ukrainian missile industry got a certain push only after the events of 2014, when the need to deter Russia from further invasion in the Ukrainian territory became obvious. Ukraine does not have a deterrent capability

---

<sup>9</sup> It should be noted that the term INF represents two types of missiles: intermediate-range (1 000 – 5 500 km) and shorter-range (500 – 1 000 km) missiles. The distinction is essential for Ukrainian and post-soviet missile production and military organization. Shorter-range missiles are the continuation of tactical ones. They are used to equip the army's missile and artillery forces. Intermediate-range missiles are close to intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBM). The latter may be used in the intermediate range. Intermediate-range missiles, as well as ICBMs, represent a separate military service branch.

In the 1960s and 1970s, Ukraine developed and produced the majority of Soviet intermediate-range nuclear forces with ranges larger than 1 000 km. Before the Treaty, there were roughly 20% of Ukrainian missiles in Soviet intermediate-range nuclear arsenal. It was exactly the intermediate-range missile of the old design (same as the one in question during Cuba Missile Crisis) that the Soviet Ukrainian industry used as a development stage for ICBMs. Independent Ukraine stopped this intermediate-range technological line and never re-launched it. First of all, this was because of Ukraine's strict adherence to the START-1, INF Treaty and MTCR. However, theoretically, even having raised the necessary money and gotten international support for the production, Ukraine would not have a possibility to test such missiles. Previously they were tested in Russia and Kazakhstan. The most suitable Ukrainian test site is out of reach after Russia annexed Crimea.

in the sense of inflicting unacceptable damage in depth to the enemy's territory. Yet, Ukraine got closer to this.

Volodymyr Gorbulin, an advisor to the President of Ukraine, claims that he has always supported the idea of developing missiles with the range of up to 1 500 km. However, in his opinion, it would take about five years for Ukraine to develop a new missile (not even mentioning financial costs and the lack of conditions for testing the missile).<sup>10</sup>

Summing up, Ukraine could potentially develop and start the production of a new shorter-range missile in several years and potentially produce a new intermediate-range missile in a longer perspective in case INF is permanently ruined. The latter would take a strong political will (foreseeing the reaction of Russia), significant costs, and would happen under the conditions, which are not favorable for developing and testing. This scenario could become viable if the situation in Donbas aggravated again and Russia's political and military pressure deepened.

Such a scenario means non-nuclear deterrence of Russia from a wide range of possible attacks and attempts of coercion.

**Scenario 2. Ukraine supports its deterrence posture continuing the production of missiles that are already included in the military budget**

Ukraine is currently developing several models of smaller missiles with a pretty light payload. They can hit targets at considerable distances (several hundred kilometers). Yet, they remain battlefield, not deterrent weapons, though Ukrainian officials tend to call any demonstration of defense capabilities, including missiles, "deterrence."

There are several such systems. The most successful of them are "Vilkha," "Neptune," and various modernizations of Soviet anti-aircraft missiles, including C-125, C-200, and C-300. "Vilkha's" claimed range is more than a hundred kilometers. Essentially it is a guided version of the unguided Soviet "Smerch" multiple launch rocket system (MLRS). However, the modernization is so deep that the missiles can be used separately as a kind of light tactical missile.

"Neptune" is an anti-ship missile that used Soviet "Uran" as a prototype. It is now capable of flying about 300 km and hitting targets at sea and on the ground. In its basic ground mobile version, it may serve as a tactical missile a bit heavier than "Vilkha" but by far not as heavy as Russian "Iskander."

---

<sup>10</sup> Horbulin about new missiles, Putin and Zelenskii, 21 March 2019, [https://www.youtube.com/watch?feature=youtu.be&v=Es16X1\\_YBOo&fbclid=IwAR3Np7qEK0QOIbImnvJZpPiDhIrgUUmnZzu7o8Hw4G7jB4VSVl3sG9\\_Zyo&app=desktop](https://www.youtube.com/watch?feature=youtu.be&v=Es16X1_YBOo&fbclid=IwAR3Np7qEK0QOIbImnvJZpPiDhIrgUUmnZzu7o8Hw4G7jB4VSVl3sG9_Zyo&app=desktop)



Soviet anti-aircraft missiles get modernized in such ways that increase ranges, improve accuracy, and widen the capabilities of hitting surface targets. Upon widening this limitation these weapons may play the mentioned role of light tactical missiles.

