

THE TRANSFORMATION OF THE NATO-RUSSIAN RELATIONS
FROM YELTSIN TO PUTIN-MEDVEDEV LEADERSHIP
BETWEEN
1991 AND 2009

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

OLESYA ÖZKAN

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN THE DEPARTMENT OF
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

JULY 2010

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Meliha B. Altunışık
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

Prof. Dr. Meliha B. Altunışık
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

Prof. Dr. Mustafa Türkeş
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Prof. Dr. Mustafa Türkeş (METU, IR) _____

Prof. Dr. İlhan Uzgel (AU, FPS/IR) _____

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Faruk Yalvaç (METU, IR) _____

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last Name:

Signature :

ABSTRACT

THE TRANSFORMATION OF THE NATO-RUSSIAN RELATIONS FROM YELTSIN TO PUTIN-MEDVEDEV LEADERSHIP BETWEEN 1991 AND 2009

Özkan, Olesya

MS., Department of International Relations

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Mustafa Türkeş

July 2010, 155 pages

The thesis seeks to chart the foundation and transformation of NATO-Russia relations from Yeltsin to Putin and Medvedev. It attempts to portray the continuity and change in the Russian Foreign Policy towards NATO in the light of the main international developments such as the dissolution of the Soviet Union, the Bosnian war and the Kosovo conflict; as well as the internal transformation of the Alliance marked by the extension of the traditional NATO roles and the expansion policy. The thesis tries to depict the new initiatives in the Russian Foreign policy aimed at undermining NATO and US' roles in Europe by attempting to establish an alternative European architecture to a NATO-centric one. It is argued that while Yeltsin promoted multilateralism based on the world led by the USA and the Russian Federation on a par, Putin and Medvedev's multilateralism was to undermine the American world hegemony and consolidate relations with Europe.

Key words: the Russian Federation, NATO, Yeltsin, Putin, Medvedev

ÖZ

1991 VE 2009 YILLARI ARASI YELTSİN'DEN PUTİN-MEDVEDEV YÖNETİMİNE KADAR NATO-RUSYA İLŞİKİLERİNDEKİ GELİŞİM SÜRECİ

Özkan, Olesya

Yüksek Lisans, Uluslararası İlişkiler Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Dr. Mustafa Türkeş

Temmuz 2010, 155 pages

Bu tez NATO-Rusya ilişkilerinin Yeltsin'den Putin-Medvedev Yönetimine kadar olan oluşum ve gelişim sürecini değerlendirmeyi hedeflemektedir. Sovyetler Birliğinin dağılması, Bosna Savaşı ve Kosova Sorunu gibi önemli bazı uluslararası gelişmeler ile Birliğin genişleme politikası ve NATO'nun geleneksel rolünün genişletilmesi şeklindeki yapısal değişikliklerin ışığı altında Rus Dış Politikasındaki oluşum ve devamlılığının bir çerçevesini çizmek te bu tezin konusudur. Ayrıca bu tez Rusya Federsyonu dış politikasının hedeflediği NATO ve Amerikan rolünü azaltmak için alternatif bir Avrupa Birliği mimarisi kurma girişimlerini de kapsar. Yeltsin dünya liderliğini yapan ABD ile Rusya Federasyonu arasında eşit şekilde oluşturulan çok yönlü politikaları desteklerken Putin-Medvedev Yönetimi'nin çok yönlü politikası ABD'nin dünya liderliği hegemonyasını azaltarak Avrupa ile olan ilişkilerin sağlamlaştırılması yönünde olduğu gözlenir.

Anahtar kelimeler: Rusya Federsyonu, NATO, Yeltsin, Putin, Medvedev

To my one and only son

Levent

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I wish to express my sincere gratitude to Prof. Dr. Mustafa Türkeş. He has been a constant source of inspiration and intellectual challenge. He was the person that introduced me with the area which I found very interesting and exciting to work on. I will always remember and appreciate his irreplaceable academic assistance and intellectual support for my thesis as well as his patience, kindness and self-sacrificing attitude. In all means, without him, writing this thesis would not have been possible.

Special thanks go to my dear colleagues, Liliana Seçer and Tülin Çoruh Özkan for their support and encouragement.

To my family, I offer sincere thanks for their unshakable faith in me and their willingness to endure with me during the vicissitudes of my endeavours.

And last but not least I am heavily indebted to my son, Levent, and to my husband, Özcan, for bearing me and for the enduring love and support they have provided during all these years of my studies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM.....	iii	
ABSTRACT.....	iv	
ÖZ.....	v	
DEDICATION.....	vi	
ACKNOWLEDGMENT.....	vii	
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	viii	
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	x	
CHAPTER		
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....	1	
CHAPTER 2: THE PROMISES FOR THE FUTURE COOPERATION BETWEEN THE USSR AND THE WEST (1989-1991).....		10
2.1. Introduction.....	10	
2.2. The Position and Stance of the West.....	11	
2.3. The Position and Stance of the USSR.....	16	
2.4. Conclusion.....	22	
CHAPTER 3: THE COLLAPSE OF THE BIPOLAR WORLD AND THE FRAGILE NEGOTIATIONS BETWEEN NATO AND THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION IN THE 1990s.....		24
3.1. Introduction.....	24	
3.2. Different Perceptions of Cooperation and a Fragile Honeymoon.....	24	
3.3. Totality of Cooperation and Friction.....	34	

3.3.1. Different stances over Bosnia and Herzegovina.....	34
3.3.2. Different stances over Kosovo crisis.....	41
3.3.3. The beginning of the long lasting contention: the NATO Enlargement.....	53
3.4. Conclusion.....	72
 CHAPTER 4: THE PUTIN FACTOR IN COOPERATION-CONFRONTATION PATTERN OF THE NATO-RUSSIAN RELATIONS.....	75
4.1. Introduction.....	75
4.2. Putin policy:	76
4.2.1. Consolidating factor in relations with NATO.....	76
4.2.2. The main cornerstones in NATO-Russia relations.....	88
4.3. Conclusion.....	111
 CHAPTER 5: CONTINUITY AND CONSOLIDATION OF RUSSIA’S NATO POLICY UNDER MEDVEDEV.....	115
5.1. Introduction.....	115
5.2. Reinvigoration of Russia’s European Security Strategy.....	116
5.2.2. Medvedev Proposal.....	118
5.3. Undermining the restoration of Russia’s great power status.....	125
5.4. Conclusion.....	133
 CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION.....	134
 BIBLIOGRAPHY	140

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

NACC	- North Atlantic Cooperation Council
PfP	- Partnership for Peace
CFE	- Conventional Armed Forces in Europe
OSCE	- Organization on Security and Cooperation in Europe
CSCE	- Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe
G8	- The Group of Eight
IMF	- International Monetary Fund
START	- Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty
UNPROFOR	- The United Nations Protection Force
KFOR	- Kosovo Force
IFOR	- Implementation Force in Bosnia and Herzegovina
SFOR	- Stabilization Force
PJC	- Permanent Joint Council
FRY	- The Federal Republic of Yugoslavia
CJTF	- Combined Joint Task Force
OECD	- Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development
SCO	- Shanghai Cooperation Organization
ABM	- Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty
NRC	- NATO-Russia Council
NAC	- North Atlantic Council
ISAF	- International Security Assistance Force
OPEC	- Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries
WMD	- Weapons of Mass Destruction
MAP	- Membership Action Plan (NATO)
INF Treaty	- Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty
BRIC	- Brazil, Russia, India, China
CSTO	- Collective Security Treaty Organization
EurAsEC	- Eurasian Economic Community

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The fall of the Berlin Wall and the dissolution of the Warsaw pact, resulting in the crucial collapse of the Soviet Union and the whole Communist party regime on the entire Soviet territory, encouraged neo-realists to claim that without its potential threat NATO will lose the purpose of existence, become dysfunctional and finally wither and disappear. NATO might endure the fruitless struggle to discover a new mission to preserve the sustainability of the alliance as a whole; however “wartime alliances rarely survive the enemy's defeat, and in that sense NATO is already something of an anomaly.”¹

Liberals, on the other hand, underlined the essence of liberal values in the spirit of the Euro-Atlantic Alliance. NATO, from its very genesis, “has been more than a mere military pact welded together by the unifying threat of a common enemy,”² it was an entity based on democratic norms, values and free market economy. Moreover, as Keohane suggests, in the international regime theory, it would be more rational for the member states to preserve the existing institutions and adapt them to the new realities instead of creating new ones.³

The Alliance survived. The member states saw NATO as the only security organization capable of sustaining peace in the Central and Eastern Europe at the time when the future of the Soviet Union was blurred, the Western European countries were not capable of handling security on their own and Germany's fate still being under question. Hence, the Alliance embarked on the journey of redefining its tasks and responsibilities to reinvent itself in the post Cold War period which could ensure the Alliance's sustainability as well as legalized NATO's

¹ Stephen M. Walt, “The ties that fray,” *National Interest*, Winter 98/99, Issue 54, pp.3-12

² Patrick Keller, “The Future of NATO: Between Overstretch and Irrelevance,” *American Foreign Policy Interests*, 29: 207–217, 2007, p. 214

³ Robert O. Keohane, *After Hegemony*, Princeton University Press: Princeton, New Jersey, 1984, Chapter 6, p. 107

presence in the Central and Eastern Europe, formerly under the Communist party rule, and even prompted it to seek accession of the Black Sea countries such as Georgia and Ukraine.

Obviously, such bold and far-reaching goals could not be achieved without the consent of its former adversary, the Russian Federation, which regardless of its internal chaos and instability still had influence in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe and former Soviet Union due to its historical, cultural and political ties and could not be disregarded by NATO as such.

This thesis will attempt to explore the foundation of the relations between NATO and USA, the country holding the main power within the Alliance, and the Russian Federation, formerly perceived as a threat to the West and deterred by NATO. Hence, the special attention will be devoted to the main driving factors which prompted the cooperation patterns in the NATO-Russian relations and the overlapping interests which brought the Russian Federation and NATO into forging such cooperation, though each side had its reservations. The study will likewise look into the transformation of NATO-Russia relations from Yeltsin to Putin and Medvedev's leadership by juxtaposing NATO-Russia relations under Yeltsin, Putin and Medvedev to point out continuity and change in their Foreign Policies towards NATO.

The neo-classical realism may give the necessary insights to analyse the evolution of the NATO-Russian relations in the post-Cold war era. Gideon Rose was the first to coin the term "neo-classical realism" in 1998 in the article "Neo-classical realism and the theories of foreign policy." Rose modified and systematized some certain tenets of the classical realism by incorporating external and internal variables.⁴ Rose argued that the theory is called realism since "the scope and ambition of a country's foreign policy is driven first and foremost by its place in the international system and specifically by its relative material power capabilities."⁵ The notion of neo-classical can be justified by the fact that "the impact of such

⁴ Gideon Rose, "Neoclassical Realism and Theories of Foreign Policy," *World Politics*, Vol. 51, No. 1 (Oct., 1998), pp. 144-172, p. 146

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 146

power⁶ capabilities on foreign policy is indirect and complex, because systemic pressures must be translated through intervening variables at the unit level.”⁷

The explanatory richness and applicability of neo-classical realism to the NATO-Russia relations can be revealed through its juxtaposition with some other forms of realism such as, for example, neo-realism or classical realism. Thus,

“...neo-realism tries to explain the outcomes of state interactions, it is a theory of international politics; it includes some general assumptions about the motivations of individual states but does not purport to explain their behavior in great detail or in all cases.”⁸

Neo-realism explains the behaviour of states in a particular situation by the external pressure from the structure of the international system and relative capabilities of the states disregarding internal characteristics and domestic differences of the states. In contrast, neo-classical realism considers the emphasis on the structure of the international system as misleading which “needs to be moderated through the introduction of unit-level variables as foreign policy can be explained adequately only if it is linked to domestic politics.”⁹ To summarize, neo-classical realism supports neo-realism in its assumption that pressure of the international system and its motives may form only the broad contours and general trajectory of the state’s foreign policy but not the specific details of state behaviour.¹⁰

The essential prediction of the neo-classical realism is that over the long term the relative amount of material power resources countries possess will shape the extent and ambition of their foreign policies which must be examined

⁶ “Power” in neo-classical realism means “the capabilities or resources ...with which states can influence each other.” For more details see William Curti Wohlforth, *The Elusive Balance: Power and Perceptions during the Cold War* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1993, p.4)

⁷ Gideon Rose, p. 146

⁸ Ibid., p. 145

⁹ Luca Ratti, “Post-Cold War Nato and International Relations Theory: The case for Neo-classical Realism,” *Journal of Transatlantic Studies*, 4(1), 2006, pp. 81-110, p. 96

¹⁰ Gideon Rose, p. 147

through the lenses of unit-level intervening variables such as decision-makers' perceptions and domestic state structure.

The states possessing more relative power will attempt to pursue more influence on the international arena and as their relative power diminishes, the same effect will be projected on their behaviour and ambition resulting in the contraction.¹¹ Thus, neo-classical realism underlines the decisiveness of the intervening variables at the domestic level in the nature of the response to structural changes and the trajectory of state policy. In line with this thought, neo-classical realism argues that “foreign policy choices are made by actual political leaders and elites, and so it is their perceptions of relative power that matter, not simply relative quantities of physical resources or force in being.”¹² Therefore, this thesis attaches significance to the course in NATO-Russia relations formed under two different leaderships of the Russian Federation, Yeltsin, and Putin and Medvedev, whose choice of foreign policy's course and not, merely, the relative material power was decisive. Thus, in the aftermath of 9/11, in spite of the strong opposition from the elite and, particularly, from the Russian Minister of Defence, Putin decided to join the USA in its fight against terrorism by implementing the relative power, perceived by him, as the most essential and effective in realignment with the West. This relative power was represented by allowing stationing of the American bases in the backyard of Russia, that is, in the republics of Central Asia.

The assumption of neo-classical realism about states looking for the expansion of their power over other international actors and their environment as a whole through influence maximization was the modification, proposed by Fareed Zakaria in his book *From Wealth to Power: The Unusual Origins of America's World Role*, of the classical realism assumption that states are pure power and resource maximizers. Zakaria further explains that states tend to use their capabilities as the means to reach the final goal – international political influence. This neo-classical realism's definition of capabilities as the means and influence as

¹¹ Ibid., p. 152

¹² Ibid., p. 147

the goal differs from classical realism's assumption of states exercising power to gain more power in the end.

