

Received: Aug 8, 2023
Accepted: Nov 23, 2023
Published: Nov 24, 2023

Re-Strategizing NATO's Roles as Transatlantic Security Alliance in Europe Post Russia-Ukraine Conflict

Lalu Ladeva Alfusa'idu Karman
Universitas Brawijaya
Email: ladevaladeva21@gmail.com

Abstract

The condition of Europe's geopolitical stability has been hit hard since early 2022. The war between Russia and Ukraine has prevailed and proven to disrupt the capacity and capability of intra-regional bodies within Europe. As the fight is still going on and war has not been declared to be over there are obstacles to analyzing what will the region be after the conflict is ended especially on how will Russia repowered itself and the action taken by the EU and NATO to respond to such a threat. This research will attempt to scrutinize and underpin NATO's important job and roles as the guardian in Europe amidst the current geopolitical instability within the region including its alliance with European Union. The perspectives from the Balance of Threat and Security Alliance Theory is the tools to analyze what lies ahead in the importance of NATO for the region. This research uses data analysis methods and collects data using secondary data from multiple sources such as journals, government websites, articles, and books. Further, this research limits the scope of the relationship between NATO and the European Union and will perceive the future of what the region might look like after the conflict ends.

Keywords: NATO, European Union, Security Alliance, Russia-Ukraine

Abstrak

Stabilitas kondisi geopolitik Eropa telah terganggu secara besar-besaran sejak tahun 2022. Perang antara Rusia dan Ukraina pecah dan terbukti mengganggu kapasitas dan kapabilitas dari organisasi intra-regional yang ada di Eropa. Dengan masih berlanjutnya perang, ada beberapa hambatan mengenai bagaimana benua Eropa akan terbentuk dalam hal keamanan, terutama terkait dengan bagaimana Rusia membangun Kembali kekuatannya dan aksi dari Uni Eropa dan NATO untuk merespons terhadap potensi tersebut. Penelitian ini akan berporos terhadap upaya untuk meneliti lebih dalam mengenai pekerjaan dan peran penting NATO sebagai pelindung di Eropa ditengah ketidakstabilan geopolitik terkini dalam wilayah Eropa termasuk hubungan NATO dengan Uni Eropa. Perspektif dari teori Balance of Threat dan Aliansi Keamanan adalah alat yang digunakan untuk menganalisa prospek selanjutnya pentingnya NATO untuk kawasan. Penelitian ini menggunakan metode analisa data dan pengumpulan data melalui sumber sekunder dari beberapa sumber seperti jurnal, situs pemerintah, artikel, dan buku. Penelitian ini membatasi lingkupnya ke dalam hubungan antara NATO dan Uni Eropa serta bagaimana gambaran masa depan kawasan Eropa pasca konflik Rusia-Ukraina berakhir.

Kata kunci: NATO, Uni Eropa, Aliansi Keamanan, Rusia-Ukraina

Introduction

North Atlantic Treaty Organization or NATO by short, is a security pact alliance of countries in the area of North Atlantic consisting of United States of America, Canada, and most of the European countries. NATO was established on April 4th, 1949, through the ratification of then the Washington Treaty, which purposes to create a self-established and powerhouse security alliance that accommodates the security interest of countries in the North Atlantic region. The founding treaty was signed by 12 countries, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, and the United States of America. In its history, the membership of NATO has been expanded to 30 nations. It is in the progress of becoming a 32 countries membership alliance, waiting for the accession confirmation of Sweden and Finland later in 2022. In its history as well, NATO has grown into a military and political alliance aiming to resolve international disputes and conflicts peacefully, upholding and promoting democratic values, and if all the possible peaceful ways fail, will be undertaking military operation(NATO, 2022d).