With the active development of battlefield missiles, Ukraine does not trespass the limits of the INF Treaty or MTCR. None of the mentioned missiles is capable of delivering a 500-kilogram payload to at least 300 kilometers or delivering any weapon of mass destruction. Ukraine reacts to the Russian missile threat by producing specific kinds of weapons that may be called light tactical missiles. These missiles may give Ukraine some sort of deterrence against Russia launching a large-scale military attack. In this case, Ukraine could strike rear echelons of advancing Russian armies more effectively with light tactical missiles. Similarly, Ukraine could deter Russia from expanding the theater of war in Donbas.

Bearing in mind political and financial cost-effectiveness, such missiles could potentially serve as a deterrent against Russia at least where it comes to regional operations like the one in Donbas. It is not about building up separate deterrence forces but rather improving the long-range capabilities of existing services.

### **Scenario3. Ukraine develops missile defense against new Russian intermediate and shorter-range missiles**

This idea was suggested by a member of the European Parliament, the leader of EPP, Manfred Weber at the Munich Security Conference 2019. According to his concept, Germany, France, Poland, Lithuania, and Ukraine should build a common missile defense. Weber noted that this project would unite Europe in the face of the new threats resulting from the INF suspension.<sup>11</sup>

It means building up a head-on defense against a direct missile threat for Kyiv. On the one hand, Ukraine has a smaller potential in developing missile defense than in creating missile deterrence capabilities. On the other hand, such a defense does not require launching a politically sensitive missile program. Theoretically, Ukraine may even continue fulfilling its obligations under the INF Treaty after its suspension.

An important driver for this scenario is that Ukraine has a moral right to appeal to western allies for help against Russian missile threat. A strong incentive for North America and Europe is that Russia poses a missile threat to them, whereas Ukraine may be a geographically important ally.

---

<sup>11</sup> Ukraine ready to consider initiatives relating to security in Europe, 18 February 2019, <https://en.interfax.com.ua/news/general/566836.html>

Ukrainian experts outlined how this scenario might look. In its dialogue with NATO Kyiv could actively support building-up regional air and missile defense systems on the Eastern flank of the Alliance. Ukraine could also promote its participation and could become a new base for international missile defense training. The state could lease a couple of Patriot batteries from NATO countries to protect its capital. After that, Ukraine may buy more Patriots to protect important centers throughout its territory. In case of a substantial advancement of Russian INF capabilities, such as hypersonic missiles, and their deployment outside Russian territory (for example in Belarus) Ukraine could deploy the US Aegis systems.<sup>12</sup>

To some extent, this scenario is a projection of Polish experience on Ukraine. Ukrainian expectations may be exaggerated. Patriot and Aegis solutions may take a decade of negotiations, while Russia did deploy SSC-8 of shorter range, may deploy a ground version of intermediate-range Kalibr cruise missile in a couple of years and Zircon hypersonic missile in five years. Both Patriot and Aegis are not effective against cruise missiles, including hypersonic ones. Their deployment would play more of a political than a military role. This scenario can potentially face strong resistance. Russia has been regarding missile defense in Europe as a security threat for many years. Considering Ukraine's special meaning for Russia, the idea of Kyiv joining European missile defense (in case of Aegis missiles stationing) would probably become a *casus belli* for Moscow.

### **Conclusion**

Ukraine has been strictly adhering to the letter and spirit of the INF Treaty. Thus, Ukraine is in a much weaker position compared to Russia, which has been clandestinely violating the Treaty for years. This is why Ukraine may be interested in a new broader INF treaty. In case it is not possible, Ukraine could build its missile potential up step by step to create deterrence from Russian missile attack. At some stage, Ukraine may ask for help from western partners to improve missile defense capabilities. The latter brings risks of further escalation at different fronts. Russia considers any advancement of western military infrastructure of any kind to its border a threat, especially when it comes to such "spheres of vital interest" as Ukraine.