Both neo-realism and neo-classical realism share the assumption that "institutions are above all a tool of national governments and that states use them in ways that suit their national interests."¹³ However, neo-realism suggests that international institutions are preserved by the states as long as these institutions serve the interests of the states or as long as the threat, against which the institution was created, exists. NATO was created in 1949 to contain the potential threat posed by the Communist party regime and prevent its spread to the countries of Western Europe. Yet, after the dissolution of the Soviet Union, the main threat to NATO became a history and the rationality of sustaining the Alliance further in the post-Cold War environment was undermined. Thus, neo-realists predicted that NATO would wither away as the individual interests of the states prevail over group interests and member states "will be unlikely to subordinate individual interests to group interests."¹⁴ Neo-realists also expected "the resurgence of traditional interstate rivalries in Europe and deterioration in relations between Western Europe and the United States."¹⁵

In reality, though, neo-realists were mistaken. The Alliance not only did not wither away but remained the main pillar of Western security provider in Europe, particularly, being involved in peace enforcement and stabilization processes in the Balkans, the territory lying beyond the borders of NATO. It clearly demonstrated that the Alliance was reinventing itself by expanding and modifying its tasks and responsibilities and strengthening the transatlantic link between Europe and NATO. In addition, NATO launched expansion to the states of former Soviet Union and improved relations with Russia.¹⁶ The relations among member states of NATO were not serene all the time. Thus, the US decision to invade Iraq in 2003 created

¹³ Luca Ratti, p.98

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 83

¹⁵ Ibid., p. 83

¹⁶ Ibid., p. 85

divergences in NATO members' attitudes and divided Europe into "old" and "new"¹⁷ one. However, these divergences can not be justified by the dissolution of the Soviet Union and as a result the deterioration in the relations between NATO member states, as it was assumed by neo-realists, but was the demonstration that "the European members of NATO are not willing to accommodate U.S. leadership, when their national interests do not coincide with those of Washington."¹⁸ Thus the neo-realism proved to be insufficient in explaining the evolution of NATO in the post-Cold war period.

In neo-classical understanding the preservation of NATO was essential for the USA to promote first, its foreign policy objectives and serve the national interests of the USA; second, to spread the liberal and democratic values shared by the members of the Alliance. However, the foreign policy of the USA in preserving NATO was not predicted by the structure of the international system solely, as claimed by the neo-realism, but by the relative power of the USA, being the biggest contributor to the Alliance, as well as domestic reasons or domestic policy. With the collapse of the Warsaw Pact, the relative power of the USA increased enormously. The possession of this power allowed USA to redirect the strategic balance of the Cold War period and, through NATO structure by inclusion of East Germany, make the Soviet Union accept a new American-dictated settlement.

As US policymakers recognized, they were taking advantage of America's vastly increased relative power (the result of Soviet weakness) to achieve 'a fundamental shift in the strategic balance' by compelling Moscow to accept an American-imposed settlement...¹⁹

Meanwhile, to secure energy supply domestically, the USA had to make use of any instruments at its disposal, to reach this goal. In this case the role of NATO

¹⁷ For more details see "Rumsfeld: France, Germany are problems in Iraqi Conflict," CNN, Thursday, January 23, 2003, available at <http://www.cnn.com/2003/WORLD/meast/01/22/sprj.irq.wrap/> (accessed on March 7, 2010)

¹⁸ Ibid., p.85

¹⁹ Christopher Layne, "US hegemony and the perpetuation of NATO," *Journal of Strategic Studies*, Sep2000, Vol. 23, Issue 3, pp. 59-91, p.69

was instrumental in projecting US influence, through the expansion process launched as one of the new tasks to reinvent the Alliance, towards such strategically important, in terms of energy resources, regions as Central Asia, Caucasus and the Middle East. Luca Ratti argues that

the United States has continued to use NATO as a political mechanism to secure adherence to its strategies and foreign policy objectives, forestall the development of an independent European security and defence structure, and acquire strategic advantages useful for the projection of U.S. power towards Central Asia, the Middle East, and the Caucasus.²⁰

The foundation and transformation of NATO-Russia relations could be best explained by the insights given by neo-classical realism. Thus, NATO-Russia relations in the aftermath of the dissolution of the Soviet Union, under Yeltsin's presidency, can be accounted for by the opportunist policies on the part of NATO and, particularly, the United States towards the Russia Federation since the latter was in a vulnerable position. In spite of Moscow's verbal objections, the Alliance with the USA, at the frontline, pushed for expansion towards former Warsaw Pact member states, first, with a newly created political and institutional mechanisms that would allow to incorporate some of the former Warsaw Pact member states while some others would only be linked to NATO through Partnership for Peace program and then fully incorporated into it. Being economically and politically weak, the Russian Federation could not countervail and prevent the Alliance and NATO from taking advantage of the Russian Federation's vulnerable position. "Moscow viewed NATO expansion as a manifestation of America's hegemonic aspirations, a threat to Russia's security, and a betrayal of the promises made by Washington during the German reunification process."²¹ The operations in Bosnia and Kosovo clearly demonstrated that the USA made use of the conflictual situation in the Balkans to reinvent NATO and to further expand its influence by imposing the Western institutions to preserve its sphere of influence in Europe.

²⁰ Luca Ratti, p.102

²¹ Christopher Layne, p. 70. Also see Jonathan Eyal, "NATO's enlargement: Anatomy of a decision," *International Affairs* 73, 4 (1997), pp. 698-699

The relations between NATO and the Russia Federation in the post-Yeltsin period may still be explained by neo-classical realism. However, the real change would take place in the leadership factor of Putin. This will have, in turn, changed the relations between NATO and the Russian Federation. This thesis attempts to explore how such change took place and whether it is sustained under Medvedev's leadership is also to be looked into.

Following the introduction, Chapter II sets the historical ground of the developments resulting in the international balance of power change induced by the dismantling of the Warsaw Pact and the fall of the Berlin Wall in order to build up an argument through out the thesis.

Chapter III will attempt to analyse the main developments which shaped the NATO-Russian relations in the 1990s and deal with the question of to what extent such issues as NATO's Bosnia and Herzegovina and Kosovo interventions as well as NATO expansion affected the Russian Federation's policy towards NATO.

The main focus in Chapter IV will be devoted to the NATO-Russian relations marked by Putin's presidency which was a crucial factor in laying the grounds for cooperation and confrontation pattern over the issues of interventions in Afghanistan and Iraq, CFE Treaty, successive NATO enlargement rounds and missile defence shield in Poland and the Czech Republic to name some of them. This chapter will also study the expectations of Moscow from realignment with NATO and the USA, and the aspirations of the Russian Federation, which prompted it to favour a more independent and assertive foreign policy towards the West in the aftermath of the Iraqi crisis, when the relations between NATO and Russia began to sour.

Chapter V will tend to discover the continuity and consolidation of Russia's NATO policy under the successor of Putin, president Medvedev, expressed in Medvedev's proposal regarding Russia's revitalized posture over European Security Strategy. This chapter will analyse the capacity of Medvedev's Russia to respond to the threats impeding on its interests and the impact of the Georgian conflict on the NATO-Russian relations.

Finally, the conclusion will point out that from the Yeltsin to the Putin's presidency a change in the Russian Foreign Policy towards NATO can be observed whereas from Putin to Medvedev's period a pattern of continuity took place.

CHAPTER II

THE PROCESS AND PACE OF COOPERATION BETWEEN THE WEST AND THE USSR FROM 1989 TO 1991

2.1 Introduction

The reform programs glasnost (openness), perestroika (structural reforms) and the New Thinking launched by Mikhail Sergeevich Gorbachev to reform the socialist system of the Soviet Union not only marked the transition in the foreign policy of the USSR, but also unleashed the unintended consequences which led to the dissolution of the Warsaw Pact, the Soviet Union, and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. These consequences were precipitated by a number of developments in international politics as well. The fall of the Berlin Wall on 9 November, 1989 opened up a discussion for the prospective German unification, its internal arrangement and, most importantly, its external status on the international arena. Thus, “the basic question was whether a unified Germany should be neutral or a member of NATO – or perhaps, as absurdly as that may seem in retrospect, a member of both NATO and the Warsaw Pact.”²²

Thus, the question of Germany’s possible unification and its further fate prompted the USSR and the USA to suggest contingent plans to solidify their stance on security structure in Europe. An examination of German unification may shed light on the process and pace of the cooperation between the USSR and the West as an initial stage for cooperation.

²² Hannes Adomeit, “Gorbachev’s Consent to Unified Germany’s Membership in NATO,” Working Paper, FG 5 2006/11, December 2006, Research Unit Russia/CIS, Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik German Institute for International and Security Affairs, p. 2

2.2 The position and stance of the West

The primary goal of the president George H. W. Bush administration, in the context of collapsing communist regimes in the Eastern Europe and emerging “security vacuum” in the beginning of 1990, was to ensure a peaceful transition from the Cold-War structure to the new one with Europe whole and free from division and under NATO’s security umbrella. In this respect the USA was strongly in favour of inclusion of a unified Germany into NATO structures. The question was whether to allow Germany’s participation only in the political wing of the Alliance with the example of France to be followed, or in the military one as well.

The Foreign Minister of West Germany, Hans-Dietrich Genscher, in his speech in Tutzing at the end of January 1990, without prior consultations with Helmut Kohl, declared that “a united Germany would be a member of NATO, but that NATO’s jurisdiction would not extend to the eastern part.”²³ This formulation was later agreed on during negotiations with the US Secretary of State James A. Baker and officially expressed by Genscher in the joint press conference. Hence, Genscher confirmed that Baker and he “were in full agreement that there is no intention to extend the NATO area of defense and security toward the East,”²⁴ which was the position advocated by the West and, particularly, the USA in the talks with Gorbachev in February, 1990.

On February 7, 1990 upon his arrival in Moscow, Baker met with Shevardnadze, the Foreign Minister of the USSR, for preliminary negotiations and insisted that it would be better for all, the USSR and European countries, to tie Germany to NATO and keep an eye on its power. Baker added that if Germany were included in NATO, the United States and its allies would guarantee “that NATO’s

²³ See the document referred to by Mark Kramer, “The Myth of a No-NATO-Enlargement Pledge to Russia,” *The Washington Quarterly*, April 2009, p.47

²⁴ *Ibid*, p.47

jurisdiction or forces would not move eastward.”²⁵ Later in the conversation with Gorbachev Baker repeated that

we understand that it would be important not only for the USSR but also for other European countries to have a guarantee that if the United States maintains its military presence in Germany within the NATO framework, there will be no extension of NATO’s jurisdiction or military presence one inch to the East.²⁶

By the end of the conversation, Baker asked Gorbachev whether he would prefer to see Germany as an independent state outside of NATO structure and with no American forces on its territory, or a united Germany inside NATO, however, with the guarantee “that there would be no extension of NATO’s current jurisdiction eastward.”²⁷ Gorbachev avoided giving any certain answer to this question, however, stated clearly that “any extension of the zone of NATO was unacceptable,” and Baker responded “I agree.”²⁸

The impossibility of practical implementation of the formula advocated by the West granting Germany full membership in NATO and no NATO “jurisdiction” to Eastern Germany induced the West to drop the term “jurisdiction” and substitute it with the phrase “special military status” to be applied to Eastern Germany to alleviate the objections of Moscow. The framework for further discussions on Germany’s destiny was decided to be “2+4,” including two Germanys and the four powers: the UK, the USA, the USSR and France which had been sharing control over Eastern and Western Germany since the end of the WW II.

On February 24-25, 1990 Bush met with Kohl at Camp David and persuaded him to adhere to the same position which later became the official stance of the

²⁵ Ibid., p. 47-48. See also “Optimism at Arms Talks: Soviet Reforms Add to ‘Elements of Trust,’” *Seattle Times*, February 8, 1990, available at <http://community.seattletimes.nwsources.com/archive/?date=19900208&slug=1054962> (accessed on February 28, 2010)

²⁶ See the document referred to by Mark Kramer, “The Myth of a No-NATO-Enlargement Pledge to Russia,” *The Washington Quarterly*, April 2009, p.48 / Zelikow and Rice, *Germany Unified and Europe Transformed: a Study in Statecraft*, Cambridge, England: Harvard University Press, 1998 p. 182

²⁷ Hannes Adomeit, p. 6

²⁸ Zelikow and Rice, p. 183

USA and West Germany and was advocated in all future negotiations with Moscow. The revised position of the USA and West Germany was officially confirmed by Bush and Kohl in a joint news conference following the negotiations:

We share a common belief that a unified Germany should remain a full member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, including participation in its military structure. We agreed that U.S. military forces should remain stationed in the united Germany and elsewhere in Europe as a continuing guarantor of stability. The Chancellor and I are also in agreement that in a unified state the former territory of the GDR should have a special military status, that it would take into account the legitimate security interests of all interested countries, including those of the Soviet Union.²⁹

On May 16-19, 1990 on his subsequent visit to Moscow for another round of negotiations with Shevardnadze and Gorbachev, Baker brought with him a nine-point plan³⁰ “designed to induce Moscow to accept the presence of a unified Germany in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.”³¹ The Bush administration was rather resolute on pushing further with the plan on united Germany’s integration into NATO anyway, in spite of Gorbachev’s objection and assurance that the Soviet Union may postpone for an uncertain time the withdrawal of its troops from the territory of Eastern Europe if a united Germany becomes a member of NATO. The USA saw unified Germany only as a member of NATO excluding the slightest possibility for Germany’s membership in the Warsaw Pact, and it was presupposed in one of the nine points suggested by the USA. Hence,

the 35-nation Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe will be institutionalized and expanded, as Moscow has insisted, to make it a pan-European

²⁹ “Joint News Conference Following Discussions With Chancellor Helmut Kohl of the Federal Republic of Germany,” 1990-02-25, in *Public Papers of the President of the United States: George Bush, 1990*, accessed on March 8, 2010 at http://bushlibrary.tamu.edu/research/public_papers.php?id=1585&year=1990&month=2

³⁰ For more details see “After the Summit; U.S. Will Press the Soviets to Accept Plan on Germany,” *The New York Times*, June 5, 1990 accessed on March 8, 2010 at <http://www.nytimes.com/1990/06/05/world/after-the-summit-us-will-press-the-soviets-to-accept-plan-on-germany.html?pagewanted=all&pagewanted=print>

³¹ Ibid.

organization in which the Soviets can play a leading role as the Warsaw Pact disintegrates and NATO remains intact.³²

Consequently, the overall tone of a nine-point plan was “take” it, or “leave” it full of ambiguous verbal promises or, as Robert Gates called them “nice diplomatic words,” without any legal binding force aiming at sweetening the deal with Moscow and indeed “bribing the Soviets out of Germany.”³³

The leaders of France and the UK, Mitterrand and Thatcher respectively, were rather cautious about Helmut Kohl’s ten-point plan³⁴ for German unification proposed on November 28, 1989. The main concern was about the haste of the policies proposed by Kohl and the overall rhetoric of the Chancellor who claimed that “cosmetic corrections [in East Germany] weren’t enough. We didn’t want to stabilize an intolerable situation.”³⁵

In her talk with Gorbachev in 1989, Thatcher said that

we do not want a united Germany... This would lead to a change to postwar borders, and we cannot allow that because such a development would undermine the stability of the whole international situation and could endanger our security.³⁶

The official stance of France regarding German reunification was expressed by Jacques Attali, the personal adviser to President Mitterrand, in his meeting with a senior Gorbachev aide, Vadim Zagladin, in Kiev on December 6, 1989: “France by

³² Ibid.

