Reconfiguring Europe's Forward Presence on the Eastern Flank

28 JUNE 2026

Anton Hahn and Anna Lena Gansaeuer



NATO Compass and Allied Flags

Abstract

Russia's 2022 full-scale invasion of Ukraine disrupted the European security architecture, forcing NATO to transition its Eastern Flank posture from a punitive "tripwire" strategy to operational forward defence. This operational shift designed to deny territorial gains at the border requires robust, high-readiness force packages and extensive operational enablers.

However, as the United States recalibrates its global posture toward the Indo-Pacific and adopts a transactional approach to transatlantic security, Europe faces a dual imperative: it must build a credible forward presence while simultaneously replacing US strategic capabilities.

This paper evaluates the evolution of NATO's force posture on the Eastern Flank, analyzes the capability deficits created by a diminishing US footprint, and details the structural gaps in European Intelligence, Surveil-

lance, and Reconnaissance (ISR), space infrastructure, long-range precision strike, and military mobility.

Finally, it outlines policy recommendations for a cohesive European Grand Strategy capable of delivering independent, high-intensity conventional deterrence.

Introduction: The Strategic Imperative for European Autonomy

The post-Cold War security framework in Europe has concluded. Russia's full-scale invasion of Ukraine in February 2022 confirmed a strategic effort by Moscow to overturn the Euro-Atlantic security architecture, re-establish exclusive spheres of influence, and constrain NATO's operational reach.

Despite sustaining heavy equipment and personnel attrition in Ukraine, Russia is executing a structural re-organization of its armed forces. The formation of the 44th Army Corps in Karelia near the Finnish border and plans to expand existing brigades into full divisions signal a long-term commitment to a high-intensity conventional posture along Europe's Eastern Flank.

Furthermore, Russia's Northern Fleet maintains a core share of the Kremlin's strategic strike vector, including *Yasen-M* nuclear-powered attack submarines capable of delivering long-range, precision conventional strikes deep into the European continent (IISS, 2025). European intelligence agencies project that within the next decade, NATO will face a re-constituted, mass-mobilization military along its eastern perimeter. While potentially technologically inferior to Allied forces in specific domains, its sheer volume, firepower, and reserves will pose a severe threat (Barry et al., 2025).

Concurrently, Europe can no longer operate under the assumption of unconditioned, permanent American security guarantees. The return of President Donald Trump to the White House in 2025 formalized a transactional policy that deemphasizes American leadership within NATO in favor of reallocating military assets to the Indo-Pacific theatre.

Estimates from the International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS) indicate that European Allies would need to deploy approximately $1 trillion in additional capital investments beyond current modernization programs to offset the conventional forces, strategic enablers, and command structures currently supplied by the United States (Barry et al., 2025).

Because the European defense landscape remains fragmented and dependent on American enablers, the European Union and its non-EU European Allies must rapidly pivot from security consumers to security providers. Formulating an integrated European Grand Strategy is no longer an optional academic ambition; it is an operational requirement.

2. The Operational Evolution: From Tripwire Punishment to Forward Denial

Understanding the current operational demands on the Eastern Flank requires analyzing the shift in NATO's underlying deterrence posture since 2014.

The Post-2014 Tripwire Posture and Deterrence by Punishment

Following Russia's illegal annexation of Crimea and initial intervention in the Donbas in 2014, NATO established its Enhanced Forward Presence (EFP). This posture was anchored in **deterrence by punishment**:

> ***Deterrence by Punishment:*** *A strategic calculus that dissuades an adversary not by physically blocking their initial military advance, but by guaranteeing that retaliation will follow, raising the long-term cost of aggression above any immediate tactical gain (Bojang & Jacobs, 2019).*

Under this model, NATO deployed four multinational, battalion-sized battlegroups (roughly 1,000 personnel each) on a rotational basis to Poland, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, supplemented by a Tailored Forward Presence (TFP) in Romania and Bulgaria. These battlegroups were backed by the NATO Response Force (NRF)—a 40,000-strong follow-on force containing the Very High Readiness Joint Task Force (VJTF), capable of deploying 5,000 troops on short notice (Guerout & Romar, 2024; NATO, 2026).