---

<sup>12</sup> Vadym Tyutyunyk and Valentyn Horovenko. Denunciation of INF Treaty: new challenges and possibilities for defense of Ukraine. CACDS, 18 March 2019, <https://cacds.org.ua/?p=6307>

## About the authors

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Douglas Barrie</b> <a href="mailto:Douglas.Barrie@iiss.org">Douglas.Barrie@iiss.org</a></p>	<p>Senior fellow for military aerospace, International Institute for Strategic Studies. Before joining the IISS Douglas Barrie was from 2002 the London bureau chief for Aviation Week &amp; Space Technology. Previous professional positions include European editor of Defense News, defence aviation editor for Flight International, and deputy news editor for Jane's Defence Weekly. He studied at Edinburgh University and holds an MA (Hons) in English Language and Literature.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>James Cameron</b> <a href="mailto:james.j.cameron@kcl.ac.uk">james.j.cameron@kcl.ac.uk</a></p>	<p>Postdoctoral Research Associate, Department of War Studies, King's College London. Author of <i>The Double Game: The Demise of America's First Missile Defense System and the Rise of Strategic Arms Limitation</i> (Oxford University Press, 2017).</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Tiphaine de Champchesnel</b> <a href="mailto:tiphaine.de-champchesnel@irsem.fr">tiphaine.de-champchesnel@irsem.fr</a></p>	<p>Research fellow on nuclear deterrence and disarmament, Institute for Strategic Research (IRSEM), Paris.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Corentin Brustlein</b> <a href="mailto:brustlein@ifri.org">brustlein@ifri.org</a></p>	<p>Director of the Security Studies Center, French Institute of International Relations (Ifri), Paris</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Katarzyna Kubiak</b> <a href="mailto:katarzynak@europeanleadershipnetwork.org">katarzynak@europeanleadershipnetwork.org</a></p>	<p>Policy Fellow at the European Leadership Network (ELN).</p>

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Julia Berghofer</b> <u><a href="mailto:juliab@europeanleadershipnetwork.org">juliab@europeanleadershipnetwork.org</a></u></p>	<p>ELN Policy Fellow and Project Manager for the Younger Generation Leaders Network at the European Leadership Network (ELN). Vice-chair of the YGLN. Holds an M.A. in Political Science from the University of Hamburg.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Giordana Pulcini</b> <u><a href="mailto:giordana.pulcini@uniroma3.it">giordana.pulcini@uniroma3.it</a></u></p>	<p>A research fellow and adjunct professor at the Department of Political Science, Roma Tre University. Since 2011, she has supervised the organization of the Nuclear Proliferation International History Project (NPIHP)'s Summer School on Nuclear History.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Artur Kacprzyk</b> <u><a href="mailto:kacprzyk@pism.pl">kacprzyk@pism.pl</a></u></p>	<p>An analyst at the Polish Institute of International Affairs (PISM). Holds a Master's in International Relations from the University of Warsaw.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Polina Sinovets</b> <u><a href="mailto:polina.sinovets@gmail.com">polina.sinovets@gmail.com</a></u></p>	<p>Head of Odessa Center for Nonproliferation (OdCNP). Associate Professor, Department of International Relations, Odessa I. I. Mechnikov National University. In 2003-2012 worked as senior research associate at National Institute for Strategic Studies. In 2006 she was a research fellow at the James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies, in 2015 a fellow at NATO Defense College in Rome and in 2017/18 a Fulbright Scholar at the CNS office in Washington DC.</p>

