

TARGET

Intelligence Report

VOLUME XXVII No. 176

W E D N E S D A Y

September 17, 2025

Viewsletter

STOP PRESS !

In the afternoon of Friday, September 12, 2025, the Security Council of the United Nations, was supposed to have held an emergency meeting, the briefing, being '*Threats to International Peace and Security*.'

Poland had requested the meeting in a letter to the Council, dated Wednesday, September 10, 2025.

Poland had been one of the countries that Russian drones had been fired from the territories of Belarus.

The Council's European members – Denmark, France, Greece, Slovenia and The United Kingdom – supported the meeting request.

Under-Secretary-General for Political and Peacebuilding Affairs, Ms Rosemary DiCarlo, was the anticipated briefer.

Belarus, Poland, Ukraine, and several other regional states were expected to participate in the meeting under Rule 37 of the Council's Provisional Rules of Procedure, while the European Union (EU) was expected to participate under Rule 39.

In its letter, Poland noted that '*19 cases of incursion by Russian drone-type objects into Polish airspace*' were recorded on the night between 9 and 10 September.

Printed by: TARGET Newspapers Ltd

Suite 2905, 29th Floor, Bank of America Tower, Number 12, Harcourt Road, Central, Hongkong.

Telephone Number: 2573-0379 Facsimile Number: 2838-1597 E-Mail Address: editor@targetnewspapers.com

TARGET Website Address: www.targetnewspapers.com

NOT TO BE REPRODUCED IN ANY FORM OR MANNER IN PART OR AS A WHOLE WITHOUT PRIOR WRITTEN LICENCE OF THE PUBLISHER

It described the incident as the first time since Russia's invasion of Ukraine in February 2022 that '*Polish territorial integrity has been violated on such an unprecedented, massive scale.*'

The letter, further argued that the incursion was a major violation of EU and North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) airspace, which marks an escalation by Russia that brings '*the whole region closer to conflict than ever before*'.

Poland shot down the drones with the backing from NATO allies, including Germany, Italy, and the Netherlands.

There were no reports of casualties in Poland in connection with the incident.

Poland invoked Article 4 of The North Atlantic Treaty, which allows NATO member countries to bring their security concerns to the attention of the North Atlantic Council for discussion.

The invocation of the Article can potentially lead to some form of joint decision or action by NATO, although it does not mandate any response.

After a September 10 meeting of the North Atlantic Council, NATO Secretary-General, Mr Mark Rutte, said that a '*full assessment of the incident is ongoing,*' while arguing that the development was '*not an isolated incident.*'

Since the start of Russia's invasion of Ukraine in 2022, NATO members, Croatia, Poland, and Romania, as well as a non-allied country, Moldova, had reported numerous airspace violations by Russia.

However, the recent incident in Poland was unusual in its scale, and represented the first time that NATO was known to have fired shots since the outbreak of The Russia-Ukraine war.

Russia, for its part, has rejected allegations that it carried out an intentional airborne incursion into Poland.

In a September 10 statement, Russia's Defence Ministry said that its 9-10 September overnight strike against Ukraine, which it described as targeting military infrastructure, '*did not include any targets in the territory*' of Poland.

While the statement accused Poland of spreading '*myths*' in order to '*aggravate the Ukrainian crisis,*' it also expressed the ministry's readiness to hold consultations on the issue with its Polish counterparts.

Belarusian officials have suggested that the drones have been impacted by '*electronic warfare assets*' that made them stray from their intended course.

The Council's European members are likely to condemn Russia's actions, including the airborne incursion into Poland and the increasing attacks against Ukraine, while characterising them as part of a pattern of escalation by Russia that also risks European security.

They are, also, expected to argue that such behaviour undermines peace negotiations to resolve the conflict in Ukraine as well as demonstrating that Moscow is not committed to dialogue.

These members may call on Russia to cease such actions, to uphold international humanitarian law, to protect civilians, and to respect the sovereignty of states.

Russia is expected to reject the allegations levelled against it, regarding the latest incident. It may, also, accuse Europe and NATO of obstructing peace negotiations to resolve the crisis in Ukraine.

Today, Kremlin spokesperson, Mr Dmitry Peskov, told reporters that *‘there is a pause in the talks,’* but, also, noted that the *‘channels of communication are in place and functioning’* and that negotiators can continue outreach through them.

He added that Russia *‘remains ready to pursue the path of peaceful dialogue...but it is true that the Europeans are hindering this.’*

At one of the meetings, Russia might echo certain messages while emphasising that any attempts to address collective security issues must take into account Russia’s interests and concerns.