Operatively, these forward battlegroups functioned as political tripwires. They were not sized or equipped to repel a full-scale assault by Russian mechanized forces. Instead, by ensuring that an attack on the Baltic States or Poland would immediately kill or capture soldiers from major Allied powers (including the US, UK, Germany, and France), the tripwire guaranteed the operational invocation of NATO's Article 5 collective defense clause.

However, wargames conducted by the RAND Corporation between 2014 and 2015 exposed the operational vulnerabilities of this strategy. In repeated operational simulations, Russian armored forces bypassed or overran forward tripwire forces, reaching the outskirts of Tallinn and Riga in under 60 hours (Johnson & Shlapak, 2016).

The tripwire model left NATO with a grim strategic dilemma: escalate to nuclear weapons, execute an amphibious and land counter-offensive against an entrenched adversary to liberate occupied Allied territory, or concede defeat and collapse the credibility of the Alliance (Cheravitch et al., 2021).

The Post-2022 Forward Defence Shift and Deterrence by Denial

The 2022 invasion of Ukraine rendered the deterrence-by-punishment model politically and militarily obsolete. The initial Russian advance demonstrated that Moscow was willing to absorb extreme costs to seize territory.

Furthermore, the atrocities uncovered in occupied towns such as Bucha and Irpin made clear to European planners that permitting even temporary occupation of Allied territory resulted in the systematic destruction of civilian populations (Kepe, 2024).

Consequently, at the 2022 Madrid Summit and the 2023 Vilnius Summit, NATO formally transitioned to **deterrence by denial** through a doctrine of **forward defence**:

> ***Deterrence by Denial:*** *A strategy that seeks to deter aggression by making an attack physically infeasible or unlikely to succeed, denying the aggressor confidence in attaining their operational objectives at the border (Mazarr, 2018).*

This operational shift required four structural adjustments:

1. **Scaling Forward Battlegroups:** The existing four battlegroups in the Baltics and Poland, along with four new battlegroups established in Bulgaria, Hungary, Romania, and Slovakia, were expanded to combat-ready, brigade-sized formations (up to 5,000 troops each) backed by pre-positioned heavy equipment and ammunition stockpiles (Calcagno & Marrone, 2024).
2. **The New Force Model (NFM):** Replacing the NRF, the NFM organizes 800,000 Allied troops across a tiered readiness framework:

Tier 1: 100,000 troops operational within 10 days, incorporating the 40,000-strong Allied Reaction Force (ARF).

3. **Tier 2:** 200,000 troops deployable between 10 and 30 days.
4. **Tier 3:** 500,000 troops deployable between 30 and 180 days (Major & Swistek, 2022; Fleischer & Vieth, 2024).
5. **Regional Defence Plans:** Agreed at the 2023 Vilnius Summit, three comprehensive regional plans assign specific geographical responsibilities, readiness thresholds, and force requirements across the High North/Atlantic, Central Europe/Baltics, and the Mediterranean/Southeastern Flank (NATO, 2023).

3. The Dynamics of US Withdrawal and Transatlantic Friction

The operational requirements of forward defence require steady force availability and long-term capability investments. However, the political environment in Washington has introduced systemic uncertainty into NATO's strategic planning.