The signing of the Washington Treaty lays the foundation structure of NATO. The main contention of their foundation is stated in Articles 3, 5, and 9 of the Washington Treaty. Article 3 urges keeping signatories intact to " maintain and develop the individual and collective capacity to resist against armed attack from an external and existential threat." The most notorious article, Article 5, stated, "Armed attacks against one or more of the members of NATO in Europe or North America region are considered an attack against all the alliance." Article 9 establishes the creation of the policy-making body of NATO, the North Atlantic Council (NAC), which lays under the sentence "set up such subsidiary bodies as necessary and immediately establish a defense committee which shall recommend measures for the implementation of Articles 3 and 5" (NATO, 2019). Article 3 and 5 is considered the main attraction of countries to join the NATO Alliance. With the expansion still on the horizon, the two articles proved to be the factors keeping the alliance intact over the years.

NATO, in its operations, has three sub-committees which are: The North Atlantic Council (NAC), the Military Committee (MC), and the Nuclear Planning Group (NPG). The NAC is the principal decision-making body of NATO.

The body's main task is to oversee the military and political action relating to the security of the entire Alliance. The body produces reports and recommendations to be executed by the subordinate committees and bodies of the Alliance, which the NAC has the authority to set up if necessary (NATO, 2017). The NPG, alongside the NAC, functioned as the decision body on nuclear-related issues within the alliance and had the authority to invent Alliance's nuclear policy, if necessary. The NPG is reviewing and setting the nuclear policy of the alliance inherent with the dynamic-changing security environment in the North Atlantic area (NATO, 2022a). The MC is the military representative's body of the council mandated as the primary army consulting body for the NAC and the NPC. The MC provides direction for the Strategic Commanders, enhancing strategic policy and concepts for military-basis policy and assessing the capabilities of NATO member states in regard to weaponry and technology capacity (NATO, 2021a). Besides the three main sub-committees, NATO has several sub-bodies to execute and support its operations, for instance: the NATO Standardization Office (NSO), NATO Cooperative Cyber Defense Center of Excellence (NCCDCE), and NATO

Communications and Information Academy (NCIA).

One to be noted NATO decision-making process is using the principle of **consensus** since NATO member states established the alliance in 1949, which means that there will be no votes. However, there will be continuous negotiations to reach a consensus where the members of NAC produce **declarations** and **communique** as the final results. Further, the operations of NATO are guided by its Strategic Concept (NATO, 2021b). The Strategic Concept identified three main tasks to support NATO operations. The first is **Collective Defense**, the second is **Crisis Management**, and the third is **Cooperative Security**. These three main tasks are executed through the routine exchange of information by each member state, thus understanding other member states' stances and needs to reach a consensus later on. The three main tasks also mean that the purpose of NATO is to invent planning for a defensive system added by the military capacity to ensure Article 5 of the Washington Treaty will be executed well if invoked. The Strategic Concepts and the Washington Treaty serve as the basis for NATO to operate in the area of land, maritime, air, and the newest domain of cyberspace.

The dynamics of Europe causing alarm to the stability of international world. While all the spotlight under the Russia-Ukraine war, the international world is divided into three stances; First is the stances that supports the Russia action to the Ukraine considering the threat possesses by the influence western world brought to the Ukraine, second is the majority of western world whom decided to condemning the action by Russia through international sanction and international legal ways, and third is the one who chooses to abstain and neither support nor condemn the action by Russia, this action most notably chosen by People's Republic of China that neither condemning nor support the action taken by Russia on not taking any international sanction to Russia. This action resulted in many ways especially regarding the regional security stability in the Europe which NATO and European Union's are responsible for.

With that being said, this article will discuss the improvement of NATO's roles in Europe's regional security and how defense system integration with European Union could be executed swiftly based on the notions that most of NATO's country is the part of EU as well. Moreover, this article will use the Security Alliance Theory and Balance of Threat

Theory to explain and elaborate the variable to answer the problems define in this article. However, one to be noted is this article will be used a hypothesis and current real-world situation as the "pivoting foundation" of this article. With most scholars are yet to discuss this issue considering that it is a fresh conflict that occurs in the international system, the results will be taken on the basis of such theory elaborated below. Hence, the authors are in the hypothesis concluded that NATO and EU could be binding and collaborate together to create a mutual or joint-defense system to protect the areas of Europe further into the occasion of international security dynamics. But, while it is yet to be proven using the theories, the hypothesis will stand as the basis for this research and will further be developed as part to answer all of the problems mentioned in this article.

