

# Political Alternatives of the Security Strategies

Tamar Kupreishvili<sup>1</sup>, Tornike Okropilashvili<sup>2</sup>

**Abstract** - Based on the historical dynamics, the geo-political location is a key aspect to determine the security policy of the states and its long-term strategies. The first consideration is the provision of sovereignty and territorial integrity, and its maintenance requires deterring a potential enemy, and in some cases, self-defense. In order to achieve this task, the most experienced methods in national security architecture are strategic alliance and policy of neutrality. Among the mentioned strategies, special importance is given to the cost-benefit analysis and the foreign political vector, on which the states establish the security policy and the possible strategies for its provision.

The dynamics of international relations and empirical experience shows that some states violate international agreements and create a destructive environment. When the important players violate the general principles of international law and create such an environment, a domino effect of global vulnerability is created. When the international order can no longer provide stability, then neutral states are at high risk and start looking for allies to provide security. The formation of a security policy begins in proportion to the increased risks and challenges, which changes the existing conditions on the international platform and states remain without international guarantees. States try to increase their security and reduce risks by diversifying their sources of security, thus they form certain relationships into the military alliances.

**Index Terms** - Deterrence Policy, Big Strategic Security, Neutrality, Strategic Alliance, International Regime.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Due to the changing dynamics of state relations, the geo-political location and epochal ambitions of powerful states strongly influence its security policy and long-term strategies. Such strategies shape the security environment and possible alternatives for its provision. In international relations, there are two categories of states: states which create a security environment and states which adapt to such environment. Accordingly, the primary task of ensuring strategic security of adaptable states is to identify potential risks and earn appropriate strategies to deal with the expected threat in a specific period of time.

When it comes to the security policy of states, the priority is to ensure sovereignty and territorial integrity in the long-term perspective. The basis of such a political strategy is the "policy of deterrence", that the state uses all the possible resources and opportunities, which causes that the opponent does not have the desire for direct military intervention. History shows many possible strategies for accomplishing this task, but the most experienced and tested ways are the strategic alliances and neutrality. The main goals of those are: ensuring national security and containing potential risks.

According to the national military strategy of Georgia, the purposes of effective deterrence are forcing a potential adversary to abandon an armed attack due to military failure and/or undue losses, preventing possible military aggression of the enemy through the development of combat-capable, adequately equipped, staffed and trained armed forces. Besides, deterrence includes the use of diplomacy, politics, economics, geo-political location, and other opportunities to avoid conflict and prevent potential escalation. Ensuring deterrence and defense requires a high level of preparedness of the armed forces, the ability to efficiently respond to a crisis and the effective mobilization of forces<sup>1</sup>.

For adaptive states, deterrence policy is a long-term strategy, when tries to develop its capabilities with limited resources. Currently, the state considers its geo-political location and current processes and draws the best political solutions for the country. From this perspective, it is necessary to study potential allies and adversaries, and evaluate their military-economic power and perspectives. If the power of the adversary exceeds the benefits received from the alliance, then the majority of states choose a neutral policy, and if the benefits received from the alliance are greater than the possible damage caused by the adversary, then states develop strategic alliances. When drawing up the mentioned strategies, special importance is given to the cost-benefit analysis and the foreign political vector. Key leverage of deterrence policy is the manipulation of military capabilities: its increasement or, on the contrary, its radical reduction<sup>2</sup>.

## II. POLITICAL PERSPECTIVES OF NEUTRALITY

To ensure deterrence, a certain category of states consider a policy of neutrality as a long-term strategy. Such states are generally small and medium-sized or have a vulnerable geo-political location. The security policy of most of them is determined by the changing international environment and its external effects. In turn, there are 3 major forms of neutral policy in international relations: permanent neutrality; armed neutrality; and actual neutrality<sup>3</sup>.

In all three cases, political and military capabilities are optimized and limited to the sovereign territory of the country, within the country's borders. In the case of permanent neutrality, the country refuses to participate in future possible wars, of which status is internationally recognized by other states. In this case, the country completes its obligation not to

<sup>1</sup> Ministry of Defense of Georgia. National Military Strategy of Georgia, 2014, page 6.

<sup>2</sup> A. Tyushka A and L. Czechowska, Strategic Partnerships, International Politics and IR Theory, 2019.