At the Council’s latest meeting on Ukraine, held on August 29, 2025, Russian Deputy Permanent Representative to the United Nations, Mr Dmitry Polyanskiy, said that Western States are using the proposals for security guarantees to promote *‘one-sided, essentially neocolonial initiatives to deter Russia.’*

Mr Dmitry Polyanskiy further maintained that *‘this applies to the inherently unfeasible European plans for further militarization of Ukraine and the build-up of NATO’s military presence in the Black Sea Region, including airspace patrols.’*

POLISH OFFICIALS INSIST

Poland has rejected the suggestion by President Donald John Trump, of The United States of America, that Russian drone incursions into the Polish airspace could have been a mistake.

‘We would, also, wish that the drone attack on Poland was a mistake. But it wasn’t! And we know it,’ Polish Prime Minister, Mr Donald Tusk, rebuked.

Poland has stated that it had shot down Russian drones in its airspace, the first time that a NATO country is known to have directly fired on Russian drones since it invaded Ukraine.

Last Thursday, September 11, 2025, President Donald John Trump speculated that the incursions *‘could have been a mistake.’*

President Trump went on to state:

‘But, regardless, I’m not happy about anything, having to do with the whole situation.’

Days of Yore

There was a time, not so very past, that The Russian Federation – as it is named, today – was known as **The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (The USSR).**

It was in just two critical years that led to the sudden collapse of the USSR.

Moscow, December 31, 1991: The Red Flag of the Kremlin was pulled down and replaced by the three-coloured banner of Russia.

That marked the end of the USSR and of its ideologies.

In only two years after the fall of the Berlin Wall, Soviet citizens brought down the statues of Vladimir Ilyich Ulyanov Lenin, better known as Vladimir Lenin, a Russian revolutionary, politician, and political theorist.

He was the first head of the Government of Soviet Russia from 1917 until his death in 1924, and of the Soviet Union from 1922 until his death.

Vladimir Ilyich Ulyanov Lenin led the very birthplace of Communism.

From 1989 to 1991, a string of unpredictable and inescapable events took place, through a jolting acceleration of history, bringing to light the rivalry between two men and their struggle for the first place in Government: President Mikhail Gorbachev, hindered by the economic results of his perestroika; and President Boris Yeltsin, said, only, to have embodied the hopes of the Russian people.

President Boris Yeltsin's historic resignation on December 31, 1999, in which he unexpectedly stepped down as Russia's first President, handing power to Vladimir Vladimirovich Putin, a Russian politician and a former intelligence officer.

Delivered on the eve of the new millennium, President Boris Yeltsin's emotional farewell acknowledged the struggles of Russia's post-Soviet transformation.

He asked forgiveness for unfulfilled hopes and expressed confidence in a new generation of leaders.

That address — marked by both vulnerability and resolve — set the stage for Vladimir Vladimirovich Putin to take over the reigns of Government of that which became known as The Russian Federation.

Vladimir Vladimirovich Putin rose while framing Boris Yeltsin's legacy as a leader who, despite flaws, sought to break from totalitarianism and trusted the Russian people's wisdom.

The Complaints

But Vladimir Vladimirovich Putin was never pleased that the 15 countries, those that once constituted The USSR, had been permitted to go their own way, becoming to be independent countries.

Today, governments of at least the four of the former countries, those that had been under the yoke of USSR, now being independent countries, some of which are quite upset with Russian-made drones, bombing their territories, causing havoc to their citizens.

The following are the known populations of the following countries that have been bombed by Russian drones of late:

Poland: 36.55 million population
Ukraine: 38,980,376 population
Moldova: 2,39,000 population
Romania: 18,887,005 population

More to come?

THE PRESIDENT, COUNCIL ON FOREIGN RELATIONS, COMES OUT SHOUTING

Dr Michael Froman, the President, Council on Foreign Relations, has, once more, put pen to paper, making intelligent statements that might well sit with people who prefer logic to force in order to obtain that which they covet:

'In 1651, the English philosopher, Thomas Hobbes, imagined life in the 'state of nature'— that is, a world without governing institutions and guardrails.

'This world was a bleak one, enveloped in a constant state of war that rendered life 'nasty, brutish, and short.'

'Hobbes envisaged a Leviathan, an all-powerful sovereign, as the only means to tame this state of nature.

'The post-World War II rules-based order, defined and led by The United States of America, was the modern alternative.

'Today, we are undergoing a grand experiment testing the impact of moving away from those rules.

'As I've discussed at length, recently, we have already witnessed the death of the global trading system as we have known it. But this slide away from the rules-based system isn't limited to trade. It is evident in the use of military force as well.