Analytical Framework

Over the course of this section the discussion will be pivoting on how is the Security Alliance Theory developed by Paul D. Williams and Balance of Threat Theory invented by Stephen Walt contributed to determine the prospect position of NATO post-Russia-Ukraine War. Both of these theories have proved their grounds in discussing the issues of

contemporary alliance geopolitical dynamics over the course of years. Therefore, these section will elaborate further about the theories variable and how these theories could be relevant for the research brought up on the introduction section.

Security Alliance Theory

A security alliance is defined as the partnerships between nations to ensure and guarantee the security of its ratified members from threats, aggression, and security violence from other countries (Seiglie & Matelly, 2020). This definition of security alliance lays the foundation to categorize a security alliance and under which sectors do these alliances operates. The basic argument of security alliance is that the alliance only justifiable and right to be operated if the protection guaranteed and offered by the alliance are far greater than the individual states can provide for themselves. The formation of security alliances falls under two categories possible to explain the phenomenon, first that emphasize the international determinants and circumstances and second is the domestic factors as the key part of ratification as alliance (D.Williams, 2008).

In discussing the international determinant factors of security alliance

formation, one thing to be noted is that the international system is anarchy and there are more of imbalance of power between states. The international determinant here that is taking part is the balance-of-power theory using the capabilities aggregation models. Paul D. Williams elaborated that the international determinants is crucial due to the states have tendency to form alliance in order to balance the power of other states, this argument could also used as the reasons in the disintegration or persistence of alliance. The consummation of what Williams use as the balance-of-power is the balance-of-threat theory. The balance-of-threat theory view the alliance as far more comprehensive form to combat and deducting further disturbance of states and its alliance, further this counterbalance-theory also highlights the strength and endurance of an alliance within its operational. These two international determinants aspects do shapes how security alliance are formed and operates also explaining the behaviour of such alliance in the international stages.

Discussing about the domestic factors that formed an alliance, the usage of balance-of-power and balance-of-threat theory is diminished within this aspect. The tendency of states no longer requires international factors but rather using the case of states ideology, and the regime

holding the power. This actual argument is proven right in the real-life example of European Union whose nations consisting of democracy ideology nations or North Atlantic Treaty Organizations whose makes up most of the countries in the Transatlantic area and have the same vision on a security alliance. Moreover, nations that have a autocracy leaders tend to cooperate with another country adopting such system, for example Cuba and USSR back in the Cold-War era. The two-factor mentioned above shapes the theory of alliance in the domestic factors point of view.

Offering another perspective in theory of security alliance is Chae-Sung Chun whom uses the US-ROK alliance as his evidence in offering his perspectives. Sung Chun using the concepts of Alliance, Alignment, Adversarial Game, and Alliance Game to explain the theory of security alliance. The security alliance consisting of four parts which are a strategic concepts, a common defense strategy with specified roles, mission, and responsibilities, an agreement on the requirements for types and level of forces to implement the defense strategy, and range of more specialized-agreements on command relations, base arrangements, and burden-sharing (Chun, 2000). The perspective offered by Sung Chun also

valued the presence of balance-of-power and balance-of-threat as part of “Balancing versus Bandwagoning” in the security alliance with the argument pivoting in the usage of both theory into the explanations of alliance behaviour on decision making forward.

Balance of Threat Theory

Balance of Threat theory is a notions and concept developed by Stephen Walt in the 1985’s “Alliance Formation and the Balance of World Power” article. Balance of Theory stands and lies under the paradigm of Neo-realist where the theory itself is a development from the Balance of Power theory. The underlying basis of this theory is the Balance of Threat Theory argues that nations tend to create and joining an alliance to balance against threats (Walt, 2005). Threats are considered by states as the function combination of power, proximity, offensive capabilities, and aggressive intentions. More, Stephen Walt elaborates that the big power nation states, for such the countries that lays under the “core” part of international system tend to balance against the threats from the most dangerous states, opposite to the action of joining cooperation with those states. In completing and explaining the core and operational of Balance of Threat theory, Stephen Walt divided four categories of

aspect that help assemble threats and constitute the theory. It is Offensive Power, Geographic Proximity, Aggressive Intentions, and Aggregate Power (Cooper, 2003).

