



*Chief of Defence*  
**PORTUGAL**



# ***MC CONFERENCE 2009***

***NATO AND ITS NEIGHBOURS,  
PARTNERSHIPS AND SECURITY SHARING***

***PORTUGUESE CHOD INTERVENTION***

***19 September 2009***



*Chief of Defence*  
**PORTUGAL**

**MISTER CHAIRMAN**  
**DEAR COLLEAGUES**

### **OPENING REMARKS**

THE TOPIC I WAS GIVEN BY OUR CHAIRMAN IS "*NATO AND ITS NEIGHBOURS, PARTNERSHIPS AND SECURITY SHARING*".

AS WE ALL KNOW IT IS NOT POSSIBLE TO ADDRESS ANY SECTION OF A *STRATEGIC CONCEPT* AS AN ISOLATED, SELF-DEFINED ELEMENT. BY DEFINITION A *STRATEGIC CONCEPT* IS A COHERENT SET OF PRINCIPLES, GOALS, RESOURCES AND LINES OF ACTION.

CONSEQUENTLY, AND IN ORDER TO PROPERLY FRAME MY THOUGHTS, ON NATO'S PARTNERSHIPS AND SECURITY SHARING WITH OUR NEIGHBOURS, I WOULD LIKE TO POINT OUT A FEW CONSIDERATIONS.

### **THE IMPORTANCE OF NEIGHBOURS**

THE FIRST AND FUNDAMENTAL REASON WHY NEIGHBOURS ARE IMPORTANT COMES FROM THE INDISPUTABLE FACT THAT WE LIVE IN A GLOBALIZED AND INTERDEPENDENT WORLD SHAPED BY SOPHISTICATED COMMUNICATIONS AND PUBLIC OPINION SCRUTINY AND WHICH, IN TERMS OF PERCEPTION, IS PHYSICALLY SMALLER AND MORE UNIFIED THAN EVER.



*Chief of Defence*  
**PORTUGAL**

L

BUT OUR WORLD IT IS ALSO THE WORLD THAT RECENTLY SAW THE FALL OF THE LEHMAN BROTHERS AND THE ONSET OF THE EXISTING ECONOMIC AND FINANCIAL CRISIS, LEADING TO THE EMERGENCE OF NEW KEY PLAYERS SUCH AS BRASIL, CHINA, INDIA, RUSSIA AND OTHERS. THIS WILL CERTAINLY IMPLY A NEW AND MULTIPOLAR GEOPOLITICAL ARCHITECTURE, EVEN IF WE ARE NOT YET IN A POSITION TO CLEARLY IDENTIFY THIS NEW ARCHITECTURE AND ITS CONSEQUENCES.

### **UNDERSTANDING SECURITY**

IN THIS DAY AND AGE, SECURITY HAS TO BE UNDERSTOOD AS A MUCH BROADER, MULTIDIMENSIONAL CONCEPT THAN IN THE PAST, INVOLVING NOT ONLY THE SECURITY OF THE POLITICAL ENTITIES BUT, AND ABOVE ALL, THE SECURITY OF THE PEOPLE AND THEIR CULTURAL, POLITICAL, ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL LIVING CONDITIONS.

ONLY EXCEPTIONALLY CAN SECURITY BE PROVIDED OUTSIDE A "*COMPREHENSIVE APPROACH*" MODEL HENCE THE IMPORTANCE OF FULLY UNDERSTANDING THE NEED TO BUILD EFFECTIVE PARTNERSHIPS.

OCCASIONALLY IT IS POSSIBLE TO BUILD POLITICAL, ECONOMIC OR SOCIAL PARTNERSHIPS WITHOUT A MILITARY DIMENSION. BUT, IN EFFECTIVE TERMS, IT IS ALMOST IMPOSSIBLE TO BUILD A MILITARY PARTNERSHIP AWAY FROM A POLITICAL, AND SOMETIMES ALSO AN ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL RELATIONSHIP.