³³ Cited in Mark Kramer, “The Myth of a No-NATO-Enlargement Pledge to Russia,” *The Washington Quarterly*, April 2009, p.54

³⁴ For more details see Helmut Kohl, “Zehn-Punkte-Programm zur Überwindung der Teilung Deutschlands und Europas” [“Ten Point Program for Overcoming the Division of Germany and Europe”] (November 28, 1989), in Bulletin des Presse- und Informationsamtes der Bundesregierung [Bulletin of the Press and Information Office of the Federal Government], November 29, 1989. Translated by Jeremiah Riemer and available at http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/pdf/eng/Chapter1_Doc10.pdf accessed on March 8, 2010

³⁵ Cited by Zelikow and Rice, “German Unification,” Chapter 6 in *Turning Points in Ending the Cold War*, ed. by Kiron K. Skinner (Hoover Institution Press Publication, 2007, p.233-234)

³⁶ “Thatcher told Gorbachev Britain did not want German Reunification,” *Times Online*, September 11, 2009, accessed on March 13, 2010 at <http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/politics/article6829735.ece>

no means wants German reunification, although it realises that in the end it is inevitable.”³⁷

Hence, Mitterrand and Thatcher were in favour of slowing down or even stopping the process of German unification due to the possible consequences which Mitterrand mentioned in his talks with Genscher: “Kohl’s rash policies might lead to the revival of the Triple Entente of France, Britain and Russia, which had been formed before World War I.”³⁸

However, the French-British axis failed to countervail West German and U.S. plans for German unification since president Bush openly said that he supported German aspirations for unification, that acutely inhibited Mitterrand and Thatcher from publicly voicing their concerns.³⁹ In fact, Bush’s full support for Kohl’s plan could be explained by the desire to create continuous support for German alignment with the Alliance. Consequently, “in this way, Bush had made Germany’s NATO membership an unequivocal prerequisite for the later process of unification...”⁴⁰ To be able to succeed in the mission and win Kohl’s favour, Bush chose to follow the line of least resistance, that is, not to put any constraints on Kohl’s plan and to expel any possibility for other partners to lay down their terms on it. The most important priority for the United States was to keep the path for Kohl open – free of conditions that Moscow, or the French or British for that matter, might attach.⁴¹

³⁷ Ibid.

³⁸ Cited by Zelikow and Rice, “German Unification,” Chapter 6 in *Turning Points in Ending the Cold War*, ed. by Kiron K. Skinner, Hoover Institution Press Publication, 2007, p.246

³⁹ Ibid., p. 249

⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 248

⁴¹ Ibid.

2.3 The position and stance of the USSR

Since the end of the World War II, European security has been sustained by NATO and the USA, as its primary power, whereas the Soviet Union had been trying to undermine the role of the USA and decouple it from the European continent by reiterating the concept of a Common European Home, expressed first, through a European Collective Security System, proposed by Molotov in 1954 and oriented on the German question with the US having an observer status⁴², and secondly, through a declaration on European Security issued by the Warsaw Pact Conference held in Bucharest in June 1966 and designed to recognize the permanent division of Germany and aimed at establishing a Europe-wide security structure to replace the two rival military blocs. The role of the USA was again not cited. Later on, in his speech in November 1981, Brezhnev reinforced the division between Europe and the USA, characterized by “us-and-them context” and concluded that “Europe is our Common Home.”⁴³ The idea of “Common European Home” or “all-European House” was also put forward by Gorbachev on his visit to Czechoslovakia in 1987, in which he first denied the divisive line between Europe (including the USSR) and the USA, but then later that year reformulated the idea in the public speech “Perestroika: New Thinking for Our Country and the World” arguing that “US was not only a non-European power, but that it was also one whose culture posed a “serious threat” to that of Europe and Europeans.”⁴⁴

In the aftermath of the fall of the Berlin Wall, in the negotiations with Bush during the Malta Summit dated December 2-3, 1989, Gorbachev was strongly supporting the preservation of the Warsaw Pact carrying out the mission of security and stability provider in Europe:

⁴² Wayne C. McWilliams, Harry Piotrowski, “The World since 1945 : A History of International Relations,” 6th edition, Boulder, Colo. : Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1997, p. 14

⁴³ Martin A. Smith, *Russia and NATO since 1991: From Cold War through Cold Peace to Partnership*, Routledge Taylor&Francis Group, London and New York, 2006, p. 3

⁴⁴ Ibid, p. 4

Existing instruments for supporting the balance must not be shattered but modified in accordance with the demands of the age. They must be utilized to strengthen security and stability and improve relations between states. Let NATO and the Warsaw Treaty Organization become to an even greater degree political, not just military, organizations; and let there be a change in their confrontational nature.⁴⁵

In this context, the idea of Germany's membership in NATO was unacceptable for Gorbachev and he openly declared it in the meeting with Hans Modrow, head of the government of GDR, in March 1990. Thus, TASS reported that:

It was stated with full determination [at the talks] that the inclusion of a future Germany in NATO is inadmissible and will not take place, whatever arguments may be used. One cannot allow the breakdown of the balance [of power] in Europe, the basis of stability and security, and of mutual trust and cooperation.⁴⁶

Gorbachev criticized a ten-point plan of Kohl for being an instrument exploited by Kohl for electoral gain. The behaviour of the West German chancellor Gorbachev called irresponsible and not serious. So, when the German Chancellor attempted to assure Moscow in taking all measures to avoid destabilization of the situation in Europe resulting from the German reunification and tried to meet with Gorbachev personally, the Soviet leader kept Kohl at a distance and rejected meeting him. By rebuffing Kohl, Gorbachev missed a chance to put forward the Soviet agenda on the German reunification.⁴⁷

⁴⁵ Soviet Transcript of the Malta Summit December 2-3, 1989, p. 29 Source: Archive of the Gorbachev Foundation, Fond 1. Opis 1. Excerpts published in: M.S. Gorbachev, *Gody Trudnykh Reshenii, 1985-1992* [Years of Difficult Decisions], (Moscow: Alfa-print, 1993), pp. 173-185. Translated by Vladislav Zubok and Svetlana Savranskaya for the National Security Archive. Accessed on March 13, 2010 at <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB298/Document%2010.pdf>

⁴⁶ "Vstrecha M.S. Gorbacheva s pravitel'stvennoy delegatsiyey GDR," *Pravda and Izvestiya*, 7 March 1990. Cited by Hannes Adomeit, in "Gorbachev's Consent to Unified Germany's Membership in NATO," Working Paper, FG 5 2006/11, December 2006, Research Unit Russia/CIS, Stiftung Wissenschaft and Politik German Institute for International and Security Affairs, p. 9

⁴⁷ Zelikow and Rice, "German Unification," Chapter 6 in *Turning Points in Ending the Cold War*, ed. by Kiron K. Skinner, Hoover Institution Press Publication, 2007, p.251

Likewise, Gorbachev tried to avoid talking on the military and political status of Germany in the Malta Summit and in spite of raising the question gave a rather evasive answer.

So what would happen? Would a unified Germany be neutral, not a member of any military-political alliances, or would it be a member of NATO? I believe we should let everyone understand that it is still too early to discuss either of these options. Let the process take its course without artificial acceleration. None of us is responsible for the division of Germany. History occurred this way. Let history continue to decide on this issue in the future.⁴⁸

It was a very unusual way for a Soviet leader to give such a diffuse answer and could characterise either the uncertainty of Gorbachev's stance on the German question or unwillingness to confront Bush. Indeed, at first Moscow oscillated between different scenarios such as

1) the settlement of the German problem by a peace treaty; 2) synchronization of the unification process with the creation of new security structures in conjunction with the transformation of the military alliances and new machinery to be allocated to the CSCE; 3) retention of the special status of Berlin and the presence of armed forces of the Four Powers in Germany until after the conclusion of the Peace Treaty; 4) membership of both unified Germany and the Soviet Union in NATO; and 5) dual membership of Germany in both alliances.⁴⁹

However, during the Malta Summit Gorbachev had already had a confidential memorandum with concrete policy on the German reunification prepared by the Foreign Ministry, but due to unknown reasons preferred not to refer to it. This stunning fact was described by Anatoly Dobrynin, Soviet ambassador to the United States:

Gorbachev responded in a general way that our policy was founded on our adherence to an all-European process and the evolutionary construction of a "common European home" in which the security interests of all countries should be respected. But he did not specify how it could or should be done, although he had

⁴⁸ Soviet Transcript of the Malta Summit December 2-3, 1989, p. 19

⁴⁹ Hannes Adomeit, "Gorbachev's Consent to Unified Germany's Membership in NATO," Working Paper, FG 5 2006/11, December 2006, Research Unit Russia/CIS, Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik German Institute for International and Security Affairs, p. 12

with him a confidential memorandum by our Foreign Ministry outlining a concrete policy: German reunification should be the final product of a gradual transformation of the climate in Europe during which both NATO and the Warsaw Pact would shift their orientation from military to political and be dissolved by mutual agreement.⁵⁰

During the meeting with Baker in February 1990, Gorbachev still believed that the German reunification was a distant question not requiring urgent solution and thus possible to be postponed. Though Anatoly Chernyaev, Gorbachev's foreign policy adviser, warned the General Secretary about the inevitability of German membership in NATO, Gorbachev was still insisting on Germany to be "non-aligned" and only a member of the European Community. Chernyaev predicted that "Germany will remain in NATO in any case... and we will again try to catch up with a train that has left the station. Instead of putting forward specific and firm terms for our consent, we are heading toward a failure."⁵¹

Furthermore, Gorbachev did not ask for any written guarantees on the repeated assurances of Baker not to expand the Alliance an inch eastward if Germany becomes its full member. The complacency of Gorbachev with the given verbal promises given by the West created the impetus for arduous discussions between the West and the Russian Federation on the issue of NATO expansion and was repeatedly referred to many years later. That is how Sergei Karaganov, Russian foreign policy analyst, described the atmosphere regarding the unified Germany's membership in the Alliance and the assurances given in relation to it:

In 1990 we were told quite clearly by the West that dissolution of the Warsaw Pact and German unification would not lead to NATO expansion. We did not demand written guarantees because in the euphoric atmosphere of that time it would have seemed almost indecent, like two girlfriends giving written promises not to seduce each other's husbands.⁵²

⁵⁰ Anatoly Dobrynin, *In Confidence: Moscow's ambassador to America's six Cold War Presidents*, Times Books-Random House, 1995, pp. 636-637

⁵¹ Cited by Hannes Adomeit, in "Gorbachev's Consent to Unified Germany's Membership in NATO, p. 10

⁵² Cited by Anatoly Lievin, in "Russian Opposition to NATO Expansion," *World Today*, October 95, Volume 51, Issue 10, p.196

Intensified pressure from the West on resolving the German question and the political and economic turmoil in the country created uncertainty and hesitation in the Soviet leader and prompted Gorbachev to take a more independent stance on Germany, often non-compliant with the Politburo and not coordinated with professional diplomats, which finally led to the decoupling of the question on “German unification from the general problem of European security.”⁵³

The turning point in the resolution of ambiguity about Germany’s security status emerged at the Soviet-American summit in Washington on 30 May - 3 June, 1990. Gorbachev made an attempt to put forward the ideas of German neutrality or even dual membership in the Warsaw Pact and NATO; however, soon had cardinally changed his mind in favour of permitting Germany to decide itself on its status.

Gorbachev’s sudden consent for Germany’s membership in NATO could be interpreted in different ways. However, it is certain that the decision was a spontaneous one and taken unilaterally by Gorbachev without prior consultations with the Politburo which plunged in a state of shock not only the Soviet delegation but the West as well. That is how Dobrynin recalled the reaction of the West to Gorbachev’s decision:

To the surprise of the West, during a blitz meeting with Chancellor Helmut Kohl in July of 1990 at a remote vacation area of the Caucasus far from public attention, Gorbachev removed all his conditions and agreed to Germany’s membership in NATO as a unified nation, even though there was still fairly strong opposition within the Politburo. I was later told by one of President Bush’s assistants that Kohl was, in his own words, stunned by Gorbachev’s sudden agreement. The German chancellor, like the West as a whole, had been prepared for prolonged and difficult discussions with Gorbachev and had come prepared with several fallback positions on different parts of any deal.⁵⁴

So, what prompted Gorbachev to yield his position? Firstly, the Soviet president regarded the German question as the opportunity to gain support of the West for sustaining the reforms at home, which were stalling, and to consolidate his

⁵³ Anatoly Dobrynin, p. 638

⁵⁴ Ibid.

power. The foreign debt of the Soviet Union and its servicing were slowly pulling the country into economic crisis and required urgent financial assistance from the West and its financial institutions. That is how Gorbachev described the situation during the meeting with the G 7 heads of governments or states:

Although its total amount calculated in freely convertible currency (upwards of 65 billion dollars as of mid-1991) is not excessively high given the country's size, the fact that short and medium term high-interest loans account for almost half of the external debt is a matter of serious concern. Coupled with a reduced export base, this situation has resulted in more than half of our hard currency export earnings being channelled toward debt-servicing.⁵⁵

Secondly, Zelikow and Rice argue that a de facto consent to unified Germany's membership was received after president Bush put forward an argument from which it followed that according to the CSCE's principles in the Helsinki Final Act, all nations had the right to determine themselves the alliances they wanted to be members of. In this regard, wasn't it the right of Germany as well to decide which alliance to join? Gorbachev nodded in response which was considered as an agreement.⁵⁶

Thirdly, in Chernyaev's view, the reason Gorbachev changed his mind was due to Baker's nine points. Thus, Gorbachev was impressed by the reasoning that being neutral, Germany could one day seek access to nuclear weapons. Chernyaev also stressed that "the West had better arguments," while the Soviet Union seemed to use up all its options by the spring 1990. In other words, the idea of granting neutral status to Germany, proposed by Moscow, did not attract the West. Likewise, so called "associate membership" of eastern Germany in the Warsaw pact or a unified Germany's membership in both blocs, the Warsaw Pact and NATO, became unfeasible because of the eastern bloc's demise.⁵⁷

⁵⁵ Personal Message from president Mikhail S. Gorbachev to Heads of State or Government Attending the G7 Meeting in London, G7 Summit: London, July 15-14, 1991, accessed on March 18, 2010 at <http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/summit/1991london/personal.html>

⁵⁶ Zelikow and Rice, p. 277

⁵⁷ Cited by Hannes Adomeit, in "Gorbachev's Consent to Unified Germany's Membership in NATO, p. 17

The final assurances on the settlement of the German question, including the conditions for Soviet troops' presence on the territory of a unified Germany and the conduct of their withdrawal, were specified on September 12, 1990 in the Treaty on the Final Settlement with Respect to Germany.⁵⁸ In article 7 of the Treaty, the four-power rights and responsibilities over Berlin were terminated and on October 3, 1990, the GDR ceased to exist and the Federal Republic of Germany was extended to the territory of the GDR. The Treaty was crucial in the sense that it made it feasible to overcome the division of the continent which had lasted for 45 years and marked the beginning of a new era in the relations between the West and the Soviet Union.

2.4 Conclusion

The German unification process has revealed the strategic dominance of the West and the USA over the USSR resulting from the perception of its victory in the Cold War which allowed the West to promote its realpolitik and proceed with the line of a unified Germany's membership to NATO in spite of possible opposition from Moscow. Washington's strong backing of Kohl's ten-point plan allowed it to gain leverage over the future fate of unified Germany, tightly tied to NATO and consequently to the West.

The leading European powers, particularly France and Britain, in spite of opposing the pace of the German unification process, turned out to be not ready for the swift changes on the European continent and practically had no plan for German reunification countervailing the American one.

The Soviet leadership in its turn failed to clearly state and further solidify its stance on security matters in Europe given the fact that it put emphasis on glasnost and perestroika. Oscillating between different scenarios on German reunification, Gorbachev did not succeed in putting forward and defending even a single one. Thus the uncertainty of Moscow's position over the status of a unified Germany and

⁵⁸ Treaty on the Final Settlement with Respect to Germany, September 12, 1990. Accessible at <http://usa.usembassy.de/etexts/2plusfour8994e.htm> (accessed on March 18, 2010)

a number of unprecedented concessions advantageous to the West, prevented it from preserving Moscow's place in European security and made it follow the American initiative which was oriented on the instrumental use of NATO in promoting its interests in Europe and anchoring a unified Germany tightly to the West.