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Nikolai Sokov</b> <u><a href="mailto:nsokov@miis.edu">nsokov@miis.edu</a></u></p>	<p>Senior Fellow at the Vienna Center for Disarmament and Non-Proliferation (VCDNP). His areas of research include missiles and nuclear weapons, arms control as well as security and military strategy. He has regional expertise in the Kosovo crisis, Russia and the Newly Independent States. Beginning in 1981, Dr. Sokov worked at the Institute of US and Canadian Studies and the Institute of World Economy and International Relations in Moscow. From 1987 to 1992 he worked at the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union and later Russia, and participated in START I and START II negotiations as well as in a number of summit and ministerial meetings. Dr. Sokov has a Ph.D. from the University of Michigan and the Soviet equivalent of a Ph.D., Candidate of Historical Sciences degree from the Institute of World Economy and International Relations. He graduated from Moscow State University in 1981.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Olexii Yizhak</b> <u><a href="mailto:olexiyy@gmail.com">olexiyy@gmail.com</a></u></p>	<p>The Head of the Dnipro Department of the National Institute for Strategic Studies. In 1989–1992 worked in the State Construction Bureau “Pivdenne”. A graduate of the European Center for the Friendless Studios of George Marshall.</p>



## **Odessa Center for Nonproliferation (OdCNP)**

Odessa Center for Nonproliferation (OdCNP) was established in 2015 under the auspices of Odessa I.I. Mechnikov National University (ONU) Faculty of International Relations, Political Science, and Sociology with the support of the Swedish Radiation Safety Authority (SSM).

The core mission of OdCNP is to provide a platform for education, training, research, and outreach for the new generation experts on nuclear nonproliferation and nuclear security in Ukraine, as well as Central and Eastern Europe, and the Black Sea region. The objective is to catalyze the development of nonproliferation expertise in the area.

The main Center's activities are:

- Education and training for students and young specialists;
- Academic research and research projects;
- Outreach aimed at such audiences as journalists, civil society leaders, and the general public;
- Fostering of dialogue and joint projects with experts from Ukrainian, European, and US universities and research centers, as well as representatives of nuclear and missile industries, and governmental bodies.

### **Contacts**

Odessa Center for Nonproliferation  
 Odessa I.I. Mechnikov National University  
 Faculty of International Relations, Political Science, and Sociology  
 Tel. +380482633259  
 Email: [odcnp.onu@gmail.com](mailto:odcnp.onu@gmail.com)  
 Website: [odcnp.com.ua](http://odcnp.com.ua)

## **Responses to the INF Treaty crisis: The European dimension. European INF Initiative Project Meeting, May 3, 2019**

The INF Treaty suspension, initiated by the United States and to certain extent provoked by Russia would ultimately primarily target Europe. And the question is whether Europe has the plan or the remedy to neutralize possible negative consequences for it, coming with the death of the Treaty in August 2019.

With the European INF Initiative Project we tried to answer this question with the central aim: to explore the potential consequences of the collapse of the INF Treaty for Europe. Another central goal of the project was to generate fresh and out-of-the-box thinking, as well as to discuss Europe's possible contribution(s) to strategic stability on the continent. The study covers six states, while their positions were explored by their national experts. Those states are: Great Britain, France, Germany, Italy, Poland and Ukraine. Ukraine is the only state which turns to be a non-NATO member in the study; however it presents special interest as the state-successor of the INF, missiles-capable producing country and the buffer zone between Russia and NATO.

Scientific Publication

**RESPONSES TO THE INF TREATY  
CRISIS:  
THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION**

The European INF Initiative Project Meeting  
May 3, 2019, Odessa, Ukraine

Edited by Polina Sinovets and Odessa Center for Nonproliferation  
(OdcNP)

with the support of Swedish Radiation Safety Authority (SSM)

The views expressed in this publication are those of the authors and do not  
represent the views of the SSM or OdcNP

Electronic edition PDF (2,46 Mb). Format 60x84x8. Conv. pr. Sheets 6,51.  
Circulation of Order № 1940.

Publisher and editor  
Odessa I.I. Mechnikov National University  
Certificate of state registration of the print media DK № 4215 dated November,  
22, 2011  
Ukraine, 65082, Odessa, Elisavetinska str., 12.  
Tel.(048) 723- 28-39. E-mail: [druk@onu.edu.ua](mailto:druk@onu.edu.ua)



ISBN 978-617-689-292-2



9 786176 892922 >