Discussing about Offensive Power in the terms of Threat, Walt offering his preposition of states that possess major powers are considering each other are threat and a potential enemy as well as allies due to the fact that states never able to guaranteed how they will utilize their own capabilities. Power, in Walt point of view is the pivoting part of Balance of Threat theory as Power is “one of the factors that affects the propensity to balance”. However, with power states also tend to choose whether or not to be alliancing with other great states due to the potential power conflict that these states might have. The *offensive power* factors analyze the possibility of states getting more powerful to balance the upcoming threats to them. Stephen Walt stated that states could be far more dangerous when they possess a new and specific military capabilities to a certain level or held a political possession within the national or international level. In other terms, the *offensive power* closely related to the *offensive intentions* aspects. An *Offensive Intentions* elaborated as the belief of the states that other nations are aggressively

improving their military capacity especially if they have aggressive intentions on the paper. As hard as it seems, detecting the aggressive intentions of the counterpart’s nation have proved to be hard, hence it is justifiable to see that such states are willing to be more active in terms of pursuing peace and alliance with other states just to either defuse that “Offensive Intentions” or to seek peace due to enormous extra “Offensive Power” from other states side.

Another variable in the Balance of Threat Theory is Geographic Proximity and Aggregate Power. Proximity is an under-the-radar aspects of elucidating and defining a threat, as proximity tend to be underestimated one thing to be noted is that “enemy is closer than expected” as in the current world, proximity would not be an obstacle of such country to launch an attack or to presenting a threat to another country. As the current world growing more sophisticated in the technology advancement especially military wise, the boundaries and borders of states have become borderless. Explaining the definition of Geographic Proximity, Walt brought the notions that “states that are nearby pose a greater threat than those that are far away”. In the world of international system and cooperation, the such statement evinces to be accurate in many real-life

examples of conflicts across the globe. Nations that bordering each other tend to have a conflict or issues of dispute if they are not under a regional body this is explaining as well that major power especially in the Europe and America have a tendency to concerned more about their next-door neighbors than they do about other potential threats far away from their mainland.

Aggregate Power is the last component that build the whole theory of Balance of Threat. Aggregate Power do not differentiate a lot with the previous mentioned type of power which is "Offensive Power". Aggregate Power speaks the volume and the variable concerned by the states, Powerful states who possess the Aggregate Power aspects won't initiate a balance in the coalition or alliance unless they are considered as the threat by many international stakeholders in one or more different occasion and ways. Aggregate Power define the stacked power and combination of elements adding up to the consideration of such states trying to balance against threats. This is the part of consideration on states turning in to become a bandwagon. Due to the stacked power, states that do band wagoning will be far stronger and have more advantage in balancing their threats by presenting and possessing more

powers. However, the effect of Aggregate Power is certain but yet to be proven in the real-life cases of international politics and negotiation.

Research Method

The method used in this research is to use the Qualitative research method with Secondary Deductive approach as the way to solve the problem mentioned in the introduction. Qualitative research method is the research method that values text, data, graphic charts, and analytical framework different from quantitative research method. John W. Creswell define qualitative research method as method that test and try the theory proposed by using literature study and valued the researcher as the pivoting factor in determining the success of such research (Creswell, 2014). Creswell emphasizing on the importance of qualitative research method to the ability of exploring and acknowledging the value hold by the researcher which could produce such research results that will be pivoting and possessing the deductive ideas and point of view. Linda Harrison and Theresa Callan as quoted by Bakry (2019) argued that qualitative research falls under the field on interpretive and natural research which the design of such research including a far more flexible and explorative approach. This research method utilizing in action, values, belief,

and decision making of the research subject in the primary method. Meanwhile in the secondary method, qualitative will relies on the data provided by third-party researcher and results.

