S.F. CUSTOS GLOBAL REACH LTD.
SECURITY · INTELLIGENCE · PROTECTION

SPECIAL REPORT
2026-07-10

SPECIAL REPORT · EUROPE / NATO / UKRAINE

# Europe Without Assumptions: Hodges on NATO, Ukraine and the Burden Shift

**Author:** Benjamin Traunecker

## Executive summary

Europe can no longer plan its security on the assumption that the United States will always carry the same political burden inside NATO. That is the practical message behind Lt. Gen. Ben Hodges' latest public remarks. His argument is not that NATO is finished. It is that European governments must stop treating American reliability as a fixed operating condition.

For SFC Global clients, the issue is not alliance theory. It is operating risk. A Europe that carries more of the deterrence burden will spend more, rearm faster, harden infrastructure, tighten sanctions enforcement and accept more friction with Russia-linked business networks. That affects travel, supply chains, insurance, energy exposure, executive movement and crisis planning across the eastern flank and, increasingly, western Europe.

Hodges' strongest point is also the least comfortable one for European decision-makers: the combined population, wealth, technology, industry and military potential of Europe, the United Kingdom, Canada, Norway and Ukraine exceeds Russia's by a wide margin. The gap is not capability on paper. The gap is political will, coordination and urgency.

The immediate risk picture therefore has two layers. First, Russia remains unable to achieve a decisive ground victory in Ukraine at acceptable cost, but it can continue missile, drone and glide-bomb pressure against cities, infrastructure and logistics. Second, Europe is moving from a support posture into a burden-bearing posture. That transition will be uneven. Germany, Poland, the Nordic states, the Baltic states and the United Kingdom will matter most; southern and western European governments may move more slowly.

The likely 2026 pattern is not a clean turning point. It is a grinding adjustment: more defence spending, more industrial pressure, more sanctions enforcement, more resilience planning and more political contestation over how far Europe should go without assuming a full U.S. lead.

## Why the Hodges signal matters

Hodges is not a neutral observer of the Ukraine war. He is a former commanding general of U.S. Army Europe and one of the most consistent Western voices arguing that Ukraine can still deny Russia strategic success. His remarks should be read as expert assessment, not as official policy. Still, they matter because they translate a larger alliance problem into operational language: logistics, will, production, sanctions enforcement and leadership.

The important shift is the loss of assumption. European planners may hope that the United States remains deeply engaged in NATO, but they cannot treat that as a baseline. If Washington becomes more transactional, more focused on the Western Hemisphere or less willing to lead European deterrence, Europe has two options. It can either build real autonomous weight inside the existing NATO framework, or it can leave gaps that Russia will test below the threshold of open war.

That does not require a new European security organisation. Hodges' view is closer to the practical answer: keep NATO structures, use existing headquarters and procedures, and build stronger European groupings where they already make sense. The Joint Expeditionary Force, the Nordic-Baltic cluster, Poland, Germany and the United Kingdom are more relevant than another institutional debate.

## The Russia problem is not only Ukraine

The interview-led candidate focused on Ukraine, NATO and European security, but the underlying problem is wider. Russia is already using military pressure, sabotage, cyber activity, energy leverage, political influence and sanctions evasion as one operating picture. European governments may not describe all of that as war in public language, but the practical effect is clear: critical infrastructure, ports, energy networks, rail links, defence production and political cohesion are now security targets.

NATO's own energy-security framing is useful here. The Alliance does not treat energy as an isolated commercial issue. It links reliable supply, diversified routes, critical energy infrastructure and military fuel supply to resilience and collective defence. That supports Hodges' focus on Russia's oil and gas revenue, shadow fleet activity and sanctions enforcement. Energy is not only a market question. It is part of Russia's war-sustainment base.

Ukraine's strikes against Russian refineries, export infrastructure and maritime oil logistics fit that logic. The point is not to defeat Russia in a single strike campaign. The point is to make the war harder to finance, harder to supply and harder to sustain. For companies, this also means a tighter compliance environment. Shipping, insurance, maintenance, bunkering, dual-use components and intermediaries will face sharper scrutiny where Russia-linked networks are suspected.

