

East, West and European NNA Discuss Military Doctrines

From January 16 to February 5 in Vienna, senior military leaders from the 35 states participating in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) met in Vienna to discuss their countries' respective military doctrines and strategies. The Military Doctrine Seminar, which was the first of its kind, came out of a Western proposal at the Negotiations on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures (CSBMs).

Four broad themes were addressed:

- military strategy against the background of national security policy;*
- military structure and posture;*
- military activities and training;*
- military budgets and planning.*

The seminar was a venture into a relatively unexplored approach to security problems. By providing a forum for dialogue among Eastern, Western and European neutral and non-aligned nations about doctrines and strategies, it attempted to promote understanding of the intentions lying behind military force structures and activities. The seminar was expected to enrich the material under discussion in the CSBM Negotiations.

Canada was represented at the seminar by Mr. David Peel, Canadian Ambassador to the CFE and CSBM Negotiations; General John de Chastelain, Chief of the Defence Staff of the Canadian Forces; Lieutenant-General Richard Evraire, Canadian Military Representative to the Military Committee at NATO Headquarters, Brussels; and Major-General Brian Smith, Commander Canadian Forces Europe, based at Lahr, the Federal Republic of Germany.

The following are Lieutenant-General Evraire's impressions of the seminar.

The Military Doctrine Seminar was a very positive experience that took place in an atmosphere of courtesy, coopera-

tion and openness. Much of the material presented was already well-known, with the possible exception of the rapidly-evolving doctrines of the Eastern Europeans. In these circumstances, the process of exchanging views and positions between NATO and the WTO on important military matters became more important than the actual substance of the presentations.

The WTO presentations tended to place heavy emphasis on the new defensive doctrine of their forces. In many respects, it was obvious that these declared doctrinal changes had not yet been fully implemented in a revised force structure, although numerous

Exchange of views important in light of rapidly-evolving doctrines of the Eastern Europeans

changes were underway. Nonetheless, it was heartening to note that this process of change is being hastened in many Eastern countries by an increased civilian control of the military.

The most interesting portion of the seminar was the presentations by the non-Soviet WTO nations. There was a general lack of clarity in their statements. This was perhaps deliberate, given the rapidity of political change these nations had undergone immediately prior to the seminar, particularly Romania. The clearest statements came from Hungary, addressing the withdrawal of Soviet troops and the redeployment of national forces within their country. Poland was relatively cautious in its statements and the Czechs were preoccupied with the question of the withdrawal of Soviet forces from their territory. The GDR representatives still hewed to a relatively traditional line.

The main concerns of the WTO centred around what they considered to be offensive aspects of NATO's doctrine, which they felt were not in keeping with the Western alliance's stated defensive nature. These included questions on follow-on forces-attack (FOFA), naval forces, flexible response, forward defence, rapid deployment forces and the purpose and meaning of deterrence, both conventional and nuclear. In response, NATO provided substantive justification in every case, while admitting that some concepts, such as FOFA, may have to evolve to keep up with changing circumstances.

The neutral and non-aligned (NNA) nations placed heavy emphasis on the defensiveness of every aspect of their military posture. In several cases, they seemed to be promoting their structure and doctrine as models for the future of Europe, ignoring the geostrategic reality of NATO neighbours which makes their neutrality possible. The NNA also attempted to put forth the idea of a set of criteria against which the defensiveness of a national military posture could be evaluated. This proposal did not meet with universal acclaim, as it was felt that any such criteria would not provide an equitable standard for evaluation due to the considerably different security requirements of each nation.

In the case of NATO, while there were considerable differences in style and emphasis, there was also a remarkable degree of solidarity and fundamental consistency among the national presentations. The Western alliance provided solid evidence of its defensive orientation, although it did so by including certain offensive capabilities as an integral part of that defence. NATO's main concerns with the WTO presentations centred around the still-tenuous link between the declared new defensive intentions and a revised force structure, as well as the status of Soviet stationed forces in other WTO nations.