The technique used to gain the data for this research analysis and data will be through secondary method. As mentioned previously, secondary method will use journal and research results from previous research with the main pivot will be surrounding the NATO and Europe political stability and alliance as a whole. Moreover, the data will be collected through reference in the article, database, government website, credible website, and books to collect the data needed to finish and drawing a result and eventually a result of this research later on in this journal paper

Discussion

Status Quo of Russia-Ukraine and Where NATO Stands in Between

The question of NATO's existence as the guardian of Trans-Atlantic region rises into the surface when Russia decides to attack the border and later the capital city of NATO's ally, the Republic of Ukraine back in 24th February 2022 in a "special military operation" ordered by the president of Russia, Vladimir Putin. When we were discussing about how at that this

point in history where Russia attacks the Ukraine, we have to look back in history and see how exactly and why does this thing occurs. Russia has been a very powerful house forces in the part of Europe for most of the time Russia has shown their dignity and their capabilities of becoming one of the biggest military forces in the world. The history of tension between Russia and Ukraine in the 2000s dates back to the full-scale military operations in the area of Crimea and Donbas in 2014. The annexation of Crimea and the Donbas case triggered a chain reaction worldwide, including the relationship between Russia and many NATO countries. In 2016 as a response, NATO strengthened its military presence in the eastern borders of NATO alliance which are Estonia, Lithuania, Poland, Latvia, and Romania; this action is later called the "Enhanced Forward Presence" (EFP) (Mankoff, 2022).

It is clear that the Russian Federation is identified as having violated the norms and principles that contributed to a stable and predictable European security order. NATO recognizes the threats from the Russian Federation as a global threat to the security environment. What concerns NATO is that the Russian Federation is investing in advanced conventional, nuclear and missile

capabilities with little transparency or regard for international norms and commitments. Ally believes that the Russian Federation has interfered in NATO democratic processes and institutions and targets the security of NATO citizens through hybrid tactics, both directly and through proxies. Therefore, NATO will significantly strengthen deterrence and defense for all Allies, enhance support their partners to counter malign interference and aggression. Besides, NATO will remain willing to keep open communication channels with Moscow to manage and mitigate risks, prevent escalation and increase transparency. Thus, creating confidence-building measures is the most crucial for NATO in ensuring the deterrence of both Russia and NATO parties. In the hypothesis, any change in the NATO-Russia relationship depends on the Russian Federation halting its aggressive behaviour and fully complying with international law.

The special military forces by NATO have created such a resistance to the condition in the arena of battle on Ukraine. The question mark however will be stands upon EU's part in making peace or defending Ukraine in this situation. In the status quo we have seen a lot of interdependencies between the EU's part

and the NATO's part in defending the Republic of Ukraine from Russia's attack. While the effectiveness has yet to be profound, the effort brought by the alliances and the EU's part in ensuring that Ukraine's safe need to be appreciated. In in the current development of this conflict we seen that there is a lot of geopolitical movement and diplomacy happening caused by this conflict. The draft resolution voted by most of the members of the United Nations in condemning the act by Russia and what we saw happening throughout all the international system where most of the international bodies and regional bodies are suspending their cooperation with Russia especially in economical wise it's one of the ways to stop this conflict. However, one hasn't seen such an effective measures from the NATO's to stop this conflict.

In contradiction, NATO's trying to "Lit the gasoline to the fire" with their action to include both Sweden and Finland in their enlargement plan by 2023 (Chatterjee, 2022). In the hypothesis this will only worsen the condition happens between the Russia and the Ukraine, the action by NATO would not only decrease the possibility of peace but also increase the tendency of NATO getting drag too much into the conflict. As the expansion of the Enhanced Forward Presence (EFP)

continue to be strengthened with the addition of armies and artilleries in the border of the eastern part of NATO which are Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, and Poland by more than 10,000 armies and hundreds of artilleries (NATO, 2022b), one thing to be aware of is that NATO will always be part of this conflict regardless on how the outcome will fall between the two conflicted parties. What need to be measured and what exactly to be waited, is how NATO will operate in these circumstances later on and how can they prevent themselves to not engage in the direct conflict with the Russian Federation.