THE THREATS AND CHALLENGES OF OUR TIME, WITH ALL ITS UNPREDICTABILITY, ARE NO LONGER THOSE OF A POST-COLD WAR PERIOD. THEY ARE DETERMINED BY EVENTS SUCH AS THOSE OF THE 9/11, MADRID AND LONDON, AND BY SITUATIONS SUCH AS THOSE EXISTING IN IRAK AND AFGHANISTAN.



*Chief of Defence*  
**PORTUGAL**

I WILL NOT ELABORATE ON THE WELL KNOWN LIST OF CURRENT THREATS AND CHALLENGES. I WILL ONLY EMPHASIZE THAT THEY ARE COMPLEX, TRANSNATIONAL, ASYMMETRIC AND UNPREDICTABLE.

OF COURSE NATO NEEDS TO PRESERVE ITS COLLECTIVE SECURITY MODEL, ALTHOUGH THERE IS NO REASON TO TARGET IT AGAINST ANYBODY IN PARTICULAR.

BUT IN THE LIGHT OF THE NEW AND PRESSING REALITIES, NATO NEEDS TO FOCUS MORE ON COOPERATIVE SECURITY.

COOPERATIVE SECURITY WITH EVERYBODY. COOPERATIVE SECURITY WITH NEIGHBOURS, THROUGH PARTNERSHIPS AND ENTAILING A WIN-WIN APPROACH AND OUTCOME.

NATO IS AN ALLIANCE, AN INTERGOVERNAMENTAL ORGANIZATION, THEREFORE IT'S ONLY NATURAL THAT OUR NATIONAL VIEWS ON THIS SUBJECT ARE NOT ALWAYS CONVERGENT.

HOW CAN WE EXPECT THE UNITED STATES, WITH ITS GLOBAL RESPONSIBILITY AND SCALE OF POWER, TO LOOK TO NATO AWAY FROM THE GLOBALISED PICTURE?

SHOULD WE BE SURPRISED FOR INSTANCE, THAT AMONG THE EUROPEAN MEMBER COUNTRIES, DIFFERENT PERCEPTIONS EXIST ON AREAS SUCH AS AFRICA AND THE CAUCASUS?



*Chief of Defence*  
*PORTUGAL*

BUT THE RELEVANT FACTOR HERE IS THAT WE ARE ALL INTERESTED IN THE CAUCASUS AND IN AFRICA. THEREFORE THOSE DIFFERENCES ARE ESSENTIALLY DIFFERENCES IN VALUE, AND DEGREE. THEY ARE NOT DIFFERENCES IN SUBSTANCE.

OUR COMMON ENDEAVOUR IN ESTABLISHING NATO PARTNERSHIPS IS TO ACCEPT AND UNDERSTAND THOSE DIFFERENCES, AS INHERENT TO THE COMPLEXITY OF ANY ALLIANCE. THEY MAKE NATO'S DAILY LIFE MORE COMPLEX AND DIFFICULT, BUT THEY ENSURE STRONGER AND MORE SHARED ANSWERS.

AT THE SAME TIME, AND IN ORDER TO AVOID THE RISK OF BUILDING UP ARTIFICIAL GEOPOLITICAL TENSIONS WITHIN THE ALLIANCE, IT IS ALSO OUR COMMON OBLIGATION TO RESIST TO THE TEMPTATION OF MANIPULATING THOSE DIFFERENCES IN ORDER TO EXTRACT MINOR TACTICAL DIVIDENDS.

ON THE OTHER HAND, ANY SUCCESSFUL RELATIONSHIP IS A TWO-WAY STREET AND IT'S IMPORTANT TO TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE VIEWS OF THE OTHER SIDE, "LE REGARD DES AUTRES", HOW WE COME ACROSS IN THOSE COUNTRIES AND WHAT IS THEIR GENERAL PERCEPTION OF OUR ORGANIZATION. THIS IMPORTANT DATA HAS TO BE PART OF THE EQUATION IN THIS STRATEGIC EXERCISE.

### **PARTNERSHIPS AND SECURITY SHARING WITH WHOM AND HOW?**

I ASSUME THAT NOTHING FUNDAMENTAL WILL CHANGE IN WHAT CONCERNS THE EXISTING PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM, AS WELL AS THE OPEN DOOR POLICY ON ENLARGEMENT, SUBJECT TO EFFECTIVE MAP ARRANGEMENTS.