CHAPTER III

THE COLLAPSE OF THE BIPOLAR WORLD AND THE FRAGILE NEGOTIATIONS BETWEEN NATO AND THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION IN THE 1990s

3.1 Introduction

The accession of Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, the first president of the Russian Federation, to the presidential post was marked by a number of internal developments in Russia resulting from the weakness, unpopularity and even shifting policies of Gorbachev. Numerous concessions, mentioned in the previous chapter, which were granted by Gorbachev to the West, precipitated the demise of Russia's influence in global affairs. In this respect the new president had to deal not only with the internal economic, political and structural issues but to enhance the role of Russia on the international arena. Hence, one of the principal issues of Russia's foreign policy was NATO-related.

Following the fall of the Berlin Wall and the German reunification, Moscow was seeking to establish institutionalized relations with the Alliance which was both the old Cold-War adversary and the foremost Western club. Russian-NATO relations during the Yeltsin presidency were shaped by three main developments: the conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina, NATO's enlargement process and the Kosovo crisis. This chapter will examine to what extent the above mentioned developments, affected the Russian Federation's policy towards NATO and whether they laid solid ground for further cooperation with NATO.

3.2 Different perceptions of cooperation and a fragile honeymoon

The coup attempt of August 19-21, 1991 demonstrated the discontent and resentment of the old Communist Party elite towards the policies of Gorbachev

which resulted in economic crisis, decentralization of the government, upheavals in Eastern Europe which affected the national governments in the Republics of the Soviet Union and the loss of the Communist Party's monopoly of power.

... when the Yeltsin administration took over from Gorbachev's in December 1991, the country had only a few days' supply of food, and its currency reserves, at some 6 billion dollars, were at a historic low.⁵⁹

The first steps taken by Yeltsin as the president of the Russian Federation were aimed at eliminating the remnants of the socialist system. Thus in November 1991 Yeltsin issued a decree banning the Communist Party of the Soviet Union on the territory of the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic and later on December 8, 1991 together with the leaders of Ukraine and Belarus (all three were the signatories of the Treaty of the Union 1922) signed Belovezhskiie Agreements⁶⁰ stating that "the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, as a subject of international law and a geopolitical reality, hereby terminates its existence"⁶¹ with the formation of the Commonwealth of Independent States instead.

In regard to the foreign policy of the Russian Federation, Yeltsin opted for better relations with the USA through NATO as the most significant priority whereas Gorbachev favoured a different option to gain close relations with the West, that is through joining Europe which he openly expressed in his Strasbourg speech in mid-1989 calling for a "Common European Home."⁶² In spite of giving consent to German reunification and a number of other concessions, as noted in Chapter 2, granted to the West without getting anything in return, Gorbachev's foreign policy trajectory did not result in sustaining Gorbachev's policies. Hence, Yeltsin redirected the focus of his foreign policy to getting closer relations with the

⁵⁹ Dmitri Trenin, *Getting Russia Right*, Washington, DC : Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2007, p. 87

⁶⁰ See the full text in *Russian Foreign Policy in Transition*, ed. by Andrei Melville and Tatiana Shakleina, CEU Press: Budapest, New York, 2005, pp. 3-7

⁶¹ Ibid., p. 3

⁶² See the full text of July 6, 1989 speech of Gorbachev on "Common European Home" at <http://www.coe.int/aboutCoe/index.asp?page=nosInvites&sp=gorbachev> (accessed on March 22, 2010)

West through intense cooperation with NATO and in December 1991 sent a letter to the leaders of NATO governments, who were having a meeting in Brussels, saying that Russia hoped to join NATO in the long run.⁶³ In his letter, Yeltsin claimed that

This will contribute to creating a climate of mutual understanding and trust, strengthening stability and cooperation on the European continent. We consider these relations to be very serious and wish to develop this dialogue in each and every direction, both on the political and military levels. Today we are raising a question of Russia's membership in NATO, however regarding it as a long-term political aim.⁶⁴

Whether Russia was really intending to join NATO remains a question. However, it was a signal, both political and diplomatic; to stress that Russia saw the improvement of its relations with the Alliance and its members as the main priority of its foreign agenda. What is more, the letter created a positive impetus for establishing a “honeymoon” atmosphere in relations between Russia and NATO.

The comments of the NATO members about the Russian membership in the Alliance were rather reserved without directly opposing or giving consent to it. Thus NATO Secretary General, Manfred Wörner, stated that “nothing is excluded ... we will have time enough to develop relations.”⁶⁵ Some others were more cautious about the issue. The Canadian Foreign Minister, Barbara McDougall, said that “it was not something for the immediate future.”⁶⁶ The Belgian Foreign Minister, Mark

⁶³ See Thomas Friedman, “Soviet Disarray; Yeltsin Says Russia Seeks to Join NATO,” *The New York Times*, December 21, 1991 accessed on March 27, 2010 at <http://www.nytimes.com/1991/12/21/world/soviet-disarray-yeltsin-says-russia-seeks-to-join-nato.html?pagewanted=1> and Andrew Meier, “How to Twist Russia’s Arm: Let it Join NATO,” *Los Angeles Times*, August 20, 2008 accessed on March 27, 2010 at <http://articles.latimes.com/2008/aug/20/news/OE-MEIER20>

⁶⁴ Ibid.

⁶⁵ “Yeltsin Seeks NATO Membership,” *Times Daily*, December 21, 1991, accessed on March 28, 2010 at <http://news.google.com/newspapers?nid=1842&dat=19911220&id=6E4gAAAAIBAJ&sjid=0McEAAAIAAJ&pg=1576,3230693> See also Thomas Friedman, “Soviet Disarray; Yeltsin Says Russia Seeks to Join NATO,” *The New York Times*, December 21, 1991 available at <http://www.nytimes.com/1991/12/21/world/soviet-disarray-yeltsin-says-russia-seeks-to-join-nato.html?pagewanted=1> (accessed on March 27, 2010)

⁶⁶ Ibid.

Eyskens, claimed that “if you do it for Russia, you also have to do it for the other republics... For NATO, there is a danger of dilution.”⁶⁷

There was no any official response to Yeltsin’s request for membership in NATO which prompted him to send a second letter to the Alliance claiming that there had been “a misprint in the original message: Russia was not considering membership anytime soon.”⁶⁸ When the Alliance failed to respond again, in May 1992 Yeltsin appealed to G.W.Bush to conclude a bilateral US-Russian Alliance. In his answer, Bush said that with the end of the Cold War, there was no practical need for such an alliance and turned the Russian initiative down.⁶⁹

Moscow’s persistence in establishing good relations with the West could be explained by the desire to be accepted into the international community, granting her the status of a major power and, particularly, into Western political and economic institutions, the financial assistance of which was essential for providing a smooth transformation of the centralized state economy to a market one. Dmitri Trenin, one of the leading Russian specialists in Foreign and Security policy, in his book *Getting Russia Right* summarized the Russian Foreign policy in the early 1990s as follows:

At that time, Russia’s wish was simply to belong. It applied for NATO membership, sought to become America’s formal ally, and talked about joining the EU... All Western clubs were good for Russia, provided they recognized her status as a major power and allowed her to become a member of the board. It appeared that Russia had no interests that would clash with the interests of the West or even significantly diverge from them.⁷⁰

Hence, Russia generously granted the West an opportunity to take part in the process of transformation, Russia was undergoing, by inviting Western advisers to different branches of the Russian government. The IMF specialists were to provide

⁶⁷ Ibid.

⁶⁸ Dmitri Trenin, *Getting Russia Right*, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2007, p. 71

⁶⁹ Ibid.

⁷⁰ Ibid., p.70

Moscow with the economic plans, specially developed for Russia. The origins of the “shock therapy”⁷¹ aimed at implementing sudden economic reforms such as liberalization of prices, cutting off subsidies to state enterprises and stabilising the country’s budget lay within Harvard University’s pundits. Professor Jeffery Sachs from Harvard University served as both a senior advisor to the Russian Federation government and a member of a group of foreign economists advising Yeltsin.⁷² Moscow also allowed the US military representatives to follow the process of reduction of the nuclear arsenal possessed by Russia which was legalized in the START II Treaty⁷³ between Bush and Yeltsin in January 1993. Washington demanded from Moscow the reconsideration and sometimes even the cancellation of the deals, which had been concluded and signed by the heads of States, on selling its military technology to other countries. In 1993, Moscow concluded a deal with Delhi, which was personally guaranteed by Yeltsin, on the sale of the cryogenic rocket. However, under pressure from Washington, Moscow had to cancel the deal which was considered “as a first step in Russia’s search for new markets for its space and military technology.”⁷⁴ Alexei Pushkov, a foreign policy analyst and speechwriter for Gorbachev, gave his own assessment to the episode claiming that “The tough position of the U.S. administration on that sale was largely held in Moscow as proof of U.S. indifference toward Russia’s needs and national interests.”⁷⁵

There were also some other gestures of goodwill on the part of Russia towards the West. As it had been previously agreed in the Treaty on the Final

⁷¹ An economic policy launched by a group of young reformists lead by Yegor Gaidar. It had been applied in Russia for four years following January 2, 1992

⁷² George M. Taber, “RX for Russia: Shock Therapy,” *Time*, January 27, 1992 available at <http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,974758,00.html> (accessed on April 8, 2010)

⁷³ For more details see START II Treaty at <http://www.state.gov/www/global/arms/starthtm/start2/st2intal.html> (accessed on April 8, 2010)

⁷⁴ Alexei Pushkov, “Letter from Eurasia: Russia and America: The Honemooon’s over,” *Foreign Policy*, Winter 93/94, Issue 93, p. 9-10

⁷⁵ Ibid.

Settlement with Respect to Germany, Russia withdrew its troops from Eastern Germany, Eastern Europe and the Baltic states. The Commonwealth of Independent States, created in 1991 under Yeltsin's initiative, was purposefully lacking a military structure in it. What is more, Moscow fully collaborated with the Western partners on the Iraqi issue and backed the UN's sanctions against Iraq.⁷⁶

The policy of rapprochement with the West brought some slight achievements to Russia. Hence, in 1991, it was granted an observer status at G7 and in 1992 became a member of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. However, most importantly, in December 1991, Russia joined the North Atlantic Cooperation Council (NACC) which marked the beginning of the formal relations between NATO and Russia. NACC was created by NATO at the end of the Cold War in December 1991 "as a means of reaching out to the countries that had been members of the Warsaw Pact, as well as to the new states that succeeded the Soviet Union."⁷⁷ It was the starting point of NATO's partnership policy specially designed to embrace the former Warsaw Pact members and former Soviet Union Republics whose initial goals were not only "to promote security dialogue and co-operation but also to help the newly independent states build a democratic environment and modernise their armed forces."⁷⁸ The creation of NACC was one of the components required for the transformation of the Alliance, which was losing its status in the post-Cold War period, from an organization responsible for the territorial defence of its members to a security organization able to promote security far beyond its borders.

In spite of the minor concessions granted to Russia, the West was trying to pursue and promote its own interests at Russia's expense at times. In response to the pledges of Gorbachev for financial assistance required to implement the reforms in the Soviet Union and later in the Russian Federation, the West, led by the USA, tied

⁷⁶ Susan Eisenhower, "The Perils of Victory," Chapter 7 in *NATO Enlargement : Illusions and Reality*, ed. by Ted Galen Carpenter and Barbara Conry, Cato Institute, Washington, D.C., 1998, p. 107

⁷⁷ NATO's Developing Partnerships, 165 PCNP 08 E bis, NATO Parliamentary Assembly, available at <http://www.nato-pa.int/default.asp?SHORTCUT=1469> (accessed on March 31, 2010)

⁷⁸ Ibid.

the possible Western assistance to full compliance with the obligations taken by the Soviet Union previously in regard to its Western debt. It was the main priority of the Bush Treasury Department to get assent from the prospective independent Russian Federation to the fulfillment of the obligations incurred by the USSR. In this regard, on September 11, 1991 in his meeting with Gorbachev, Baker, US Secretary of State, presented the U.S. position saying that

... first, the Soviet government needed to approach debt restructuring cautiously since the West would be unable to provide even emergency food and medicine if the Soviets could not maintain creditworthiness. Second, the Soviet government had to be transparent to the G-7 about its gold reserve holdings.⁷⁹

Although in October 1991, Yavlinsky (appointed to be responsible for economic issues after the August coup) informed the finance ministers of G-7 that the Soviet Union was on the verge of default and would be unable to service its foreign debt as of November 1991, there was no mentioning on the part of the West about restructuring or forgiveness of even a part of the Soviet debt, though such forgiveness was offered to Egypt on the condition of its participation in the Gulf War. The argument was that "...it [the Russian Federation] wasn't a poor country. It had energy exports. And if it chooses to spend on defence, that's its choice. It can pay its foreign debt and it should."⁸⁰

Thus, instead of \$23 billion, an assistance package estimated by the World Bank, required for the transformation to a market economy in the Russian Federation, on November 20, 1991, Washington declared \$1.5 billion in food assistance (largely agricultural credit guarantees) and \$100 million additionally as an emergency assistance to the USSR.⁸¹ The humanitarian assistance named "Operation Provide Hope" was provided by the USA in February 1992 and consisted of food and medicine left over from the U.S. military operation in Iraq named Desert Storm in 1991. On the overall scale, EU had provided 71 percent of

⁷⁹ James M. Goldgeier and Michael McFaul, *Power and Purpose: U.S. Policy toward Russia after the Cold War*, Brookings Institution Press, Washington, D.C., 2003, p.69

⁸⁰ Ibid.

⁸¹ Ibid., p. 72

aid to the former Soviet Union Republics while the US total amounted to 6 percent only,⁸² which consisted of “tied credits” to be used to buy American food.

Another priority for the West was denuclearization of the former USSR Republics namely Ukraine, Belarus and Kazakhstan. On May 23-24, 1992 the foreign ministers of the Russian Federation, Belarus, Ukraine and Kazakhstan and Baker, as the representative of the United States, signed the START protocols in Lisbon on the “commitment of the member states of the Commonwealth of Independent States [Kazakhstan, Ukraine, Belarus and the Russian Federation] that the nuclear weapons of the former Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will be maintained under the safe, secure, and reliable control of a single unified authority,”⁸³ represented by the Russian Federation as the successor state of the USSR. Kazakhstan, Ukraine and Belarus were to become non-nuclear weapon states “in the shortest possible time, and shall begin immediately to take all necessary action to this end in accordance with their constitutional practices.”⁸⁴

On the other hand, not everybody in the Bush administration supported the idea of denuclearization of the former USSR Republics, particularly, Ukraine. Thus the officials in Pentagon and Secretary Dick Cheney were wary about feasible Russian expansionism and attempted to balance Moscow by supporting other regional powers among which Ukraine was seen as possessing the necessary nuclear arsenal to act as a deterrent against the Russian Federation. Cheney’s assistant secretary of defence for international security policy, Stephen Hadley, in his interview with Michael McFaul and James Goldgeier stated that

...There was a view at the Pentagon that a Ukraine with nuclear weapons was the best way to safeguard that Russia would not try to reassert its control; there was another view that a Ukraine with nuclear weapons would be such a problem for

⁸² Ibid., p.77

⁸³ Article V, Lisbon Protocol 1 to the START Treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms, May 23, 1992 available at <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/27389.pdf> (accessed on April 10, 2010)

⁸⁴ Ibid.