<sup>3</sup> I. Menaghisvili, is it acceptable to declare Georgia's neutrality, 2017, p. 3.

enter bilateral and/or multilateral alliances and not to get involved in any form of conflict of another states. Nevertheless, it may reserve the right to self-defense and develop armaments at the national level. Mainly, permanent neutrality is chosen by the small or medium-sized states, to strengthen their independence and sovereignty and security. Moreover, it should be noted that this status must be recognized by the other states, and they must fulfill their obligations. The states, by using the status of permanent neutrality, mainly define economic development as a political priority and address the issue of the establishment of a universal status, which will be equally accessible to all states, as the main political priority. These states are usually international economic centers, multicultural corporations, or stock exchanges.

In the case of armed neutrality, the country reserves the right to defend itself and develop its armed forces, to ensure its neutral status and its own security. The states use this strategy to have the ability to defend themselves against potential aggression and it is conditioned by geo-political location. Such states have strong armaments, but refuse to involve themselves in other states conflicts, in any form or way, including the supply of arms and ammunition. The states with armed neutrality have the ability, both from the military and economic perspective, to cope with the expected aggression of the enemy, without the help of other states.

The actual neutrality may be formalized legally, or actual circumstances may determine its status. Legally, neutrality may be formalized by a domestic or international act, while in reality, neutrality may be a state's established policy of disarmament and/or non-intervention in conflicts. Such states direct their resources to the development of the national economy and maintain a minimum of armaments in the country, sufficient to eliminate internal conflicts, by police forces. States with *de facto* neutrality claim such status to reduce the potential risks that determines their military status, and their policy is not perceived as a threat to a potential adversary in the long term<sup>4</sup>.

In all three cases, the policy of neutrality depends on the geo-political location, current political events, and foreign policy priorities of the state. International law contains three restrictions on the actions of neutral countries during war: first, not to supply their own armaments to the opposing parties; secondly, not to give up one's territory to the opposing parties in any way; Thirdly, to show an equally neutral attitude towards the opposing parties, the restriction should be the same or should not exist at all. Such strategies are used as deterrence, not to spill over the conflict into the territory of the states. However, in any case, neutrality must be respected by other states, and they must not violate international order, agreements, and obligations.

International law defines, recognizes and protects neutrality, such a policy and its possible security guarantees have lost relevance in parallel with Russia's war in Ukraine. States with neutral status began to increase armaments and cooperate with the alliance, with the aim of later joining (examples of Finland and Sweden). Several countries admit

that the neutral policy failed to ensure their security and stability (examples of Ukraine and Moldova).

On July 16, 1990, the Rada of Ukraine adopted a declaration defining the country's nonaligned status. Until 2014, Ukraine maintained a neutral status, but it could not ensure its security, sovereignty, and territorial integrity. Ukraine intended that a neutral status would preserve its long-term stability, but in 2014 such a status failed to save Ukraine from Russian aggression, which resulted in the second bloody Maidan, the annexation of Crimea and the occupation of eastern Ukraine<sup>5</sup>.

Unlike to Ukraine, Moldova decided to resolve the existing territorial problem with a neutral status and declared permanent neutrality in 1994. After this adjustment, Russia had to withdraw the 14th Army from Dnipro, which has been stationed there since Soviet times. But the neutral status did not ensure the restoration of Moldova's territorial integrity, and Russian occupation forces remain there to this day<sup>6</sup>.

After 2020, the defense budgets of Sweden<sup>7</sup> and Finland<sup>8</sup> has been increased significantly in response to increased challenges in the region. Although Sweden had almost 2 centuries of experience of neutrality, after 2020 strategic armaments and their placement on important military sites, including Gotland and the Musk Islands, has begun<sup>9</sup>. Along with the increased risks, Finland's defense budget has also increased, and both countries have applied for NATO membership in 2022. In response to the increased challenges, neutral states defined a new security policy in which, the main guarantor of security will be a military alliance and collective defense<sup>10</sup>.

### III. ALLIANCE FOR STRATEGIC SECURITY ASSURANCE

Historical dynamic reveals that at a certain point in time, there are states that violate international agreements and create a destructive environment. Henry Kissinger explains that "the creation of mass instability or such behavior has the effect of influencing other states. If any important player creates such instability and violates the rules of the international game, it encourages other states to do the same". Accordingly, states with a neutral status may change their policies in proportion to the current processes in international relations. Since the international order and the agreements between the states are the solid foundation of the neutral status, in the case of the absence of such order or its violation, the neutral states are in direct danger. At such a time, the international order can no longer provide a neutral status, since the state guaranteeing such a status, it becomes a threat itself.

When important players violate the general principles of international law and create an unstable environment, a domino effect of global insecurity is created. If the international order can no longer provide stability, then

<sup>5</sup> Official Page of Ukrainian Rada: Constitutional amendments, 2014.

<sup>6</sup> Constitution of the Republic of Moldova.