## Germany is the pressure point

Hodges' argument places Germany at the centre. That is analytically sound. Germany has the economic weight, geography and industrial depth to shape Europe's deterrence posture. It is also politically constrained by its own history, coalition politics, fiscal debates and the legacy of energy dependence on Russia.

The gap between German potential and German speed matters for business. If Berlin accelerates, defence procurement, logistics corridors, rail security, ammunition production, energy resilience and host-nation support will receive more attention. If Berlin hesitates, Poland, the Nordic states and the Baltic states will move anyway, but Europe will remain less coherent.

For SFC Global clients, Germany's role should be watched through practical indicators rather than speeches. Useful indicators include defence-industrial orders, ammunition production contracts, rail and port resilience measures, civil-defence messaging, counter-sabotage prosecutions, and sanctions enforcement against Russia-linked services.

## The Ukraine front: hard, but not lost

Hodges' frontline assessment is that Russia cannot easily overwhelm Ukrainian defenders. That view must be treated as expert judgment, not as a verified battlefield forecast. It is consistent, however, with the broader pattern seen through open-source war reporting: Russia can continue attritional pressure and long-range attacks, but a decisive operational breakthrough remains difficult without solving manpower, logistics, command and equipment constraints.

The danger for Ukraine is not only territorial loss. It is fatigue: manpower strain, civilian casualties, air-defence depletion, infrastructure damage and wavering external support. Russia's theory of victory still relies on the West tiring before Moscow runs out of usable resources. That makes sanctions enforcement and defence production as important as battlefield courage.

For corporate risk managers, the Ukraine theatre remains a direct operating concern only for organisations with personnel, suppliers, assets or transit exposure in or near Ukraine. Indirect exposure is broader: energy prices, cyber spillover, defence-industrial bottlenecks, border disruption, refugee flows, insurance exclusions and political pressure on companies still linked to Russian markets.

## Implications for organisations

The first business implication is that Europe is entering a longer security mobilisation cycle. This does not mean daily crisis everywhere. It means normal corporate planning in Europe will carry more security assumptions than it did before 2022.

Companies should expect more checks around Russia-linked trade, maritime services, dual-use items, technology transfer and beneficial ownership. They should also expect more public sensitivity around suppliers, ports, insurers and logistics partners connected to the shadow fleet or sanctioned networks.

The second implication is travel and site security. Eastern flank travel can continue in most areas, but executive movement should be tied to current airspace, rail, border, protest and cyber conditions. Germany, Poland, the Baltics, Finland and Romania are not equal-risk environments, but they are all part of the same deterrence geography.

The third implication is business continuity. Companies with European headquarters, data centres, logistics hubs or energy-intensive operations should test scenarios involving cyber disruption, rail interruption, port congestion, fuel constraint, sanctions enforcement action and sudden government requests for information.

## Watch indicators

- German defence and resilience spending moving from announcement into signed contracts.
- New Baltic Sea enforcement actions against shadow fleet activity or maritime support services.
- Russian sabotage, cyber or influence cases leading to prosecutions in EU states.
- Ukrainian strike patterns against Russian energy infrastructure and export nodes.
- NATO or EU measures on military mobility, ammunition production and critical infrastructure protection.
- Any U.S. policy signal that reduces, conditions or delays support to Ukraine or European deterrence.

## SFC Global assessment

The strategic direction is clear enough for planning: Europe is moving toward a harder security environment, but not at one speed. Russia does not need to defeat NATO to create cost. It only needs to exploit delay, division and underprotected infrastructure.

The best near-term posture for companies is not alarmism. It is disciplined exposure mapping: know which routes, suppliers, ports, insurers, executives, data systems and local partners would be affected if the Russia-Europe confrontation tightens another step.

## Selected sources


- Ukrainer in English, interview with Lt. Gen. Ben Hodges on European security, NATO strategy and defence cooperation, accessed through SFC VIP monitoring on 10 July 2026.
- SFC daily cross-source synthesis, 10 July 2026, European Security / NATO / Ukraine VIP cluster.
- NATO, The NATO Representation to Ukraine, current public information on NATO-Ukraine cooperation and support structures.

- NATO, Energy security overview, current public information on critical energy infrastructure, resilience and military fuel supply.
- SFC Daily Topic Sitrep, russia-ukraine-eastern-europe, 10 July 2026.