NATO's Roles in Europe as Security Alliance Pre-Conflict

The relationship between NATOs and European Union has been love hate relationship especially regarding the defense capability of both institution in the land of Europe. The enactment and the establishment of Berlin Plus agreement back in 2002 is what most of the European countries expected from both of the supranational institution to deliver a strong alliance backbone and to protect the security of the region until today. However, the ratification and the daily operation of such Berlin Plus it's not going well. Take a look at what president macron from French Republic stated back in 2019,

he mentioned about NATO that is slowly becoming a "braindead" alliance (BBC, 2019). The argument stated by the president macron it's not without the reason, in 2019 United States have decrease their support in the NATO alliance by a drastic margin. The abatement done by the president trump error has created such chaos to the NATO's countries leaders. One to be noted is that since the early 2000s The United States have shown their face as the leader of the alliance next to the United Kingdom, France, and Germany. While many of the experts assume that United States and other countries share the same position and leverage within the alliance, the fact is the backbone of the alliance falls to the United States due to their contribution in assigning their troops all over the Europe's member states, with the total number of more than 50.000 troops spreaded in Germany, Italy, United Kingdom, and other central parts of the alliance (Team Reality Check, 2021).

Within the concept of security alliance theory, we have seen so much factors that plays a part in shaping how an alliance react to such a threat to their existence. Analyzing such cases with the framework of security alliance, we need to look into the international determinants and domestic factors on why the reaction

and action happens. In the international determinant factors of NATO, the founding of NATO was to protect the interest and security as an alliance that covered the region of Trans-Atlantic. On the first international determinant, Russian Federation has played such a huge part in shaping the NATO alliance that's what it is today. Russian Federation as one of the major powers that opposed the enlargement of NATO's since the USSR dissolved in 1991. Even though in May 1997 NATO and Russia agreed to the founding act on mutual relations of cooperation and security which lay the foundation for the cooperation of both parties especially for the consultation and coordination the effect of those framework is yet to be efficient (Pifer, 2022). The relationship between NATO and Russia strained cause by the Russian use of military forces to capture Crimea and its involvement in the conflict of Donbass which located in the eastern part of Ukraine circa 2014. The part of this international determinants is proof to be crucial in overseeing the roles of NATO prior to the Russia Ukraine conflict in 2022.

The next one is discussing the domestic factors of nations that's shaping up the NATO alliance. The mutual ground between countries that involve in NATO's

it's all of them are adopting the system of democracy. As one of the unwritten rules to join the NATO alliance, this prerequisite requirement shows that the voice of the people could determine where are their nations stand in the alliance. If we take a look on how the democracy system in the United States which are considered as the "backbone" of the alliance, the vote to decide where does their foreign policy headed relies under public opinion same goes to the United Kingdom, Germany, France, and Netherlands. Proved to be one of the decisive domestic factors we often see the change of heart on nations that trying to contribute more to the alliance or we don't often see a better action from states after public opinion presented. One of the newest examples is NATO's member state are racing to increase their defense budget since the attack of Russia, they were aiming to increase their defense budget by 2% of GDP by 2024 this it's a further step dot the alliance member states have been planning on since the annexation of Crimea in 2014 whereas the member states are expected to increase their military budget by \$140 billion rising up 15% from their previous budget (Balakrishnan & Kirk-Wade, 2022). The increasement did not come without the support from the public which gathered their support for the raising of their

security measurements and to advocate and sympathize on the attack to Ukraine.

NATO's Defense System After Conflict and Future Relations with EU.

