Cheatography

Future NATO: Adapting to New Realities Cheat Sheet by enil via cheatography.com/168627/cs/35386/

NATO Facts				
North Atlantic Treaty Orgaisation		Created 1949 in Washington		
0		30 members		
		2% of GDP		
NATO M	IAIN TASK			
NATO	1. NATO is	determined to		
Strategic	safeguard th	safeguard the freedom and		
concept	security of A	Allies. Its key		
	sibility is to defence, ag	d greatest respon- ensure our collective ainst all threats, ctions. We are a lliance.		
	Authoritaria	n actors not directly eat		
	China "chall security and	anges interests, l values"		
		threat to Russia, ek confrontation		
NATO Core Tasks (conti- nued)		and defence - eadiness, New main		
	Crisis preve Managemer			
	Collective s			
		5		
NATO as	s a PARTNER			
NATO and EU	Critical partner will not work	rship, NATO by itself		
		cooperation pushes ration, collective		
	Ukraine-Russi deterrence, El	a. Through NATO J sanctions		

NATO and China		
US and China	US interest = european interest	
	Technology challenges	
China threat to values	Authoritarian, ideological (freedom, human rights, democracy)	
NATO's N	New Task from Lecture	
New tasks are old ones	Deterrence and Russia	
	Old fashion deterrence with new dimensions - internet, gas	
Threats	Russia's weaponisation of energy	
	Lots of non-military and non-tr- aditional	
Issues	NATO has military tools, but not economic (Needs EU)	
	Democracy may not be enough for inclusion. Conflicts between member states (Greece-Turkey)	
NATO Article 4 and 5	Now Cyberattack included (Estonia 2007)	
	Article 4 says that security issues are first discussed, then Article 5 can be implemented	
Article 3	You can free ride, you can ask for assistance	
Article 10	Open-door policy provided you can defend yourself and you are a democracy	
Evolution	of Russian Threat to NATO	
Why is Russia a	Russia's economy is stagnant, no longer a great	

	Cyber attacks, limited military intervention, and operations
	Russian military still relevant
	Kremlin ambitions for sphere of influence
Why are Russian tactics effective?	Credibility and backing of conventional forces
	Now arguably half-c- redible seeing Russian military failure

Evolution of Russian Threat to NATO (cont)

challanges

Kremlin can push through

NATO Techno	blogy
Technology and new Threats	Cyber, Space
NATO's future	Must increase Cyber prepar- ations as well
	Future question of whether a cyber-attack would qualify for article 5?
	Technology can allow smoother functioning for example air-land

NATO's Enduring Relevance		
US	Russian revisionism gets new	
leadership	engagement from the US,	
in NATO	though politics are not always stable.	
	Now not ideological conflict	
NATO's new aims	Building up deterrence and defence	
	Probably not conventional warfare	
	Russia Hybrid Warfare	

Sponsored by **ApolloPad.com** Everyone has a novel in them. Finish Yours! https://apollopad.com

By **enil** cheatography.com/enil/ Not published yet. Last updated 10th November, 2022. Page 1 of 2.

power

challange?

Cheatography

Future NATO: Adapting to New Realities Cheat Sheet by enil via cheatography.com/168627/cs/35386/

NATO's En	during Relevance (cont)	The State	e of NATO - Hooker
-	egionalisation of whether just being a	Russia possible	Estonia, Latvia - ethnic minority
democracy	y is enough to be a member		Kaliningrad
			Black Sea
	itime domain	Turkey problem	Suppliewd drones to Ukraine, did not let Russian non-as- sidgned warships to Black Sea
Permanent Europe	Deterrence / US military in		No sanctions against Russia
NATO Deterrence	Broadening region, for e example now more emphasis on bordering countries	Other actors	UK left EU, downsised army, France focus on EU and less NATO, Germany slow
	Reinforce NATO cohesion		Norway, Denmark stable
	Increased air and naval deployments in region		Southern Europe - Spain, Italy, more concerned with economic and refugees
	Promote training and readiness to US (reinforce confidence)	Sweden and Finland	Increased defence by 50 and 7 percent
	Ensure maximum US forces flexibility for a quick response (training in Northern Norway)		Germany alone with 2% GDP outspends Russia in defence
	Expand opportunities for burden-sharing	What to spend on?	Readiness is an issue, mainte- nance
	Ensure adequate host-nation support for NATO		UK, Germany, France - One combat division takes long time
NATO and expansion	1997 NATO-Russia Founding Act		Readiness issue, not burden- sharing
Finland, Sv Schreer	veden - NATO Alberque &		Eastern border was poorly defended. "Tripwire"
Why	Russian threat. Finland border,	Pros	Firm response to Ukraine
,	Sweden would break neutrality	Other initia-	More concrete readiness UK, France, Germany
	Big economies, good military (from being on their own)	tives	Strong Eastern flank

Brutal Examination (Russia) - Dalsjö

Putin	More risk-taking now
	Russia's conventional power is lacking
Ukraine	Russia expected Ukraine to give in (intelligence failure)
	Centre of gravity (capital), but then no backup plan
	No central commander in first 6 weeks, only regional commanders
	Lack of allies - UK and US supplied a lot of information to Ukraine in the buildup, having public documents regarding NATO
	Logistics problems - bad routes, lack of food
	Failure of Russian Air superi- ority
	Failure to coordinate ground and air
	20% of tanks gone
Russian prepar- ation	III-prepared soldiers
	Restricted terrain, easily blocked
	Got to test missiles during Syria, 60% fail apparently
Why Russia fail to prepare?	Wishful thinking of easy takeover
	Too much confidence in lacking technology
	Lapping over holes in Georgia 2008

By enil cheatog

border

burden

Quick incorporation

Cons

cheatography.com/enil/

NATO further threat now Finland

US might assume big nordic economies to carry economic

Not published yet. Last updated 10th November, 2022. Page 2 of 2.

Cyber aggression

Sponsored by **ApolloPad.com** Everyone has a novel in them. Finish Yours! https://apollopad.com