Russia that you would ensure that it would not develop good relations with Russia...⁸⁵

By underpinning Ukraine, being an independent state and possessing nuclear weapons, Washington was pursuing its own geostrategic interests. The geographical position, natural resources and the size of Ukraine made it the “insurance policy”⁸⁶ in the hands of Washington to counterbalance Moscow.

Therefore, the Russian Federation was no longer considered a superpower and was “relegated to the role of junior partner, or not acknowledged at all.”⁸⁷ Regarding itself the winner in the Cold War, Washington availed itself of the imbalance of power between itself and Moscow by promoting unilateral policy disregarding the reaction of the former. Indeed, the Russian Federation was not informed by the USA about its air strikes on Libya, Moscow’s old ally, in 1993. The situation in the relations between the Russian Federation and the West was similarly worsened by other slights. Washington accompanied by its Western partners raised protectionist walls in the way of Russia’s technological products supposed to be sold on the markets of the Western countries.

Almost immediately after the Soviet collapse, the United States and Western Europe set about imposing economic quotas on such things as aluminum, uranium, and aero-space and rocket-launch technology—in which Russia actually had a hope of competing internationally.⁸⁸

There was an impression in Moscow that “the Americans are frankly driving us into a corner.”⁸⁹

And what was the stance of Russia? Had it submitted to the Western political agenda implicitly? In 1993, a drastic shift in the Russia’s foreign policy from a conciliatory one with the West to a nationalist oriented one could be clearly

⁸⁵ James M. Goldgeier and Michael McFaul, *Power and Purpose*, p. 43

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 47

⁸⁷ Susan Eisenhower, “The Perils of Victory,” p. 108

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*

observed. “Yeltsin became much more critical of the proposed extension of NATO membership to Eastern European nations. He became less willing to automatically assent to Western political demands.”⁹⁰ A number of internal and external factors precipitated it. Firstly, the situation in Russia was deteriorated by the effects of the economic policy called “shock therapy” aimed at removing state controls from wholesale and retail prices. In one day, January 2, 1992, the government removed state controls from over 80 per cent of wholesale prices and 90 per cent of retail prices.⁹¹ Naturally, the consequences of this measure were high rocketing consumer prices and hyper inflation. To illustrate, in January 1992, consumer prices rose by 2500 per cent amounting to 31.2 per cent of inflation rate per month whereas in the 1980s the inflation rate was less than 2 per cent per year, 5.6 per cent in 1990 and 160 per cent in 1991.⁹² The unstable economic situation paved the way for a failed attempt to impeach Yeltsin in spring 1993 which caused the dissolution of Parliament in September the same year. Finally, the majority of votes in December 1993 parliamentary elections was won by the nationalists who pushed Yeltsin for a tougher nationalist rhetoric in the foreign policy.

Secondly, Moscow did not get commensurate acknowledgment from the West for its policy of unilateral concessions to it. Thirdly, the financial help released by the West was scarce and badly allocated. Fourthly, there was realization that the Russian Federation’s weakness was exploited by the West to promote its interests in the international political arena.

On the wave of the newly acquired course of nationalist rhetoric in foreign policy, Yeltsin dispatched a letter to the leaders of the USA, Germany, France and the UK stating his vision of the European Security’s future. The main idea in the letter was that “security must be indivisible and must rest on pan-European structures,” or else, there was a possibility of “neo-isolation of [the Russian

⁹⁰ David M. Kotz and Fred Weir, *Russia’s Path from Gorbachev to Putin: The demise of the Soviet system and the new Russia*, Routledge Taylor&Francis Group, London and New York, 2007, p.196

⁹¹ Data provided by International Monetary Fund. Cited by David M. Kotz and Fred Weir in *Russia’s Path from Gorbachev to Putin: The demise of the Soviet system and the new Russia*, p. 162

⁹² *Ibid.*, p. 172

Federation] as opposed to its natural introduction into the Euro-Atlantic space”.⁹³ Undoubtedly, this letter revealed the first sign of Moscow’s discontent with the policy of NATO, oriented on its expansion, which will be discussed later in the present chapter.

Consequently, the fragile honeymoon in the relations between the Russian Federation and the West was in the twilight. The initial euphoria in Moscow changed into a sober realization of reality and laid the ground for the friction-cooperation pattern in the relations with the Alliance. Thus, the first serious breach in the relations with NATO since the fall of the Berlin Wall was posed by the crisis in Bosnia and Herzegovina stipulated by a number of reasons examined in details further.

3.3 Totality of Cooperation and Friction

3.3.1 Different stances over the conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina

In 1992, the direction of the Russian foreign policy towards the Bosnian conflict was formed by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and its minister Andrey Kozyrev who was a liberalist in his political views and wholeheartedly advocated the idea that being a democratic state Russia shared common interests with the West which enabled her in the rights of partners through the international institutions such as the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE) and the United Nations (UN) to peacefully resolve the conflicts posing threat to international and European security. Thus in unison with the West, the Russian Federation voted for Resolution 757,⁹⁴ aiming at applying sanctions against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia in the United Nations Security Council on 30 May 1992. Nevertheless, the Russian Federation was against removing an arms embargo from Bosnia. Side

⁹³ President Boris Yeltsin’s letter to Bill Clinton. Cited by Martin A. Smith in “A Bumpy Road to an Unknown Destination? NATO-Russia Relations, 1991-2002,” *European Security*, Volume 11, Issue 4, Winter 2002 , p. 61

⁹⁴ The full text of the resolution can be accessed at <http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/RESOLUTION/GEN/NR0/011/16/IMG/NR001116.pdf?OpenElement> (accessed on April 14, 2010)

by side with the foreign policy set forth by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs there was another one supported by the opposition. The Russian military, for example, was promoting the idea of great power rivalry with the West for influence in the Balkans, historically Russian sphere of interest, by supporting the Serbs.

In 1994, in the aftermath of the parliamentary elections in Russia, when two-fifths of the seats in the Parliament were occupied by the communists and nationalists, the trajectory of the official Russian foreign policy changed to a realistic one. The compliance with the demands and interests of the West was not considered a priority anymore. Instead, more importance was given to her own interests which “did not necessarily coincide with those of Western states; on the contrary, it was assumed that as a great power, Russia would have to compete with other great powers to protect its perceived interests and assert its power.”⁹⁵ Bosnian conflict in this sense was an opportunity to demonstrate the status of a great power and secure the Russian interests in the Balkan region.

The escalation of the Bosnian crisis turned into a new phase with the firing of a mortar shell into the Markale market-place in Sarajevo on 5 February 1994, which killed 68 people and wounded another 200.⁹⁶ The next day after the incident the Secretary-General of the UN, Boutros Ghali, in his letter to Manfred Wörner, the NATO Secretary-General, asked for the authorization of NATO’s command to launch air strikes on request from the UN.⁹⁷

The Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs severely condemned the market-place killings and called for objective investigation to find the guilty party. However, it saw hardly any grounds for the use of force on the part of NATO as had been requested by Boutros Ghali.

The Markale market-place incident seemed to have enough grounds for NATO to call

⁹⁵ Jim Headley, “Sarajevo, February 1994: the first Russia NATO crisis of the post-Cold War era,” *Review of International Studies*, (2003), 29, p. 212

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 216

⁹⁷ Cited by Jim Headley in “Sarajevo...,” p. 217

for the withdrawal, or regrouping and placing under UNPROFOR control, within ten days, of heavy weapons (including tanks, artillery pieces, mortars, multiple rocket launchers, missiles and anti-aircraft weapons) of the Bosnian Serb forces located in an area within 20 kilometres of the centre of Sarajevo, and excluding an area within two kilometres of the centre of Pale.⁹⁸

The perception of the Russian Federation towards the decision of NATO to launch air strikes was based on the grounds that NATO went beyond its legal authority. Vitaly Churkin, Deputy Foreign Minister of the Russian Federation and Russia's special envoy to the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, expressed Russia's official view on the possible air strikes:

Regardless of what they are telling us, I believe that NATO's decision goes beyond what UN Security Council resolutions stipulate. We should have taken it to the UN Security Council and then we would have had total unanimity in the international community's stance. This was feasible, since basically we are talking about the same views. We would have the UN Security Council's authority behind us. I believe that this method would have been far better.⁹⁹

Participation in the resolution of the conflict in Bosnia was essential for the Russian Federation since it would reaffirm its great power status and secure its interests in the traditionally Russian sphere of interests. "Some people are trying to resolve the Bosnian question without the participation of Russia," Mr. Yeltsin said in his first remarks since NATO threatened the Bosnian Serbs with air strikes. "We will not allow this."¹⁰⁰

There was an attempt on the part of NATO to bring Moscow into the active phase of the resolution of the Bosnian conflict but it was rejected by Moscow on the

⁹⁸ Decisions taken at the Meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Permanent Session1, Article 6, February 9, 1994, available at http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_24465.htm (accessed on April 21, 2010)

⁹⁹ ITAR-TASS, *SWB*, SU/1924 B/11-12, February 17, 1994.

¹⁰⁰ Steven Erlanger, "Yeltsin Adamant on Role in Bosnia," *The New York Times*, February 16, 1994, available at <http://www.nytimes.com/1994/02/16/world/yeltsin-adamant-on-role-in-bosnia.html?sep=1&sq=YELTSIN%20ADAMANT%20ON%20ROLE%20IN%20BOSNIA&st=cse> (accessed on April 23, 2010)

grounds that it would undermine its position in the Balkans. That was the case when on February 14, 1994, the Russian command of the battalion (RUSSBAT) stationed in Sector East (Croatia) under UNPROFOR received an order to send 400 troops to Bosnia. As a response, the Russian Ministry of Defence released a directive to the command of RUSSBAT not to fulfil any orders of the UN on the relocation of Russian troops.¹⁰¹

On February 17, 1994 Churkin brought a proposal from Yeltsin to Slobodan Milošević, Serbian President, and Radovan Karadžić, leader of the Bosnian Serbs. According to the proposal, the Bosnian Serbs were to withdraw their heavy weapons in accordance with the NAC statement twenty kilometers from Sarajevo and to fill the vacuum, 400 Russian peace-keepers were to be redeployed from Sector East in Croatia to Sarajevo. The proposal was accepted by the Serbian President and the Bosnian Serbs and helped to avoid the air strikes on Bosnian Serbs. The Russian Federation favoured the peaceful resolution of the conflict since the launch of air strikes would be a big blow to its interests and role in the Balkan region. That is how *The Sun Journal* commented on the issue, “NATO’s growing role in Eastern Europe and the Balkans has irritated Russia and air strikes would likely humiliate the Kremlin.”¹⁰² In this sense, the diplomatic solution offered by the Russian side and not the threat of military action promoted by the West was stressed to be the most decisive one. “It was precisely the Russian initiative that made it possible to resolve the crisis that developed around Sarajevo in recent weeks,”¹⁰³ said Churkin. On the other hand, the West claimed that only diplomacy backed by credible military actions could lead to the peaceful resolution of the conflict.

Each side was seeking to raise the importance of its own role in alleviating the Bosnian crisis and had grounds for that. The Russian Federation blamed the West for not being consulted and informed in advance about the possible air strikes

¹⁰¹ Jim Headley, “Sarajevo...,” p. 219

¹⁰² “Russians Claim Credit for Serb Arms Withdrawal,” *Sun-Journal*, Lewiston, Maine, February 19, 1994, p.2 available at <http://news.google.com/newspapers?nid=1914&dat=19940219&id=-RIgAAAIBAJ&sjid=6mUFAAAAIBAJ&pg=1497,4183790> (accessed on April 22, 2010)

¹⁰³ Ibid.

against Serbs. Vyacheslav Kostikov, Yeltsin's spokesman, linked this issue to the Alliance's initiative, Partnership for Peace (PfP), designed to establish relations between NATO and former USSR and Warsaw Pact countries, including Russia. "Bombing Serb positions with NATO planes would be associated by the world and by Russia, with the United States and its recently launched Partnership for Peace, which has not been explained or understood fully," Kostikov told the Interfax news agency. "I think this might inflict psychological damage on this diplomatic initiative. The operation might be viewed as the false start of the American initiative,"¹⁰⁴ he explained.

Additionally, the Sarajevo conflict revealed the fact that the Russian Federation and the NATO countries had their interests at stake in Bosnia. The Russian Federation saw active participation in the resolution of the conflict in Bosnia vital to its interests in the Balkans which it still considered its traditional sphere of influence. Regarding itself a European power, expressed numerous by the Soviet and Russian leaders in the idea of Common European Home, Moscow perceived conflict in Bosnia threatening to the stability in wider Europe. Churkin stated that "we are not only a world power but also a European country and naturally it is in our interests that there should be peace in Europe."¹⁰⁵ Although the Russian Federation attempted to demonstrate that it was a great power, in reality it proved to be a weak actor in the Bosnian conflict under Yeltsin's leadership. Moscow's seemingly decisive role in mitigating the Bosnian conflict could domestically bring the support of the electorate for Yeltsin. "Our people are grateful," one of Mr. Churkin's colleagues said. "I'm quite sure it will also help us in domestic politics, for it will be seen as a success for Mr. Yeltsin."¹⁰⁶

Moscow's main calculation was to limit the role of NATO in any military operation in Bosnia. At the start of the conflict in 1991-1992 NATO was a distant participant in pacifying the conflict and preferred not to intervene since it was

¹⁰⁴ Steven Erlanger, "Yeltsin Adamant..."

¹⁰⁵ Cited by Jim Headley in "Sarajevo..." p. 223

¹⁰⁶ Ibid.

involved in the Gulf War. “Yugoslavia would be a problem only if the conflict spread and involved other major powers, and so the Bush administration put a small U.S. force in Macedonia to deter the conflict from spreading but not to put the fire out.”¹⁰⁷ The UN and EC, on the other hand, had been taking an active role in the peace process. Thus, early in 1993 the UN Special Envoy Cyrus Vance and EC representative Lord Owen launched negotiations on a peace proposal with Bosnian Serbs. Rejection of the Vance-Owen Peace Plan by the Bosnian Serbs in May 1993, prompted the UN Security Council to establish six “safe areas” in Sarajevo, Žepa, Srebrenica, Goražde, Tuzla and Bihać aimed at protecting civilians from military attacks. Only in 1994, was the Alliance’s active role in Bosnia put forward by the UN with the declaration of the ultimatum of possible air strikes on Serbs.

1994 was also the year when under the NATO umbrella the USA embarked on a new initiative, PfP, to link former Warsaw Pact and USSR members to NATO. To be successful on this journey, it was essential to raise the credibility of the Alliance, undermined as the Cold War ended. In this regard, new out of area peace-keeping and peace-enforcing operations like the one in Bosnia could demonstrate NATO’s relevance to the realities of the post-Cold War era. In Moscow’s view “the more NATO became involved in former Yugoslavia and dominated the peace-keeping programme, then the more it would appear as de facto NATO expansion into the former communist world and an area of traditional Russian interests.”¹⁰⁸ The Alliance, was performing the duty of patrolling the no-fly zone in Bosnia and Moscow, was unwilling to grant NATO a much wider role. Being politically and economically weak, the Russian Federation in its foreign policy could not follow a line aimed at direct opposition to the policies of the West and NATO. However, diplomatically it was in its national interest to impede any vigorous actions of the Alliance in the strategically significant region of Bosnia and later, particularly in Yugoslavia.