The center of power distributed amongst two most influential organizations in the European land NATO and European Union is imbalance, within the year of 2022 both organizations have met several times to discuss about the threats coming from the eastern side of their respective borders which is Russian Federation. Multi-level consultation and coordination between the two organizations have taken places and continue to be intensified since the first weapons raise with the Russian army. Laying as the framework for cooperations of both organizations, the Berlin plus treaty signed in 2003 serves that's the beginning of where NATO's and EU agreed to provide the basis into crisis management especially on command arrangement and assistance and operational planning, hence NATO will support the operations left by European Union regarding the security aspects of the region on which NATO as a whole did not engage as an alliance (Waugh, 2002).

The notions of EU's cooperation with NATO it's that both organizations would work deliberately to secure the region of Europe. In July 2016 on a

meeting in Warsaw Poland the leaders of NATO and EU agree on a joint declaration to enhance their cooperation of countering hybrid threats, enhancing resilience, defense capacity building, cyber defense, maritime security, and exercises. This joint declaration would then continue on the meeting in 2017 and Brussels summits 2018 which take further the partnerships into the areas of military mobility, counterterrorism, and to chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear related issues (NATO, 2022c). on the week of Russia's attack NATO develop a new strategic concept in 2022 Madrid summit which acknowledge that European Union as the "unique and essential partner" for NATO.

The new strategic concept shows that NATO is trying to balancing themselves against the threats from Russia and asking European Union to be part of it. In the Balance of Threat Theory, it discusses about four components that makes states wants to balance against threat- Offensive Power, Geographic Proximity, Aggressive Intentions, and Aggregate Power- in the NATO case three of the components does play in part in making the balancing happens: Geographic proximity, Offensive Power and Aggressive Intentions. The geographic proximity is a "no brainer" due to the

neighboring geographic locations between NATO and the Russia as the threat subject. This particular reason causes fear and perhaps a security dilemma for the alliance to move forward on their plan to enhance and enlarge the alliance. The Geographic Proximity factor added with the Offensive Power shown by the Russia on their attack to Ukraine and there are more than just an Aggressive Intention shown to the world sums up a perfect reason on why NATO is trying to balance themselves against the threat coming from Russia.

In balancing the threat NATO need the help from the European Union. However one to be noted that in status quo, EU are perceived to be the free rider of NATO equipment and strategies and that EU shall have their own defensive forces separated from the NATO (Mattelaer, 2022). This point of view needs to be altered by thoughts that EU and NATO have agreed to support each other's back in the case of a threat coming to the region, the separations of crisis management between NATO and EU would only worsen the condition of the current status quo. With the total members in common of both organization reaching the number of 21 member countries the free rider thoughts is as real as it seems, the potential of merging between two forces might be inevitable caused by the

tendency to balance the threat against the common enemy. Therefore, as the balance of threat theory mention that states are time to do balancing instead of band-wagoning in their doctrine to fight against the incoming threats. The theory also mentioned that with the four components states are willing to cooperate with each other's allies to seize and protect themselves. The future of NATO and EU relationship might become closer the reality of merging due to the upcoming timeline of events that caused a disruption on the geopolitical crisis in Europe. The merging we'll create a unilateral power in the region of Europe to save themselves from the threats more than Russia for such China and North Korea.

Conclusion

To re-strategize the NATO's roles as the security alliance that encompass the area of northern America and most Europe one or two needed to be sacrificed for such the merging of the NATO and EU forces to create a unity in their defense capabilities and capacity building. As the balance of threat theory and the security alliance theory mentioned in their arguments, the NATO and EU are right to be where they at in balancing against the threat. With both organizations have a concrete reason to do the merging, and save the future of Europe from another

potential collision with the eastern threats. It is sufficient to acknowledge the importance of timing and momentum to discuss the probability further in another joint-meeting.

The Russia Ukraine war has proof to be one of the pivotal moments in the development of relationship between EU and NATO, overlooking the roles of NATO in the upcoming futures it is one thing to be sure that NATO will always continue to provoke they're eastern counterparts in an indirect way for such funding the fight of Ukraine's army or to enlarge the membership of the alliance itself. It is an anticipated move in the international world to see where NATO will bring their strategic concept into effect admits and post Russia-Ukraine war, moreover with the international support are divided into 2 and there are many external and internal factors that will be playing part in shaping what will the NATO do and how they will develop themselves among their trusted allies and bitter enemies.