The Reorientation of US Posture

The Trump administration's national security agenda has driven a pivot toward the Indo-Pacific, resulting in incremental drawdowns and strategic uncertainty across the European theatre:

- **Force Drawdowns in the South-East:** In October 2025, the US Army withdrew approximately 1,000 personnel from Romania—a 50% reduction of its footprint in the country (Costita & Furlong, 2025).
- **Cancellation of Deep-Strike Deployments:** In mid-2026, the Pentagon cancelled the planned stationing of the Multi-Domain Task Force (MDTF) in Germany. This unit was intended to provide an interim deep-precision strike capability using Tomahawk cruise missiles, SM-6 semi-ballistic missiles, and hypersonic glide weapons (Newdick, 2025). Concurrently, Washington rejected Germany's procurement request for 400 Tomahawk missiles, citing inventory constraints and strategic stability considerations regarding Russia (Serohina, 2026).
- **Rotational Arbitrage:** In May 2026, the Pentagon briefly halted the scheduled deployment of the 2nd Armored Brigade Combat Team (1st Cavalry Division) to Poland. While the decision was reversed following allied appeals, it underscored that US forward presence on the Eastern Flank is increasingly subject to political bargaining (Britzkey, 2026; Jack & Wälde, 2026).
- **Naval and Air Capability Withdrawal:** By late May 2026, reports indicated that the US sought to reduce its contributions of naval destroyers, attack submarines, strategic bombers, fifth-generation fighter squadrons, and high-altitude drones from NATO's regional defense allocations, while scaling back its reported contributions to the NFM Tier system (Gray et al., 2026).

4. Capability Deficits: The European Operational Gap

The 2025 NATO Summit in The Hague established revised defense spending and capability targets. While European defense expenditure rose nominally by 50% between 2022 and 2025, the operational demand generated by the regional defense plans creates a significant capability deficit (IISS, 2025; Ruitenberg, 2025).

The updated Minimum Capability Requirements (MCR) outline an increase in required forces:

- **Maneuver Brigades:** Increased from 81 in 2021 to 131.
- **Command and Control Structures:** Warfighting Corps Headquarters increased from 6 to 15; Division Command Posts increased from 24 to 38.
- **Ground-Based Air Defence (GBAD):** Increased from 293 operational units to 1,147 units—a nearly 300% surge (Jungholt, 2024).

European Allies face a dual challenge: they must expand their conventional capabilities by 30% to meet these targets while simultaneously replacing the 30% contribution historically provided by the United States.

Without American structural enablers, Europe's current force structure cannot sustain high-intensity operations along the Eastern Flank.

Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (ISR)

Deterrence by denial requires early warning to track, identify, and target adversary force concentrations across extended battlefields.

Europe operates a small fleet of 36 crewed ISR aircraft, compared to more than 80 operated by the US military. Furthermore, European Signal Intelligence (SIGINT) aircraft account for only one-third of the equivalent US capacity (IISS, 2025). European efforts to develop indigenous Medium-Altitude Long-Endurance (MALE) uncrewed aerial vehicles remain hindered by development delays and procurement fragmentation.

Military Space Infrastructure

Modern targeting and battle management depend heavily on orbital space assets. While the EU operates two main satellite constellations—Copernicus for Earth observation and Galileo for navigation—European militaries face structural gaps in military-grade space situational awareness, early missile warning, and SIGINT constellations (Süß, 2025).

Additionally, European space launch capabilities remain reliant on US commercial providers, while European satellite constellations suffer from low revisit rates. This hinders the maintenance of real-time situational awareness during rapidly evolving contingencies.

Military Mobility and Heavy Infrastructure

Sustaining forward defence requires moving armored formations, artillery systems, and sustainment stocks over 1,000 kilometers to the Eastern Flank. European transportation infrastructure exhibits severe operational bottlenecks (Budginaite-Froehly, 2024):

- **Rail and Structural Infrastructure:** Railway gauge discrepancies between Western and Eastern Europe delay strategic rail transport. In Germany alone, over 4,000 highway bridges require structural repairs to handle military loads (IISS, 2025).
- **Gap-Crossing and Bridging Deficits:** Most European military bridging systems are rated at Military Load Classification 50 (MLC50) or MLC60. However, modern main battle tanks (such as the Leopard 2A7+ or M1A2 SEPv3) and heavy equipment transporters require **MLC80** rated systems (Fish, 2025). A shortage of MLC80 pontoon and ferry systems creates vulnerable choke points at major river crossings, leaving advancing reinforcements susceptible to long-range strike interdiction.