'Three examples of unilateral military action over the past couple weeks are particularly instructive:

'First, late Tuesday night, Russia launched more than a dozen one-way attack drones, which entered Polish airspace and crashed on Polish soil — soil we are bound to protect under the NATO charter.

'Make no mistake: Russia has been intently testing the rules-based system — and the prime directive of that system, that states should not use military force to change borders and acquire territory — since 2014 when it invaded Crimea, and again in 2022 when it launched its full-fledged invasion of Ukraine.

'Yet, this week, for the first time in the alliance's history, NATO fighter jets were scrambled to shoot down enemy air assets over NATO airspace.

'Whether the strike was intentional or unintentional, the Russians have failed to offer an explanation, or an apology; instead, Belarusian military officials claimed, in the Russians' place, that the Ukrainian electronic warfare systems caused the drones to veer off course.

'No matter the root cause, the Russian's muted reactions make it clear they are as emboldened as ever to continue testing the limits of the rules-based system.

'That brings me to my second example: Israel.

'It was convenient for The United States of America when Israel reshaped the security landscape of the Middle East by decimating or seriously degrading Iran's regional proxy network, including Hamas (at a tremendous and increasing humanitarian toll), Lebanese Hezbollah, and the Houthis in Yemen.

'Then, of course, there were Israel's (and The United States') strikes on Iran itself, including its nuclear facilities.

'It was far less convenient, however, when this week, Israel launched a unilateral airstrike to assassinate Hamas's political leadership in Qatar. Qatar has a complicated set of relationships across the region, but it has been a mediator between Israel and Hamas and host to Al Udeid Air Base — the largest U.S. military installation in the region.

'What the United States of America knew, and when we knew it is unclear, but the Trump Administration's rare rebuke of Israel suggests that it sees the risks when countries ignore rules or conventions, take matters into their own hands, and act, unilaterally, at others' expense.

'Russia and Israel are not the only ones pushing the envelope when it comes to the use of force.

'Last week, the United States of America struck a boat which President Donald John Trump claimed was transporting drugs "heading to the United States," killing all 11 people onboard. (There are reports that the boat had already turned away.)

'The strike, arguably the most forceful example of Trump's aspiration to assert hemispheric dominance, was notable in its treatment of alleged drug smugglers as combatants of war versus targets of law enforcement.

'The United States of America is not at war with Venezuela; drug smuggling has not historically received the same treatment as imminent national security threats; and Congress did not authorize such an action.

'In a letter to Congress, President Trump argued that The United States of America was compelled to act in self-defence, as thousands of Americans die annually from drug overdoses. Self-defence, however, is usually a rationale when there is an imminent threat or actual harm.

'Is this action the start of a sustained policy to employ lethal force against suspected drug traffickers outside U.S. borders, bringing new meaning to "the war on drugs?"

'And how would the United States of America respond if Russia, China, or another opportunistic power used a similar premise to strike a vessel in the Black Sea, Taiwan Strait, or elsewhere? The risks of retaliation, imitation, and contagion are not so easily dismissed.

'That is the real Hobbesian peril.

'Each of these actions can be seen as an isolated instance, but if one or two or three countries take kinetic action unilaterally, it risks creating a permission structure where others feel there are no guardrails to constrain them. We could see a more widespread undermining of the rules-based system, including around the centre-piece of the post-World War II system: Constraints on the use of force.

'Admittedly, maintaining the rules-based system can be an expensive and, at times, fraught endeavor. A core proposition of Trump's thinking, on American foreign policy, is that the United States of America got sucked into "forever wars" and did not receive adequate compensation for serving as the world's de-facto policeman during the post-Cold War era.

'There is a grain of truth in Trump's assessment, even if the manner in which he challenges the old order comes with significant costs itself.

'As the United States' commitment to upholding the rules-based international system frays, we may unshackle ourselves from burdensome norms and exercise power more swiftly and unilaterally than before.

'But the same could well hold true for our allies, competitors, and adversaries alike.

'Left unchecked, a system defined by jungle rules could end up posing more, not fewer demands for at least some measure of U.S. intervention, given our interests around the world.

'The historian, Mr Robert Kagan, has opined that the liberal international order of the post-World War II era, defined by a rules-based system, was not the natural state of world affairs but an aberration, a fragile and artificial construct, sustained only by deliberate American power. Hobbes would certainly agree, and the jungle can always grow back.

'While I understand why we might be tempted to live there — as the rent is very cheap — the ecosystem is not particularly hospitable.

'Just take a look at the first half of the twentieth century!'

*

*

*

*While **targetnewspapers.com** makes every attempt to ensure accuracy of all data published, **targetnewspapers.com** cannot be held responsible for any errors and/or omissions.*