References

Bakry, U. S. (2019). *Metode Penelitian Hubungan Internasional* (3rd Editio). Pustaka Pelajar.

Balakrishnan, S., & Kirk-Wade, E. (2022).

Defence spending pledges by NATO members since Russia invaded Ukraine. *UK Parliament House of Commons Library*.
<https://policymogul.com/library-material/1208/defence-spending-pledges-by-nato-members-since-russia-invaded-ukraine>

BBC. (2019). Nato alliance experiencing brain death, says Macron. *BBC News, November*.
<https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-50335257>

Chatterjee, P. (2022). *Sweden and Finland's journey from Neutral to NATO*. BBC News.
<https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-61397478?piano-modal>

Chun, C.-S. (2000). Theoretical Approaches to Alliance: Implications on the R.O.K.-U.S. Alliance. *Journal of International and Area Studies*, 7(2), 71–88.

Cooper, S. (2003). State-centric balance-of-threat theory: Explaining the misunderstood Gulf Cooperation Council. *Security Studies*, 13(2), 306–349.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09636410490521181>

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (4th Editio).

- Sage Publications.
pics_50069.htm
- D. Williams, P. (2008). Security Studies: An Introduction. In *Routledge New Diplomacy Studies*. Routledge.
- Mankoff, J. (2022). Russia's War in Ukraine Identity, History, and Conflict. *Centre for Strategic and International Studies*.
- Mattelaer, A. (2022). Free Rider No More? Belgium and the NATO Madrid Summit. *Egmont Institute*, June. <https://www.egmontinstitute.be/free-rider-no-more-belgium-and-the-nato-madrid-summit/>
- NATO. (2017). *NATO: Topic- North Atlantic Council*. https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_49763.htm
- NATO. (2019). *The North Atlantic Treaty*. https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_17120.htm
- NATO. (2021a). *NATO: Topic- Military Committee*. https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_49633.htm
- NATO. (2021b). NATO 2030 Agenda. *NATO Factsheets*, June. https://www.nato.int/nato_static_fl2014/assets/pdf/2021/6/pdf/2106-factsheet-nato2030-en.pdf
- NATO. (2022a). *NATO: Topic- Nuclear Planning Group*. https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_50069.htm
- NATO. (2022b). NATO Forward Presence. *NATO Enhanced Forward Presence*, June. <https://shape.nato.int/efp/efp/map>
- NATO. (2022c). *NATO Relations with the European Union*. https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_49217.htm#topic1
- NATO. (2022d). *WHAT IS NATO?* <https://www.nato.int/nato-welcome/index.html>
- Pifer, S. (2022). One. More. Time. It's not about NATO. *Brookings Center for International Security and Cooperation*. <https://www.brookings.edu/opinions/one-more-time-its-not-about-nato/>
- Seigle, C., & Matelly, S. (2020). Global and Regional Security Alliance. *Rutgers University*.
- Team Reality Check. (2021). Nato summit: What does the US contribute? *BBC News*, June. <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-44717074>
- Walt, S. M. (2005). Keeping the World Off Balance: Self Restraint and U.S. Foreign Policy. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.253799>
- Waugh, T. (2002). Berlin Plus agreement. *European Council Documents*, 3.

http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cmsUpload/03-11-11_Berlin_Plus_press_note_BL.pdf

Writer's Biography

Lalu Ladeva Alfusa'idu Karman or Ladeva is a senior undergraduate student in Universitas Brawijaya. Throughout his academic journey, he grew a strong interest in United States & European foreign policy. Mainly, he focuses on the relations of NATO as an alliance in the Transatlantic region and the framework of which European Union was built. Ladeva is also an avid enthusiast of Model United Nations practices and a practitioner on soft-diplomacy model of cultural exchange. Ladeva dedicated to bring his ideation and knowledge forward especially in aforementioned sectors.