5. Strategic Recommendations: Building an Independent European Defense Capability

To address these capability gaps and build a credible forward defense posture independent of US assets, European governments, the European Union, and European NATO members should pursue four strategic priorities:

Recommendation 1: Prepare for Standalone European Contingencies

European defense planning should assume that US military support in a crisis may be delayed, constrained, or diverted to other theatres.

A European Grand Strategy must prioritize the independent deployment, command, and sustainment of heavy armored formations along the Eastern Flank. This requires establishing pre-positioned ammunition and equipment stocks, securing high-capacity transport corridors, strengthening air and missile defense systems, and establishing independent warfighting Corps and Division command posts.

Recommendation 2: Establish Non-US Force Frameworks

To offset potential drawdowns in US contributions to NATO's high-readiness force pools, Europe should build operational redundancy through non-US frameworks:

- **Coalition Formations:** Strengthen non-US multilateral frameworks, such as the UK-led Joint Expeditionary Force (JEF) or the France-UK Multinational Force–Ukraine (MNF-U), anchored at its strategic joint command headquarters at Fort Mont-Valérien in Paris.
- **EU Rapid Deployment Capacity:** Operationalize the EU's Rapid Deployment Capacity (up to 5,000 personnel/brigade level) using NATO Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe (SHAPE) command infrastructure via the Berlin-Plus arrangement.

Recommendation 3: Integrate Commercial High-Tech Space and ISR Enablers

To rapidly close the critical ISR and satellite reconnaissance gap, European defense ministries should integrate commercial space capabilities into military operations.

Providers such as the Finnish synthetic aperture radar (SAR) company ICEYE demonstrate how commercial constellations can deliver real-time, all-weather radar imaging and data transmission. Governments should utilize long-term anchor tenancy contracts, simplified procurement tracks, and joint commercial-military data-sharing protocols to build a responsive European space architecture.

Recommendation 4: Harmonize EU and NATO Capability Planning

Dual-member states currently face competing demands from the EU's Capability Development Plan (CDP) and NATO's Defence Planning Process (NDPP). Divergent planning requirements fragment limited procurement budgets.

Europe should integrate the procurement activities of the European Defence Agency (EDA) and the NATO Support and Procurement Agency (NSPA). Merging procurement initiatives, standardizing hardware requirements, and pursuing joint equipment acquisitions will eliminate duplication and maximize the output of European defense spending.

6. Conclusion

The transformation of NATO's Eastern Flank posture from a punitive tripwire strategy to forward denial is a necessary operational response to Russian revanchism. However, a forward defense strategy cannot succeed on political declarations alone. It demands heavy armored formations, comprehensive real-time ISR, persistent orbital coverage, robust deep-strike assets, and streamlined military mobility.

As the United States shifts its military focus toward the Indo-Pacific, Europe can no longer rely on American enablers to fill its operational gaps. The security of the Eastern Flank depends on Europe's ability to develop an integrated Grand Strategy.

By building standalone force structures, leveraging alternative coalition frameworks, integrating commercial space technologies, and unifying EU-NATO procurement mechanisms, European nations can construct a credible, independent conventional defense capability that secures the continent for the decades ahead.

References

Barry, B., Barrie, D., Boyd, H., Childs, N., Gjerstad, M., Hackett, J., McGerty, F., Schreer, B., & Waldwyn, T. (2025). *Defending Europe Without the United States: Costs and Consequences. IISS.* https://www.iiss.org/research-paper/2025/05/defending-europe-without–the-united-states-costs-and-consequences/#:~:text=This%20IISS%20report%20assesses%20the%20financial%20costs%20and,the%20United%20States%20were%20to%20withdraw%20from%20NATO (Retrieved on June 8, 2026).

Bashchenko, O. (2025). *US may pull 30% of its troops from Europe – Politico. RBC Ukraine.* https://newsukraine.rbc.ua/news/us-may-pull-30-of-its-troops-from-europe-1753690808.html (Retrieved June 21, 2026).