*Chief of Defence*  
*PORTUGAL*

L

BUT IN ADDITION TO THIS AND WITHOUT AIMING TO BECOME A GLOBAL ACTOR, NATO NEEDS TO DEVELOP PARTNERSHIPS WITH A GLOBAL EXPRESSION.

I SEE THIS DEVELOPMENT IN SIX LAYERS:

- THE UN AND THE OSCE;
- THE EUROPEAN UNION;
- RUSSIA;
- THE COUNTRIES OF THE MEDITERRANEAN DIALOGUE AND OF THE ISTANBUL COOPERATION INITIATIVE (ICI);
- THE AFRICAN UNION AND THE ARAB LEAGUE;
- THE NEW EMERGING COUNTRIES.

THE PARTNERSHIPS WITH THE UN AND THE OSCE ARE INDISPENSABLE TO THE PURPOSE OF POLITICAL AND LEGAL LEGITIMACY, IN THE GLOBAL AND EUROPEAN CONTEXTS RESPECTIVELY, AND NATO CAN ALSO PROVIDE RELEVANT MILITARY ASSISTANCE TO THESE ORGANIZATIONS.

I SEE THE PARTNERSHIP WITH THE NEW EMERGING COUNTRIES AS BEING BASICALLY POLITICAL AND DRIVEN BY PURPOSES OF MUTUAL KNOWLEDGE AND TRANSPARENCY, AIMING AT POTENTIAL COOPERATION, INCLUDING IN THE MILITARY FIELD.

IN MY VIEW THE PARTNERSHIP WITH THE AFRICAN UNION AND WITH THE ARAB LEAGUE SHOULD ALSO BE BASICALLY POLITICAL, ALTHOUGH I BELIEVE THAT THERE IS ROOM FOR MILITARY COOPERATION ON DEFENCE ORGANIZATION AND PLANNING, AND ON MILITARY EDUCATION AND TRAINING.



*Chief of Defence  
PORTUGAL*

L

ON THE ISSUE OF THE PARTNERSHIP WITH THE MEDITERRANEAN DIALOGUE AND THE ICI COUNTRIES, I THINK THAT OUR MAIN GOAL RELATES TO CONFIDENCE BUILDING, PROSPECTIVE COMMON ENGAGEMENTS ON CRISIS MANAGEMENT AND THE FIGHT AGAINST THE MANY THREATS FACING NATO AND THOSE COUNTRIES.

THIS DEFINE RELEVANT POSSIBILITIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES FOR MILITARY COOPERATION. EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION, EDUCATION AND TRAINING ARE DEFINITELY ON THE PRIORITY LIST, BUT OTHER AREAS CAN BE ADDRESSED SUCH AS SITUATION AWARENESS, AIR DEFENCE OR SEARCH AND RESCUE, NOT EXCLUDING PARTICIPATION IN NATO-LED OPERATIONS AND IN CIVIL PROTECTION ARRANGEMENTS.

THE PARTNERSHIP WITH RUSSIA HAS TO BE RULED BY THE UNDERSTANDING THAT, REGARDLESS THE RECENT HISTORY AND POSSIBLE CURRENT DIFFICULTIES, RUSSIA IS AND WILL CONTINUE TO BE IN THE LONG RUN, A CRUCIAL PARTNER IN MANY IF NOT ALL KEY SECURITY ISSUES.

TERRORISM, ARMS CONTROL, COUNTER PROLIFERATION, ENERGY SECURITY, CYBER DEFENCE ARE ALL EXAMPLES OF ISSUES THAT REQUIRE A CONSTRUCTIVE ENGAGEMENT BETWEEN NATO AND RUSSIA.

THE SAME IS TRUE FOR MANY OTHER NON-MILITARY SECURITY ISSUES SUCH AS ORGANIZED CRIME, GLOBAL WARMING, ETHNIC MINORITIES AND ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION AMONG OTHERS.