<sup>7</sup> Military budget of Sweden, 2015-2020.

<sup>8</sup> Military budget of Finland, 2015-2020.

<sup>9</sup> P. Hulqvist, Talks on the security situation in the Baltic Sea Region, 2021

<sup>10</sup> Official Page of NATO, Finland and Sweden submit Applications to join NATO, 2022.

<sup>4</sup> A. Michalski, *Diplomacy in a changing world order: The role of Strategic Partnerships*, 2019, page 13.

neutral states are at a high risk and start looking for allies to ensure security. In proportion to the increased risks and challenges, the formation of a security policy begins, which changes the existing conditions and remains without international guarantees.<sup>11</sup>

States whose national security is based on the general rules and principles of international agreements, in parallel with the formation of an unstable international environment, need the help of strong states to ensure their security. As a rule, such states sign bilateral or multilateral mutual assistance agreements and undertake to help the partner in the direction of improving the security environment. However, the process of strategic military cooperation is long-term (complex) and requires a number of changes in the political, civil, and military sectors.

The dynamics of international relations are based on the behavior of states in a long-term perspective and are determined by the geographical or political characteristics. Hence, the behavior of important players creates an international regime, which in turn determines the security policy of states. As the international regime changes in proportion to the behavior of important players, states have to produce and manipulate security policies appropriate to the regime. At such a time, the primary task of the country is to ensure sovereignty and territorial integrity, which should not be negatively affected by the change of the international regime.

The history of relations between states shows that security policy should not be based on a specific political event, and it should respond to the challenges in a long-term perspective. That is why it is important to correctly identify the containment policy that should ensure stability and a safe environment. As usual, close cooperation of states and pooling of defense capabilities are solid foundation for long-term strategic security and neutralization of potential risks.

In spite of the fact that security and its prospects are mostly considered in strategic alliances, it is important to understand it for the structures of international system, along with the change of global balance. As the international system changes, strategic alliances have the deterrent leverage to minimize the threats posed by change. At such times, the goal of alliances is to provide stability and protect members from outside actors. Expected changes in international security should not be harmful for the Allies, since their security policy has already defined a deterrent lever, which will be the main instrument of the "deterrence policy"<sup>12</sup>.

Ensuring strategic security requires a military alliance, which is a formal agreement between the nations regarding national security. Parties of the military alliance agree to actively participate in defense of other members in case of crises and during their progress. Such cooperation and security guarantees establish policy of common deterrence in the long-term perspective.

International relations hold many examples of the formation and dissolution of military alliances that arise in

response to a specific challenge. Security formation in this way is related to the challenges that the alliance must deal with, to avoid disintegration. An alliance can improve both: deterrence and defense, by considering the common interests of allies to other states (including each other) and shaping the interests of allies based on/ respect to the commitment of support.

States forming certain relations into military alliances. Announced official commitments increase the credibility of other states' aid intentions and cost-benefit commitments. In case of signing an alliance, the parties fulfill the obligation to provide assistance to each other. But, at the same time there is a risk, on the part of fulfilling obligations, how state will behave if it does not match its national interests at that time. Given these two dilemmas, it is necessary to have a political concept of alliance security that should provide credible deterrence before the war, as well as effective defense in a case of war.

For the viability of military alliances, it is necessary to fulfill the obligations that the states owe to each other and to the goals of the alliance. To meet such commitments, alliances define levers that include military coordination and a common defense policy. The alliance's defense policy should be unified, which can be achieved by the multinational command structure, common equipment and techniques, and joint military exercises, which should form multiple national contingents into a single fighting force. This kind of alliance, pre-war military coordination and unified military capabilities make the alliance as a unified force.

States seek to increase their security and reduce risk by diversifying their sources of security. But, at the same time, a state can strengthen its security by seeking allies or creating its own army. In both cases, cost-benefit analysis is crucial. Financial obligations are one of the important components of alliance membership. When a state intends to become a member of the alliance based on its security policy, it is necessary to identify the costs that it will have to pay in a case of membership, which requires a review of national interests and material resources. If the goal of the alliance is to deter a threat, then successful deterrence takes the form of a public good. This deterrence depends on the overall military strength of alliance, so allies want to reduce their own military costs but share the benefits of deterrence<sup>13</sup>.

The strongest example of a modern alliance is the North Atlantic Treaty Organization - NATO. To ensure security and stability, NATO has defined 14 articles that respond to the challenges of collective defense, peace, and security. Among other agreements, the treaty defines the main lever of deterrence and defense, Article V, which ensures the security of the member states of the alliance in the long term.