Boes, S. (2025). *US-Truppenstärke: Europa stellt sich auf Reduzierungen ein. Soldat und Technik.* https://soldat-und-technik.de/2025/08/streitkraefte/44734/truppenstaerke/ (Retrieved on June 21, 2026).

Bojang, O., & Jacobs, J. (2019). *Denial or punishment? Perspectives on the deterrence strategy behind NATO's eFP in Lithuania. Atlantisch Perspektief*, Vol. 43, No. 3, pp. 16-20.

Britzkey, H. (2026). *Trump is cutting the numbers of US troops in Europe. Here's how. CNN.* https://edition.cnn.com/2026/05/14/politics/us-military-troop-numbers-europe-trump (Retrieved on June 21, 2026).

Budginaite-Froehly, J. (2024). *The Missing Link: Railway Infrastructure of the Baltic States and its Defence-related Implications. Globesec.*

https://www.globsec.org/what-we-do/commentaries/missing-link-railway-infrastructure-baltic-states-and-its-defence-related (Retrieved on June 18, 2026).

Calcagno, E., & Marrone, A. (2024). *NATO's Posture vis-a-vis Russia: Features and Challenges. IAI.* https://www.iai.it/sites/default/files/iaicom2409.pdf (Retrieved on June 21, 2026).

Cheravitch, J., Doll, A., Geist, E., & Reach, C. (2021). *Competing with Russia Militarily. RAND.* https://www.rand.org/pubs/perspectives/PE330.html (Retrieved on June 21, 2026).

Costita, G., & Furlong, R. (2025). *US Cuts Troops In Romania Amid Military Posture 'Adjustments'. Radio Free Europe.* https://www.rferl.org/a/33575594.html (Retrieved on June 21, 2026).

Erling, B. (2025). *Poland last on list for US troop cuts in Europe, Polish defence ministry says. Reuters.* https://www.reuters.com/business/finance/poland-last-list-us-troop-cuts-europe-polish-defence-ministry-says-2025-07-31/ (Retrieved on June 21, 2026).

Fish, T. (2024). *Building up: The need for more military bridging systems. European Secruity and Defence.* https://euro-sd.com/2024/09/articles/40268/building-up-the-need-for-more-military-bridging-systems/ (Retrieved on June 8, 2026).

Fleischer, J., & Vieth, A. (2024). *NATO Force Model: Wie Deutschland sich ab 2025 in der Allianz engagiert. Bundesministerium der Verteidigung.* https://www.bmvg.de/de/aktuelles/nato-force-model-wie-deutschland-sich-ab-2025-engagiert-5465714 (Retrieved on June 21, 2026).

Gray, A., Landay, J., & Slattery Gram (2026). *US plans to shrink forces available to NATO during crises, sources say. Reuters.* https://www.reuters.com/world/us-plans-shrink-forces-available-nato-during-crises-sources-say-2026-05-19/ (Retrieved on June 21, 2026).

Greet, K. (2025). *Germany Requests to Buy U.S. Typhon Missile Launchers.The Aviationist.* https://theaviationist.com/2025/07/16/germany-typhon-missile-launchers/ (Retrieved on June 21, 2026).

Guerout, C., & Romar, T. (2024). *The Evolving 'Tripwire' on NATO's Eastern Flank. Wilson Center*. https://www.wilsoncenter.org/article/evolving-tripwire-natos-eastern-flank#:~:text=Back%20then%2C%20NATO%20agreed%20to%20strengthen%20its%20eastern,security%20environment%20in%20Europe%20since%20World%20War%202 (Retrieved on June 21, 2026).

Jack, V., & Wälde, M. (2026). *Rutte and Polish officials cheer Trump's U-turn on NATO troops in Europe.Politico.* https://www.politico.eu/article/rutte-welcomes-trump-poland-uturn-nato-troops/ (Retrieved on June 21, 2026).