¹⁰⁷ James M. Goldgeier and Michael McFaul, *Power and Purpose*, p. 9

¹⁰⁸ Jim Headley, “Sarajevo...,” p. 215

After all, if NATO was intent on expansion into Eastern Europe and the Baltic, and sought a peace-keeping/peace-making role that might bring it into other parts of the former Soviet Union, then Russian diplomats wanted it to fail at the first attempt.¹⁰⁹

The decisiveness of the Alliance to resort to air strikes in Bosnia materialized in summer 1995 when NATO launched Operation Deliberate Force¹¹⁰ in response to another Markale Massacre on August 28, 1995. The campaign lasted between August 30 and September 20, 1995 and ended with the conclusion of the Dayton Peace Agreement enforced on Serbia, Croatia and Bosnia by the members of the Contact Group (the UK, France, the Russian Federation, Germany and the USA). A multinational NATO-led peace Implementation Force (IFOR) was deployed in Bosnia and Herzegovina in December 1995 with a one-year mandate, in which a Russian contingent operated under “an American general but not in the NATO chain of command.”¹¹¹ The Supreme Allied Commander (SACEUR) and the commander in chief (CINC) of U.S. forces in Europe was represented by the same person, the American General Joulwan. Thus, in response to the demands of the Russian side, which favoured participation in the Bosnian peace process but not under NATO, it was decided to appoint a Russian General Shevtsov, as Joulwan’s deputy. That is how Defense Secretary William Perry commented on the arrangement reached with Moscow over Bosnia:

Under the Joulwan-Shevtsov scheme, we got what we wanted; unity of command, under Joulwan, for all combat forces, including Russian forces. And the Russians got what they wanted: a role “with, but not under NATO.”¹¹²

When IFOR’s mandate expired in December 1996, a stabilization force (SFOR) was deployed instead, in which the number of Russian troops comprised the largest non-NATO contingent to the NATO-led peacekeeping forces. Russian troops

¹⁰⁹ Ibid., p. 216

¹¹⁰ See details of Operation Deliberate Force at <http://www.afsouth.nato.int/factsheets/DeliberateForceFactSheet.htm>, (accessed on April 24, 2010)

¹¹¹ James M. Goldgeier and Michael McFaul, “Power and Purpose,” p. 200

¹¹² Ashton B. Carter and William J. Perry, *Preventive Defense: A New Security Strategy for America*, The Brookings Institution, 1999, p. 44

make up some 1,200 of the 20,000 peacekeepers in the Stabilization Force (SFOR) in Bosnia and Herzegovina.¹¹³

Incorporation of the Russian Federation into the Contact Group could not prevent the air strikes against the army of the Republika Srpska but marked the recognition of Moscow's importance in the region on the part of the West. In continuation of this line of thought, Headley asserts that

for Russian policymakers, participation in the Contact Group was not merely a reflection of Russia's status, but also enabled them to avert any action that they deemed to be against Russia's interests or that might be considered anti-Serb and that would be attacked by domestic political force.¹¹⁴

The Bosnian conflict had been the first case of opposition between NATO and the Russian Federation since the dissolution of the USSR and led to increased friction in their relations which was though, healed by the integration of the Russian Federation into the peace settlement in Bosnia, contributing to the sustaining of the cooperative relationship between Moscow and the Alliance, subsequently severed only by the issues of the Kosovo crisis and NATO enlargement.

3.3.2 Different stances over the Kosovo Crisis

Since the end of the Cold War NATO-Russia relations had faced several challenges and the Kosovo crisis, for many, represented one of the biggest challenges. Vladimir Baranovsky, deputy director of the institute of World Economy and International Relations, claimed that "the Kosovo phenomenon has contributed to consolidating Russia's anti-NATO stand more than the entire vociferous campaign against the enlargement of NATO."¹¹⁵

¹¹³ "Russia and NATO: Partners in Peacekeeping," NATO Office of Information and Press, p.1 available at <http://www.nato.int/docu/presskit/010219/brocheng.pdf> (accessed on April 24, 2010)

¹¹⁴ Jim Headley, "Sarajevo...", p. 225

¹¹⁵ Vladimir Baranovsky, "The Kosovo factor in Russia's Foreign Policy," *The International Spectator*, Issue 35, No: 2, April-June 2000, p. 115

A number of parallel lines can be drawn between the Bosnian and Kosovo conflicts in terms of the Russian Federation's role in resolving the conflicts, its great power aspirations and NATO's disregard of Moscow's role in the Balkans, the region the Russian Federation had historic and ethno-religious ties with. As in the Bosnian conflict, the Russian Federation took a cooperative stance with the West and in March 1998, the UN Security Council voted for Resolution 1160 putting an arms embargo on the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, including Kosovo, as its province:

all States shall, for the purposes of fostering peace and stability in Kosovo, prevent the sale or supply to the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, including Kosovo, by their nationals or from their territories or using their flag vessels and aircraft, of arms and related matériel of all types, such as weapons and ammunition, military vehicles and equipment and spare parts for the aforementioned, and shall prevent arming and training for terrorist activities there¹¹⁶

The Resolution did also contain the clause on "the consideration of additional measures" in case of "a failure to make constructive progress towards the peaceful resolution of the situation in Kosovo."¹¹⁷ Nearly six months later in September 1998 the UN Security Council passed Resolution 1199 urging for "enable[ing] effective and continuous international monitoring in Kosovo by the European Community Monitoring Mission and diplomatic missions accredited to the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia."¹¹⁸ Resolution 1199 had also referred to "consider[ing] further action and additional measures to maintain or restore peace and stability in the region"¹¹⁹ if its provisions were not fulfilled. However, the decision of Moscow to vote for Resolution 1160 and 1199 should not be interpreted as giving its consent to the use of force against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia,

¹¹⁶ Resolution 1160, UN Security Council, March 31, 1998, Article 8, p. 2 available at <http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N98/090/23/PDF/N9809023.pdf?OpenElement> (accessed on April 25, 2010)

¹¹⁷ Ibid., Article 19, p. 4

¹¹⁸ Resolution 1199, UN Security Council, September 23, 1998, Article 4b, available at <http://www.un.org/peace/kosovo/98sc1199.htm> (accessed on April 25, 2010)

¹¹⁹ Ibid., Article 16

which was inadmissible and unacceptable for the Russian Federation, but as “requiring further action by the Security Council to allow military action.”¹²⁰ The Russian Federation did not exercise its veto power in regard to the above mentioned resolutions due to the following reasons. According to the Russian newspaper Kommersant-Daily, firstly, Moscow regarded UN Resolutions as the final warnings to the President of the FRY, Milošević and secondly, to avoid isolation of the Russian Federation within the Security Council.¹²¹

In October 1998, when NATO was preparing to give a pre-attack “activation order” on launching air strikes against Yugoslavia, Yeltsin called Clinton and assured him that in the negotiations with Russian diplomats, Milošević had agreed to comply with the UN obligations resulting in the elimination of any need to use force.¹²² Without having any intention to fulfil the UN obligations Milošević was again able to put off NATO air strikes with Russian help.

Moscow’s policy towards the Kosovo issue was a combination of “solidarity pressure over Belgrade with attempts to advocate the interests of the latter.”¹²³ Indeed, Moscow supported the international efforts by voting for Resolution 1160 and imposing an arms embargo on the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia while strongly defending the interests of the latter during the negotiations in the Contact Group requiring a dash of diplomatic efforts.

Moscow was successful in pursuing this line when it played a crucial role in preventing the military intervention of NATO in October 1998; it failed later, however, during the Rambouillet talks and on the eve of NATO air strikes in February/March 1999.¹²⁴

¹²⁰ Catherine Guicherd, “International Law and the War in Kosovo,” *Survival*, Vol. 41, Issue 2, Summer 1999, pp. 26-27

¹²¹ Kommersant-Daily, April 3, 1998

¹²² James M. Goldgeier and Michael McFaul, “Power and Purpose,” p. 250

¹²³ Vladimir Baranovsky, “The Kosovo Factor in Russia’s Foreign Policy,” *The International Spectator*, Volume 35, Issue 2, 2000, p. 118

¹²⁴ Ibid.

In January 1999 the Alliance issued an ultimatum to Belgrade following the discovery of civilian bodies in Racak, Kosovo and the talks on a peaceful settlement were launched in Rambouillet, France. The talks were predetermined to failure due to a number of reasons. Mark Weller summarized these reasons as follows:

The presence of the parties at the talks had been ensured through the threat of the use of force by NATO. Acceptance of the political interim settlement on the basis of non-negotiable principles which contained difficult elements for both parties was to be obtained, if necessary, through the threat of use of force.¹²⁵

What is more, the agenda of the Rambouillet Conference soon departed from its main trajectory on resolving the Kosovo conflict to discussion of the relations among the Contact Group members. France attempted to undermine NATO's decision-making over Kosovo. The Russian Federation was opposing the peace settlement enforced by NATO. On the whole, there was a feeling among NATO member states that the Russian Federation was defending the interests of Belgrade acting "almost in the way of a representative of a particular party to the talks."¹²⁶

Russia in its turn blamed NATO for being rather subjective and uncompromising towards Belgrade and regarded the Rambouillet Conference as a pretext for NATO to launch a military action against FRY. The Russian perception was that "not only was NATO biased against the Serbs, but it was also now actively seeking to engineer a situation whereby the talks would fail, with the Serbs being blamed. NATO members would then, the Russians felt, have their pretext to begin bombing."¹²⁷

The Rambouillet Conference failed to reach a comprehensive peace solution and what is more, led to further deterioration in the relations between the Alliance and Moscow following the decision of NATO to launch air strikes against FRY on 24 March 1999, named Operation Allied Force. In spite of the fact that the

¹²⁵ Mark Weller, "The Rambouillet Conference on Kosovo," *International Affairs*, 1999, Vol. 75, no. 2, p. 250

¹²⁶ Ibid.

¹²⁷ *Segodnya*, March 17, 1999. Cited by Martin A. Smith in *Russia and NATO since 1991*, Routledge: Taylor & Francis Group, London and New York, 2006, p. 79

Permanent Joint Council had been established for NATO and the Russian Federation to coordinate, consult and work together to prevent future conflicts, the Alliance made a unilateral decision to start a military operation without consulting with Moscow. Apart from this, “the focus of official Russian anger was on the fact that NATO had not obtained, or even tried to obtain, a UN Security Council Resolution authorizing its use of military force.”¹²⁸ Obviously, the decision of the Alliance was dictated by the desire to avoid complications to the process which could be caused by the Russian veto power in the UN Security Council. For the Russian Federation, in its turn, it meant ignoring its world power status and relegation to the sidelines of world developments. It had been also interpreted by some Russian observers that “a new reorganization of world power has already started – and that it is one that can be compared to two previous ones (in 1918 and 1945) or has an even more fundamental character.”¹²⁹ NATO’s military operation was also perceived as discrediting the democratic principles and values advocated by the Western countries.¹³⁰ The Western-oriented path in Russian foreign policy was strongly undermined by the air strikes and severely criticized by the communists and nationalists inside the country, who called for breaking off relations with the NATO member countries.

Was the strategy of breaking off relations with the West really feasible for Moscow in 1999? Obviously not. Moscow’s aspirations were to become a fully-fledged member of the Western financial clubs and to receive further financial assistance for implementing the reforms. Furthermore, dependence of the Russian Federation on the credits obtained from the International Monetary Fund and the fear of being isolated from the European processes as well as overall political and economic weakness to influence the NATO decisions played a crucial role in choosing the proper response to NATO military action on the part of Moscow.¹³¹

¹²⁸ Martin A. Smith, *Russia and NATO since 1991*, p. 79

¹²⁹ Vladimir Baranovsky, “The Kosovo Factor...,” p. 116

¹³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 117

¹³¹ Martin A. Smith, *Russia and NATO since 1991*, p. 80

Yeltsin clarified the Russian position on 20 April 1999: “But in spite of NATO's aggressive actions, we cannot break with the Western countries. We cannot lead ourselves into isolation because we are in Europe and no one will kick us out of Europe.”¹³²

Moscow's response consisted in the suspension of its participation in PJC and withdrawal of its mission from NATO. However, it continued keeping up diplomatic relations with NATO member countries on a regular basis and was sending messages to the West on its readiness to cooperate with the members of the Contact Group on the peaceful settlement of the Kosovo crisis. Yeltsin stated that

the sooner negotiations are resumed, the greater the chance the international community will have of finding a political settlement. Russia is prepared to continue working closely with the other members of the Contact Group for the sake of achieving this goal.¹³³

The essence of the matter was that cooperation with NATO and not confrontation would allow Moscow to be integrated into a European post-settlement environment. Indeed, the Alliance would anyway be an influential organization whereas Moscow had to deserve its place under the sun in order not to be pushed out completely from the Balkans, its sphere of influence. The only way it could be succeeded was through interaction with NATO on resolving the Kosovo crisis. NATO “would remain an influential structure in the post-settlement context as well, and having no mechanisms for dealing with NATO would hardly be in Russia's interests.”¹³⁴ Consequently, the Russian Federation favoured the strategy of freezing Russia-NATO relations without ceasing them permanently and irreversibly.¹³⁵

Meantime, along with establishing cooperation with the West, Moscow made every effort possible to reach a peaceful settlement in Kosovo through its subtle

¹³² Cited in D. Lynch, “Walking the tightrope”: The Kosovo Conflict and Russia in European security, 1998–August 1999”, *European Security*, 1999, vol. 8, no. 4, p. 70.