On April 4, 1949, based on the North Atlantic Treaty, NATO was formed, in purpose to ensure the freedom and security of the member countries, both from a political and military perspective. Besides the military-political values, the alliance has an ideological framework that feeds into the long strategic security and is linked to democratic peace. However, at the modern stage, NATO has developed new dimensions of security policy related to its political responsibility and

<sup>11</sup> A. Michalski, *Diplomacy in a changing world order: the role of strategic partnership*, 2019, page 14-15.

<sup>12</sup> J. Kathleen, *The competitive Advantages and Risks of Alliances*, 2019.

<sup>13</sup> J. Kathleen, *The competitive Advantages and Risks of Alliances*, 2019.

obligations to ensure international security. NATO has set a goal of diversifying its security strategies, which goes beyond the specific military-political dimensions and transforms into a broad multinational organization with the goal to provide big strategic security.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

Security and its dimensions remain the main problem in international relations, which changes according to the expansive manifestations of powerful states. The security policy of any state is aimed for long-term stability, which has various national interests, in proportion to the state power. The changing nature of the international environment cannot ensure universal stability because national interests often go beyond the borders of a particular state and come into conflict with the interests of other countries, and in some cases with internationally recognized rules and norms.

In order to avoid the mentioned negative effect, the followers of the theory of international relations consider the policy of deterrence as a part of the strategy. Strategy is always based on a long-term perspective and can evolve over years, involving increasing capacity and gaining influence with limited resources. Since its existence, the states have been trying to increase its power, which is dictated by the geo-political situation. Due to this power, in many cases weak states have to adapt to the will of stronger players and obey the rules of the game initiated by them. If we reduce international relations to the level of the power of states, then we mainly meet 2 types of states: states who create the international environment and states who adapt to such an environment.

Accordingly, the behavior of important players creates an international regime, which in turn determines the security policy of states. As the international regime changes in proportion to the behavior of important players, states have to produce and manipulate security policies according to the regime. Taking this into account, the states should make a decision about what kind of policy will be most effective to ensure their national security in the long term and have a deterrent factor against a potential aggressor. History shows that security policy should not be based on a specific event and should respond to the challenges in the long-term perspective. That is why it is significant to correctly identify the deterrence policy that ensures stability and safe environment. The effectiveness of the deterrence policy is a form of public good, which is achieved in proportion to national security.

By providing a policy of deterrence, the most experienced security strategies are the policy of neutrality and strategic alliances. Based on the political dimensions of state security and national interests, the country's long-term strategy is defined, which requires an analysis of the international system and geo-political situation. Since the main purpose of the state security policy is to ensure long-term stability, the selection of such strategies should be based on historical experience and respond to modern challenges.

Based on the dynamics of relations between states, the policy of neutrality cannot ensure long-term stability, because

using this policy needs a stable international regime, an agreement between strong states and a special geo-political location. Since the nature of international security is changing, in order to ensure long-term stability, it is necessary to develop strategic alliances, which should provide reliable deterrence before war, as well as effective defense in case of war, based on the principle of a unified force.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] I. Menagharishvili, "Is it acceptable to declare Georgia's neutrality", Georgian Strategy and International Relations Research Foundation, 2017. P.1-3
- [2] P. Hultqvist, "Defence ministers from Sweden and Estonia visit Gotland for talks on the security situation in the Baltic Sea region". 2021. P.6-9  
<https://www.dw.com/en/swedens-gotland-gets-ready-for-anything-amid-rising-russian-threats/a-60620892>
- [3] J. McInnis Kathleen, „The Competitive Advantages and Risks of Alliances“, The Heritage Foundation 2019. P.5-6
- [4] A. Michalski, "Diplomacy in a Changing World Order: The Role of Strategic Partnerships", Swedish Institute of International Affairs 2019. p.3-4
- [5] Military budget of Finland by years:  
<https://www.statista.com/statistics/530097/defence-budget-relative-to-gdp-finland/>
- [6] Military budget of Sweden by years:  
<https://www.statista.com/statistics/695627/military-spending-in-sweden/>
- [7] Official Page of NATO.  
"Finland and Sweden Submit Applications to Join NATO". 2022.  
[https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/news\\_195468.htm](https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/news_195468.htm)
- [8] Official website of Presidency of the Republic of Moldova "Constitution of the Republic of Moldova":  
<https://www.presedinte.md/eng/constitution>
- [9] Official website of Ukrainian Rada: <https://www.rada.gov.ua/>
- [10] A. Tyushka and L. Czechowska, "Strategic partnerships, international politics and IR theory", Social and Political Science 2019. P. 12-30