Johnson M., & Shlapak, D. (2016). *Reinforcing Deterrence on NATO's Eastern Flank. Rand*.https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR1253.html (Retrieved on June 21, 2026).

Jungholt, T. (2024). *NATO fordert weitere 49 Kampftruppen-Brigaden. Welt.* https://www.welt.de/politik/deutschland/article253847236/Absicherung-gegen-Russland-Nato-fordert-49-weitere-Kampftruppen-Brigaden.html (Retrieved on June 21, 2026).

Kepe, M. (2024). *From Forward Presence to Forward Defense: NATO's Defense of the Baltics. Rand*.https://www.rand.org/pubs/commentary/2024/02/from-forward-presence-to-forward-defense-natos-defense.html (Retrieved on June 21, 2026).

Lunday, C. (2025). *Vance floats US troop withdrawal from Germany over free-speech concerns.Politico*.https://www.politico.eu/article/vance-floats-us-troop-withdrawal-from-germany-over-free-speech-concerns/ (Retrieved on June 21, 2026).

Major, C., & Swistek, G. (2022). *Die Nato nach dem Gipfel von Madrid, SWP-Aktuell No.49.Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik.* https://www.swp-berlin.org/publications/products/aktuell/2022A49_NatoGipfel.pdf (Retrieved on June 21, 2026).

Mazarr, M (2018). *Understanding Deterrence. Rand.* https://www.rand.org/pubs/perspectives/PE295.html (Retrieved on June 21, 2026).

NATO, (2023). *Vilnius Summit Communiqué. NATO.* https://www.nato.int/en/about-us/official-texts-and-resources/official-texts/2023/07/11/vilnius-summit-communique (Retrieved on June 21, 2026).

NATO, (2023). *Vilnius Summit Communiqué. NATO.* https://www.nato.int/en/about-us/official-texts-and-resources/official-texts/2023/07/11/vilnius-summit-communique (Retrieved on June 21, 2026).

NATO, (2026). *Strengthening NATO's eastern flank. NATO.* https://www.nato.int/en/what-we-do/deterrence-and-defence/strengthening-natos-eastern-flank (Retrieved on June 21, 2026).

Newdick, T. (2026). *Confusion Surrounds Future Of U.S. Long-Range Missiles In Germany Amid Rift With White House. The Warzone.* https://www.twz.com/land/confusion-surrounds-future-of-u-s-long-range-missiles-in-germany-amid-rift-with-white-house (Retrieved on June 21, 2026).

Ruitenberg, R. (2025). *NATO to ask allies for 30% capability boost, top commander says. Defense News.* https://www.defensenews.com/global/europe/2025/03/14/nato-to-ask-allies-for-30-capability-boost-top-commander-says/ (Retrieved on June 21, 2026).

Serohina, K. (2026). *US blocks Tomahawk sale to NATO ally over fears of Russia – Politico. RBC-Ukraine*.https://newsukraine.rbc.ua/news/us-blocks-tomahawk-sale-to-nato-ally-over-1780613642.html (Retrieved on June 21, 2026).

Speer, C. (2025). Bundeswehr will 400 Tomahawk Marschflugkörper beschaffen. Sicherheit undVerteidigung.https://suv.report/bundeswehr-will-400-tomahawk-marschflugkoerper-beschaffen/ (Retrieved on June 21, 2026).

Süß, J. (2025). *European Autonomy in Space. Space Systems as a Pillar of European Defence. Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik.* https://www.swp-berlin.org/en/publication/european-autonomy-in-space (Retrieved on June 8, 2026).

The International Institute for Strategic Studies. (2025). *Progress and Shortfalls in Europe's Defence. IISS*. https://www.iiss.org/globalassets/media-library—content–migration/files/publications—free-files/strategic-dossier/pds-2025/complete-file/iiss_strategic-dossier_progress-and-shortfalls-in-europes-defence-an-assessment_092025.pdf (Retrieved on June 8, 2026).