¹³³ Cited by Martin A. Smith in *Russia and NATO since 1991*, p. 81

¹³⁴ Vladimir Baranovsky, “The Kosovo Factor...”, p. 120

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*

diplomacy. Diplomatic maneuvering, as in the case with Bosnia, remained the last resort to be referred to. The then Prime Minister of the Russian Federation, Yevgeny Primakov, strived to enhance Moscow's mediator's role in the conflict through "divide and rule" policy. Undeniably, dealing with the Alliance as a whole, which practically meant dealing with the USA, required a lot of efforts and could not guarantee the desirable result, whereas establishing amenable relations with the individual members of the Alliance, such as Germany and France, would allow Moscow to build a coalition within NATO and make its voice more vocal in the Alliance.¹³⁶

Moscow's efforts and the "divide and rule" policy soon bore fruit. Thus, the German Foreign Minister, Joschka Fischer, asserted that Germany was counting on a diplomatic outcome to the war in Kosovo, with the backing of Russia.¹³⁷ Consequently, when NATO released a statement on "The situation in and around Kosovo,"¹³⁸ containing NATO's demands addressed to Milošević, Germany, in cooperation with Russia, presented its own plan which had some subtle differences with the NATO's one. Moscow's role in finding a peaceful solution to the Kosovo war was stressed by the German foreign minister on 7 April 1999.¹³⁹ In spite of this, the plan was called "German" because "it suited the Russians to have the proposals presented formally by the FRG, in order to increase the chances of positive reception within NATO."¹⁴⁰

¹³⁶ Martin A. Smith, *Russia and NATO since 1991*, p. 81

¹³⁷ Jane Perlez, "Crisis in the Balkans : Diplomacy, German Pegs Quick Peace to the role of Russians," *The New York Times*, May 26, 1999 available at <http://www.nytimes.com/1999/05/26/world/crisis-in-the-balkans-diplomacy-german-pegs-quick-peace-to-the-role-of-russians.html?scp=13&sq=germany+russia+kosovo&st=cse> (accessed on April 29, 2010)

¹³⁸ "The Situation in and around Kosovo," Statement issued at the Extraordinary Ministerial Meeting of the North Atlantic Council held at NATO Headquarters, Brussels, April 12, 1999 available at http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_27435.htm (accessed on April 29, 2010)

¹³⁹ B. Posen, 'The war for Kosovo', *International Security*, Vol. 24, Issue. 4, 2000, p. 67

¹⁴⁰ Martin A. Smith, *Russia and NATO since 1991*, p. 83

The initial proposal of NATO contained the following demands to be complied with by the president of FRY:

- ensure a verifiable stop to all military action and the immediate ending of violence and repression;
- ensure the withdrawal from Kosovo of the military, police and paramilitary forces;
- agree to the stationing in Kosovo of an international military presence;
- agree to the unconditional and safe return of all refugees and displaced persons and unhindered access to them by humanitarian aid organisations;
- provide credible assurance of his willingness to work on the basis of the Rambouillet Accords in the establishment of a political framework agreement for Kosovo in conformity with international law and the Charter of the United Nations.¹⁴¹

The final proposal accepted by the Group of Eight on 6 May 1999 and later on by Milošević in June 1999 embodied NATO's five demands as well as additional points from the German-Russian plan which were:

- following the withdrawal of Serbian military from Kosovo, "international civil and security presences" were to be deployed. The original NATO proposal mentioned only about "international military presence;"
- these presences were to be "endorsed and adopted by the United Nations." Thus the German-Russian proposal underlining the leading role for the United Nations, which was bypassed in the NATO proposal, was incorporated into the final statement of G8;
- the G8 members reached an agreement on "establishment of an interim administration for Kosovo to be decided by the Security Council of the United Nations." This point was omitted from the NATO proposal;
- another integral point in the G8 statement was "the demilitarization of the UCK (the Kosovo Liberation Army)." The 12 April NATO proposal did not have any mention of that;¹⁴²
- lastly, the G8 statement stressed "the principles of sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the other countries of the region." This was one of the central points in the German-Russian proposal on which the NATO one was silent.

¹⁴¹ "The Situation in and around Kosovo," Statement issued at the Extraordinary Ministerial Meeting of the North Atlantic Council held at NATO Headquarters

¹⁴² Martin A. Smith, *Russia and NATO since 1991*, p. 83

In fact, incorporation of the German-Russian proposal into the G8 statement was the first fruit of Russian diplomatic maneuvering. Likewise, “a keeping the Russians out approach seemed to be replaced by how to get them in.”¹⁴³ Moscow’s role in possible persuasion of Milošević had been finally recognized by the West after a month of bombing of NATO which led to the formation of a Troika format to negotiate with the president of FRY. Russia was represented by Victor Chernomyrdin, an envoy to Yugoslavia and former prime minister of the Russian Federation, whereas NATO appointed Strobe Talbott, the United States Deputy Secretary of State and Martti Ahtisaari, the Finnish president, was proposed and later accepted as a negotiator from the EU.

On 3 June 1999, Milošević accepted the demands of the G8 which was believed to be the success of NATO-Russia-EU cooperative efforts. The persuasive skills of Moscow contributed greatly to persuading Milosevic to accept the G8 plan. The US officials and Ahtisaari shared the idea that it would be impossible to gain the agreement of Milosevic to the G8 demands. Ahtisaari recalled:

I shared those doubts, and I had warned Strobe that look, it may not be enough that you and I are around. You may have to produce higher echelons within your administration. Madeleine Albright, the Vice President or as high as you could. Because I thought had I been Milošević, that’s what I would have wanted. But to the surprise of all of us, they accepted.¹⁴⁴

The driving force behind Moscow’s hard efforts and desire to persuade the president of FRY was the next G-8 summit to be held in Cologne on 18-20 June 1999. Working hard on joining the G-7 club and finally being accepted to it in 1997 at the Denver summit, Moscow would do everything to avoid “this meeting torn asunder by Russia’s refusal to be in accord with the others on Kosovo.”¹⁴⁵ The Cologne G-8 summit would allow the Russian Federation to participate on the grounds of a full member and what is more, one of the issues discussed would be

¹⁴³ Vladimir Baranovsky, “The Kosovo Factor...,” p. 121

¹⁴⁴ Cited by James M. Goldgeier and Michael McFaul in *Power and Purpose*, p. 261

¹⁴⁵ James M. Goldgeier and Michael McFaul, *Power and Purpose*, p. 260

Russia's Soviet debt. Hence, it was crucial for the Russian leadership to avoid isolation in this summit.

In this regard, the Russian Federation had also made another concession. The original demand of Moscow on the peace settlement in Kosovo was an international security presence under UN control. However, the UN Resolution 1244¹⁴⁶ called for the establishment of "the international security presence with substantial North Atlantic Treaty Organization participation." Hence, Moscow gave up its demand for a UN-controlled operation and "basically agreed to an SFOR-type NATO-led arrangement."¹⁴⁷ In spite of giving this concession, "Chernomyrdin secured a role for the UN as a source of mandate authority for a NATO-led operation."¹⁴⁸ In this way, Moscow made sure that NATO's unilateralism in military operations would not be exercised. The experience acquired by the Russian Federation in the Bosnian operation "Allied Force," prompted it to ensure that "a NATO monopoly on the use of force and Russia's exclusion from international decision-making - were not repeated in the subsequent KFOR [Kosovo Force] operation."¹⁴⁹

However, there was still one last demand of Moscow which was repeatedly put aside by the West at the time of accepting Resolution 1244. It was the Russian military presence in Kosovo. Moscow insisted on having its own sector, particularly in the north-west of Kosovo, which would be solely under Moscow's command and not under the NATO one. The US was strongly opposing this idea which, in its opinion, could lead to the dilution of NATO command. Talbott stressed that "The KFOR train has left the station and the Russians need to cooperate or they'll miss the train." To which, on 10 June 1999, Russian General Leonid Ivashov replied that

¹⁴⁶ The full text of the Resolution 1244 of the UN Security Council, June 10, 1999 available at <http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N99/172/89/PDF/N9917289.pdf?OpenElement> (accessed on May 1, 2010)

¹⁴⁷ D. Lynch, "Walking the tightrope": The Kosovo Conflict and Russia in European security, 1998–August 1999', *European Security*, 1999, vol. 8, no. 4, p. 76.

¹⁴⁸ Ibid.

¹⁴⁹ Ibid.

Moscow had decided “to take her own train.”¹⁵⁰ Ivashov also added, “We will not beg them to give us a piece of land [...] If no agreement is reached, Russia has the same rights as NATO [...]. We will announce a sector which will be agreed with the Yugoslav side and which meets our interests.”¹⁵¹

The rhetoric was soon followed by real assistance. After Resolution 1244 was passed, 200 Russian troops had been detached from the Russian peacekeeping contingent working in SFOR in Bosnia to the airport in Prishtina before the NATO troops from KFOR arrived. This incident did not result in granting Moscow its own sector in Kosovo but similarly could not be circumvented by the Alliance. On 18 June 1999, an agreement between the US and the Russian Federation on the latter’s participation in KFOR was reached in Helsinki.¹⁵² According to this agreement “The total Russian deployment in Kosovo will not exceed five battalions with a total strength not exceeding 2850 troops [in the sectors under US, German and French command], plus up to 750 troops for the [Slatina] airfield.”¹⁵³ The Slatina airfield was to be accessed by all KFOR forces fully. In return for this, Moscow was granted full political and military control of its forces.

The Russian leadership still had a number of concerns related to the inadequate fulfillment of some provisions of UN Resolution 1244. These concerns were described in details by Maxim Yusin, foreign editor of the *Izvestia* daily:

The establishment of the KLA-based protection corps was accessed as being in contradiction with the proclaimed goal of disarming Kosovo Albanians. Decisions to issue personal identification documents and to introduce a parallel currency, the D-mark, were considered as affecting the sovereignty of Yugoslavia over the province. These and many other facts are regarded as leading to Kosovo de jure secession from Yugoslavia, contrary to the compromise that seemed to have been achieved in June and to the letter of Resolution 1244.¹⁵⁴

¹⁵⁰ Cite by James M. Goldgeier and Michael McFaul in *Power and Purpose*, p. 262

¹⁵¹ D. Lynch, “Walking the tightrope,” p. 77

¹⁵² See the full text of the agreement at <http://www.nato.int/koSovo/docu/a990618a.htm> (accessed on May 1, 2010)

¹⁵³ Ibid.

¹⁵⁴ Cited by Baranovsky in “The Kosovo Factor...,” p. 126

Indeed, the seeds of Kosovo secessionism were planted in 1999 by the Western indulgence to the aspirations of the Kosovo leadership which would give fruit in February 2008 resulting in the recognition of Kosovo's independence from FRY by some global players.

NATO's military campaign in Kosovo was the first war launched by the Alliance not to protect an internationally recognized state, as it was in the case with Bosnia, but to protect a constituent part of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. The Alliance lacked UN Security Council authorization and it stipulated a violation of a state's sovereignty.¹⁵⁵ For the USA it was a war required to call a halt to the genocide against Albanians in Kosovo carried out by Milošević. Yet, at the middle of the bombing campaign, when it was clear that the Operation Allied Force would continue indefinitely because Milošević was resisting conceding to the demands of the Alliance, NATO members "evidently decided that some *post facto* justification" for their actions was required. The members of the Alliance had achieved it "by formally adopting – at their Washington summit, which took place in the middle of the bombing campaign – the new role of undertaking what they called crisis management and crisis response operations."¹⁵⁶

Gorbachev, however, gave his own assessment to the US and NATO actions against FRY in Kosovo:

this war provides evidence that the United States, which plays a commanding role in NATO, is willing not only to disregard the norms of international law but also to impose on the world its own agenda in international relations and, in fact, to be guided in world relations solely by its own "national interests," taking the United Nations into account only if UN decisions and actions serve U.S. interests.¹⁵⁷

In spite of all the discord between the Russian Federation and the Alliance by the end of June 1999 it was obvious that NATO-Russia relations overcame the

¹⁵⁵ James M. Goldgeier and Michael McFaul, *Power and Purpose*, p. 248-249

¹⁵⁶ Martin A. Smith, *Russia and NATO since 1991*, p. 30

¹⁵⁷ Mikhail Gorbachev, *On My Country and the World*, New York: Columbia University Press, 2000, p.256

Kosovo crisis fractured by NATO bombings of FRY. Thus on 23 July 1999, for the first time after the NATO bombings, the Russian Federation met with the Alliance's officials to discuss issues related to KFOR in the PJC format. Nonetheless, the Kosovo crisis prompted Moscow to reconsider some aspects of its military and security policy by publishing a new Military Doctrine, incorporating amendments to an already adopted National Security Concept and increasing the spending on the military industry as well as look for some other international players to counterweigh the United States. One of such examples was a twenty-year treaty for Good Neighborliness, Friendship and Cooperation signed in July 2001 between China and the Russian Federation.¹⁵⁸ These moves represented the shift in Moscow's policy from the West, oriented on cooperation and at times compliance with the Western interests, towards a more independent policy of balancing against the West and USA in particular.

3.3.3 The beginning of a long lasting contention: the NATO Enlargement

One of the bones of contention and thorniest issues in relations between NATO and the Russian Federation in the 1990s was the enlargement process of the former. One would think that with the fall of the Berlin Wall and the collapse of the Soviet Union, NATO would fade away. It did not happen and it could not happen. Although NATO lost its potential threat perception in the face of the Soviet Union and with it the necessity to provide security commitment to Western Europe, obscuring the purpose for which it was created, "its political effect in western Europe was to promote reconciliation with the former Axis powers Germany and Italy, while fostering an enduring acceptance of the transatlantic interdependence."¹⁵⁹

¹⁵⁸ See the full text of the treaty at <http://www.chinese-embassy.no/eng/dtxw/t110017.htm> (accessed on May 2, 2010)

¹⁵⁹ Zbigniew Brzezinski, "An Agenda for NATO," *Foreign Affairs*, Sep/Oct 2009, 88/5, pp. 2-3

In the negotiations with Moscow on Germany's future in 1989, the USA was trying to pursue two objectives "central to America's traditional goal of allied containment: ensuring that NATO – the primary means of US preponderance and allied containment – survived in post-Cold War Europe and ensuring that a reunified Germany would be enfolded in the Alliance."¹⁶⁰ The Alliance succeeded in incorporating a unified Germany into its structure and the next task to be accomplished was the preservation of NATO in the post-Cold War era. Thus, NATO was to acquire new missions and new members to adjust to the realities of the 1990s since "devoid of new members and new missions, NATO—as a means of exerting political pressure on the Europeans—will become about as relevant as a treaty governing migratory birds."¹⁶¹

In spite of the promises given by Baker to Gorbachev in 1990 "not to move an inch east," in return for the Soviet Union not to impede German unification, NATO set the expansion process as its one of the main goals, the genesis of which dates back to the Rome Summit held on 7-8 November 1991.

The main developments of the Rome Summit were the Alliance's new Strategic Concept¹⁶² and Rome Declaration on Peace and Cooperation.¹⁶³ However, the purpose of the Rome Summit, deserving separate attention, was the institutionalization of the relations between NATO and the countries of Central and Eastern Europe through the new mechanism called the North Atlantic Cooperation Council (NACC). Hence, "the establishment of the North Atlantic Cooperation Council (NACC) in December 1991 brought together the member countries of NATO and, initially, nine Central and Eastern European countries, in a new

¹⁶⁰ Benjamin Schwarz, "NATO's Enlargement and the Inevitable Costs of the American Empire," Part I in *NATO enlargement: illusions and reality*, ed. by Ted Galen Carpenter and Barbara Conry, Cato Institute: Washington D.C., 1998, p. 77

¹⁶¹ Ronald Steel, "Beyond NATO," Chapter 18 in *NATO Enlargement : Illusions and Reality*, ed. by Ted Galen Carpenter and Barbara Conry; Cati Institute, Washington, D.C., 1998, p. 248-49

¹⁶² The full text of the document available at http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_23847.htm (accessed on May 3, 2010)

¹⁶³ The full text of the document available at <http://www.nato.int/docu/comm/49-95/c911108a.htm> (accessed on May 3, 2010)

consultative forum.”¹⁶⁴ NACC was the first step in answering the question of U.S. president Bush raised at his intervention at the NATO Rome Summit on 7 November 1991 which sounded as, “How should we answer the calls of Europe's new democracies to join us [NATO]?”¹⁶⁵

Obviously, the enlargement of NATO was on the agenda of the USA at the beginning of the 1990s, even though the US officials were claiming the opposite. Moreover, the question was not on the feasibility of the new initiative but on “how and in what circumstances to expand.” The next stage on this journey was “to start thinking about criteria for new membership,”¹⁶⁶ which had lasted for two years. During this period NATO-Russia relations were marked by mutual cooperation.