*Chief of Defence*  
**PORTUGAL**

L

IT IS OBVIOUS THAT RUSSIA SHOULD NOT BE ALLOWED TO HAVE A RIGHT OF VETO OR A "DROIT DE REGARD" ON NATO DECISIONS, BUT THIS IS BY NO MEANS INCOMPATIBLE WITH THE PRESERVATION OF GOOD RELATIONS BETWEEN NATO AND RUSSIA.

WE KNOW BY EXPERIENCE THAT EVEN IN MOMENTS OF HIGH POLITICAL TENSION IT HAS ALWAYS BEEN POSSIBLE TO MAINTAIN A REGULAR MIL-TO-MIL COOPERATION WITH RUSSIA.

THIS CONSIDERATION INDUCES TO THE MC PARTICULAR RESPONSIBILITIES WITHIN THE ALLIANCE, THE FIRST BEING TO AVOID STIMULATING OR ESCALATING ANY CONFRONTATION.

FINALLY THE PARTNERSHIP WITH THE EUROPEAN UNION.

THIS PARTNERSHIP IS OF TREMENDOUS IMPORTANCE. I WOULD SAY THAT IT IS ABSOLUTELY VITAL FOR BOTH PARTS AS THE EU IS NATO'S CLOSEST AND FIRST NEIGHBOUR AND IT SHOULD BE ITS CLOSEST AND FIRST PARTNER.

NATO NEEDS THE EU AT LEAST AS MUCH AS THE EU NEEDS NATO.

THIS IS NOT MERELY THE RESULT OF THE EXTENDED OVERLAPPING MEMBERSHIP. WHAT'S IMPORTANT IS TO RECOGNIZE THAT NATO AND THE EU NEED EACH OTHER TO DELIVER PROPER COMPREHENSIVE APPROACH ANSWERS. AS THEY EXIST TODAY, THEY ARE COMPLEMENTARY FOR THIS PURPOSE, AND IT IS OBVIOUS THAT MANY OF THE CHALLENGES OF THE WORLD REQUIRE THE EFFECTIVE COOPERATION BETWEEN NATO AND THE EU.



*Chief of Defence*  
**PORTUGAL**

FAILURE ON THIS WILL REPRESENT FAILURE FOR BOTH ORGANIZATIONS.

THERE WILL BE LITTLE PURPOSE IN DEVELOPING A NEW *NATO STRATEGIC CONCEPT* IF THIS FUNDAMENTAL ASPECT IS NOT PROPERLY ADDRESSED, FIRST OF ALL ON THE GROUNDS OF MENTALITY AND OF THE CULTURE OF BOTH ORGANIZATIONS, BUT ALSO AND, IN PRACTICAL TERMS, PAYING DUE ATTENTION TO THE *EUROPEAN SECURITY STRATEGY*, AS REVIEWED LAST DECEMBER UNDER THE HEADING OF "*PROVIDING SECURITY IN A CHANGING WORLD*", AS WELL AS FOLLOWING THE POTENTIAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE EU LISBON TREATY AND ITS INHERENT POSSIBILITIES.

THE FACT THAT THE MILITARY COMPONENT, EVEN WITH DIFFERENT EXPRESSIONS, EXIST WITH A CERTAIN MEANING ON BOTH SIDES OF BRUSSELS DEFINE A VAST FIELD FOR COOPERATION AND EVEN FOR CONVERGENCE. ON CRISIS MANAGEMENT, ON OPERATIONAL MATTERS TO INCLUDE INTELLIGENCE AND LOGISTICS, ON DEFENCE PLANNING AND ON THE HARMONIZATION OF THE INDUSTRIAL AND TECHNOLOGICAL DEFENCE BASIS.

ALLOW ME TO CONCLUDE WITH A PERSONAL THOUGHT INSPIRED BY THE DEFINITION OF HEALTH, AS PROPOSED BY THE WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION:

*"SECURITY IS A CUMULATIVE STATE, TO BE PROMOTED THROUGHOUT THE WORLD, IN ORDER TO ENSURE THAT THE FULL BENEFITS ARE ENJOYED BY ALL".*

SINTRA, 19 SEP 2009  
LUÍS VALENÇA PINTO  
GENERAL  
PRT CHOD