However, after two years of tranquility in relations between NATO and the Russian Federation, the wind of enlargement began to blow again in 1993. The reason for that was the U.S. administration of Bill Clinton acceding to power and the desire of some of its members, in particular National Security Adviser, Anthony Lake, to put forward the issue of NATO expansion at the top of the next NATO summit. Lake argued that “the president should propose at the NATO summit of January 1994 a set of criteria and a timetable for NATO’s enlargement into central Europe and even perhaps the notion of associate membership status for leading candidates.”¹⁶⁷

However, the Russian team at the U.S. State Department was on the verge of signing the Trilateral agreement to withdraw from the territory of Ukraine the nuclear weapons, having been left there at the time of the USSR, and in this regard, NATO enlargement was the least desirable impediment on the way to already succeeded progress. So, the Russian team in the Clinton administration, led by the

¹⁶⁴ The North Atlantic Cooperation Council, NATO Handbook, available at <http://www.nato.int/docu/handbook/2001/hb020201.htm> (accessed on May 3, 2010)

¹⁶⁵ “III. NATO Summit in Rome: A New Strategic Doctrine,” *Foreign Policy Bulletin*, Special Double Issue, January-April 1992, p. 54

¹⁶⁶ Hans Binnendijk, “NATO Can’t be Vague about Commitment to Easter Europe,” *The New York Times*, November 8, 1991 accessible at <http://www.nytimes.com/1991/11/08/opinion/08iht-nuha.html?scp=15&sq=North%20Atlantic%20Cooperation%20Council&st=cse> (accessed on May 3, 2010)

¹⁶⁷ James M. Goldgeier and Michael McFaul, *Power and Purpose*, p. 185

Pentagon, instead of launching the process of NATO expansion, as a short-term goal, advocated the Partnership for Peace program (PfP) which was designed for all countries in Eastern and Central Europe, including the former Soviet Union to “deepen their political and military ties”¹⁶⁸ with the Alliance without being granted any guarantees for future membership.

For Pentagon officials, “the goal of integrating Russia into the West and the continuing efforts to denuclearize the former Soviet Union far outweighed any benefits of enlarging NATO.”¹⁶⁹ The PfP could mitigate Moscow’s strong opposition to NATO enlargement while allowing the alliance to promote its agenda on institutionalising its relations with the countries in Central and Eastern Europe.

Secretary of State Christopher tried to assure Yeltsin on his visit to Moscow that PfP did not mean membership in the Alliance. Christopher stated that “... there would not be even an associate status.” However, the Secretary of State made it clear that the policy of Washington “will in due course be looking at the question of membership as a longer term eventuality”¹⁷⁰ and the partnership “will pave the way for the eventual expansion of the Alliance” since “the USA is committed to NATO’s expansion.”¹⁷¹

Moscow considered expansion of the Alliance as a threat to its security. However, it could not prevent the process. Thus to avoid being isolated by the West and to be able to have a say in European affairs, Moscow declared its willingness to participate in the PfP which it was supposed to sign in April 1994. The bombings of Bosnian Serbs by NATO, without prior notification to Moscow, postponed the signature of the PfP, though. “We are against the practice whereby Russia is only

¹⁶⁸ Partnership for Peace : Framework Document, 10-11 January 1994 available at http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_24469.htm?mode=pressrelease (accessed on May 5, 2010)

¹⁶⁹ James M. Goldgeier and Michael McFaul, *Power and Purpose*, p. 186

¹⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, p.187

¹⁷¹ Elaine Sciolino, “Russia Pledges to Join NATO’s Partnership,” *The New York Times*, 11 June 1994 available at <http://www.nytimes.com/1994/06/11/world/russia-pledges-to-join-nato-partnership.html?scp=11&sq=partnership%20for%20peace&st=cse>, (accessed on May 5, 2010)

consulted in the expectation we will give an affirmative “yes”, ”¹⁷² said Grigory Karasin, Kozyrev’s spokesman.

Moscow had been also hesitating to sign the PfP as it was expecting to be entitled to “special status” and treatment in the program considering its size and possession of a nuclear arsenal. By “special commitment,” the officials in Moscow meant “a commitment to political consultation and genuinely shared aims with NATO-including peace-keeping...”¹⁷³

Indeed, the participants of the PfP do not have any political leverage in NATO over its decisions- including the ability to prevent any military operations of NATO. What is more, Article 5 of the Treaty does not extend its collective security defence mechanism to the participants of the PfP. Lastly, the participants lack full access to NATO operational planning information or intelligence.¹⁷⁴ The PfP is a mechanism designed by the Alliance to establish institutionalized relations with the participants without extending its commitments to them and without granting them a prospective membership in NATO. “ ...It has provided NATO with resources and manpower for operations, without the obligations that it would entail for NATO members – in effect, free manpower.”¹⁷⁵ For the participants of the PfP it was an opportunity to join the western security system.

The U.S. officials, though, were unwilling to confer special status to any of the states, signatories to the PfP, including the Russian Federation claiming that the same rules should be applied to all countries. The American Defence Secretary,

¹⁷² Steven Erlanger, “The World; Ant’-Western Winds Gain Force in Russia,” *The New York Times*, April 17, 1994, available at <http://www.nytimes.com/1994/04/17/weekinreview/the-world-anti-western-winds-gain-force-in-russia.html?scp=23&sq=partnership%20for%20peace&st=cse> (accessed on May 5, 2010)

¹⁷³ Steven Erlanger, “An Army in Need of a Goal: a Russian Goes to NATO,” *The New York Times*, May 23, 1994 available at <http://www.nytimes.com/1994/05/23/world/an-army-in-need-of-a-role-a-russian-goes-to-nato.html?scp=16&sq=partnership%20for%20peace&st=cse> (accessed on May 5, 2010)

¹⁷⁴ Charly Salonijs-Pasternak ed, “From Protecting Some to Securing Many NATO’s Journey from a Military Alliance to a Security Manager,” FIIA Report 17/2007, The Finnish Institute of International Affairs, p. 25

¹⁷⁵ Ibid.

William Perry, stated that “NATO has taken the position ... that there will be no special protocol for Russia as a member of the Partnership for peace.” He also added that “NATO has been very clear that no nation will be granted veto status or authority over the partnerships.”¹⁷⁶ To persuade Moscow to sign up for PFP a compromise was reached by the Alliance and Moscow, known as “no vetoes and no surprises,” which meant that Moscow would not have any veto power over NATO’s decisions whereas the Alliance would “not make major decisions without consulting Russia first.” The importance of “no surprises” formula would ensure that Moscow “would have plenty of warning should NATO members ever decide to seriously proceed with an enlargement process.”¹⁷⁷

In January 1994, the Brussels Summit launched the Partnership for Peace initiative, proposed earlier by the USA, which supported the concept of Combined Joint Task Forces (CJTFs) to react to new security challenges and other measures to develop the European Security and Defence Identity.

At last on 22 June 1994 (the day when Hitler invaded the USSR in 1941), the Russian Federation officially became a PFP member after it had signed the Partnership for Peace program.

The compromise reached by NATO and Moscow established a cooperative pattern in their relations which was sustained until December 1994, when the relations suddenly started to deteriorate. The victory of the Republican Party in both the U.S. Houses of Congress in November 1994 was followed by criticism of the Clinton administration on constantly delaying the issue of NATO enlargement. It created an impetus for taking a more decisive policy on the process of NATO enlargement by the Clinton Administration. On 1 December 1994, at the NAC meeting in Brussels, the U.S. Secretary of State Christopher declared that “We are deciding today that the Alliance begin its internal deliberations on expansion. A

¹⁷⁶ William M. Schmidt, “Russia Tells NATO it is Ready to Join Peace Partnership,” *The New York Times*, May 25, 1994 available at <http://www.nytimes.com/1994/05/25/world/russia-tells-nato-it-is-ready-to-join-peace-partnership.html?scp=1&sq=partnership%20for%20peace&st=cse> (accessed on May 5, 2010)

¹⁷⁷ Martin A. Smith, *Russia and NATO since 1991*, p. 62

process has begun. It is also essential that we begin to present our views to interested Partners during 1995.”¹⁷⁸ Four days later, at the Budapest CSCE Summit, which was scheduled by NATO and Moscow to sign Russia’s Individual Partnership Program (to be signed by all PfP participants to launch their actual participation) and the documents related to the establishment of a NATO-Russia dialogue, NATO Secretary General Willy Claes confirmed the intention of NATO to expand saying that:

The Alliance has now embarked on an internal examination to determine how NATO will enlarge, the principles to guide this process and the implications of membership. An extensive study will begin and we will present the results to interested Partners prior to our next meeting in Brussels in the late autumn of 1995.¹⁷⁹

The idea of starting the deliberations inside the Alliance on its expansion was fiercely opposed by Yeltsin which led to Moscow’s refusal to sign any documents with NATO. The Budapest breakdown in NATO-Russia relations was a result of America’s ambiguous position on the process of enlargement. On the one hand, the USA was trying to assure the Central and Eastern European states that enlargement was still on the agenda of NATO. On the other hand, it wanted to reassure Yeltsin that the enlargement process will be on hold until summer 1996, the time for Russian presidential elections.¹⁸⁰ What is more, there was not a clear policy in the Clinton administration on whether to proceed with NATO enlargement or advance the PfP program. Thus, Richard C. Holbrooke in the State Department, who was in charge of the enlargement issue tried to move on the process of expansion further, while William Perry was for postponing the issue until late 1990s. Pentagon endorsed the PfP since in its view it was “an ideal program that would allow NATO to develop ties with all states in the region while the Alliance was resolving big

¹⁷⁸ Intervention by U.S. Secretary of State Warren Christopher, North Atlantic Council Meeting, 1 December, 1994, Brussels, Belgium. Electronic version can be found at <http://www.nato.int/docu/speech/1994/s941201b.htm> (accessed on May 7, 2010)

¹⁷⁹ Remarks by NATO Secretary General, Milly Claes, Budapest CSCE Summit, 5 December 1994. See the full text at <http://www.nato.int/docu/speech/1994/s941205b.htm> (accessed on May 7, 2010)

¹⁸⁰ James M. Goldgeier and Michael McFaul, *Power and Purpose*, p. 192

issues: finding a solution to the conflict in Bosnia and managing the relationship with Russia.”¹⁸¹

The initial requirements of Moscow were to get assurances that first, in 1995, only the study on the enlargement process would be done without proceeding to the initial stage of appointing the new members and second, before any NATO expansion was launched, NATO-Russia relations would be assented. In the meeting with Gore, two weeks after the Budapest CSCE summit, Yeltsin got such assurances.¹⁸² In May 1995, in the meeting with Clinton, Yeltsin insisted on slowing down the expansion of NATO suggesting “Let’s postpone NATO expansion for a year or two years. There’s no need to rile the situation up before the elections.”¹⁸³ In response to Yeltsin, Clinton attempted to trade off the issue of slowing down the process of expansion until the end of presidential elections in the Russian Federation for getting Moscow to sign up for concrete participation in PfP and launch the Russian-NATO dialogue. Clinton said:

I’ve made it clear I’ll do nothing to accelerate NATO. I’m trying to give you now, in this conversation, the reassurance you need for ’95 and ’96. But you need to be careful that neither of us appears to capitulate... If you can sign the PfP and begin the Russian-NATO dialogue, I can get you past the next elections with no discussion of “who” or “when.”¹⁸⁴

The American officials proposed institutionalization of NATO-Russia relations in the form of a charter which would get Moscow involved in NATO discussions without being able to affect its decision process directly, though. Moscow completed its accession to PfP in May 1995. However, officially the concessions given to Moscow were secured at a NATO foreign ministers’ meeting only in December 1996. By this time the presidential elections in the Russian Federation were over, resulting in the re-election of Yeltsin and eroding any threat

¹⁸¹ Ibid., p. 195

¹⁸² Ibid., p. 197

¹⁸³ Cited by James M. Goldgeier and Michael McFaul in *Power and Purpose*, p. 197

¹⁸⁴ Ibid.

of communists coming to power. Furthermore, “the Dayton accords had brought peace to Bosnia so it was no longer embarrassing that NATO enlargement could help prevent future Bosnians.”¹⁸⁵ Under these circumstances the issue of NATO enlargement was reopened again.

The Russian officials had eased their tone on the issue of NATO enlargement and were ready for a compromise. Primakov commented:

Russia, while still against enlargement, does realize that NATO is an important organization that plays an important role in Europe and, being pragmatists, we are certainly going to base ourselves on that.¹⁸⁶

On the other hand, apart from putting NATO-Russia relations on an institutionalized footing as it had been demanded by Moscow before, Primakov, expressing the official stance of Moscow demanded that no NATO military infrastructure and no nuclear weapons should be stationed on the territory of new Central and Eastern European members of the Alliance. Primakov said:

We are talking about the unacceptability for us of expanding NATO's military infrastructure up to the territory of Russia. If the new NATO members are fully incorporated into the alliance's military systems -- management, communications, reconnaissance, rear logistics, etc. -- then NATO troops can be deployed there in a matter of hours. This possibility, though small today, will become a factor of uncertainty for us.¹⁸⁷

In regard to this, the NATO foreign ministers' meeting on 10 December 1996 formalised the concessions given to Moscow on the issues of first, NATO nuclear weapons and military infrastructure deployment and second, advancing its institutional relations with Moscow. With respect to the first issue the Final Communiqué stated that

¹⁸⁵ Ibid., p. 202

¹⁸⁶ Craig R. Whitney, “Russia Tells NATO that it Accepts Offer on a Formal Link,” *The New York Times*, 12 December 1996, <http://www.nytimes.com/1996/12/12/world/russia-tells-nato-it-accepts-offer-on-a-formal-link.html?scp=9&sq=primakov+nato+military+infrastructure&st=cse> (accessed on May 8, 2010)

¹⁸⁷ Thomas L. Friedman, “Foreign Affairs; Russia’s Nato Fax,” *The New York Times*, 24 July, 1996, available at <http://www.nytimes.com/1996/07/24/opinion/foreign-affairs-russia-s-nato-fax.html?scp=7&sq=primakov+nato+military+infrastructure&st=cse> (accessed on May 8, 2010)

NATO countries have no intention, no plan, and no reason to deploy nuclear weapons on the territory of new members nor any need to change any aspect of NATO's nuclear posture or nuclear policy - and we do not foresee any future need to do so.¹⁸⁸

Regarding the second issue, the Final Communiqué confirmed that the advancement of NATO-Russia relations “could take the form of a Charter,”¹⁸⁹ which was supposed to be completed before a new member entered the Alliance.

The Russia-NATO Founding Act

In January 1997, NATO and the Russian Federation proceeded to deliberation on developing their “special relations” to be devised in the form of a charter. The negotiations were to be conducted by Foreign Minister, Primakov, from the Russian side and NATO Secretary General, Javier Solana, appointed by the U.S. officials. It had been decided that “Solana would have the lead role [a formal role though], but the United States would control the process from behind the scenes.”¹⁹⁰ Thus the main concern of Washington was not to allow Moscow to have veto over the NATO decision making process and not to relegate new members to a second-class position, whereas Moscow wanted to get guarantees that no nuclear weapons and a limited amount of military infrastructure would be stationed on the territory of NATO new members.¹⁹¹ What is more, Moscow was concerned about losing its traditional military market with the adoption of new members by the Alliance.

¹⁸⁸ Press Communiqué M-NAC-2(96)165, Brussels, NATO, 10 December 1996, available at <http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/1996/p96-165e.htm> (accessed on May 8, 2010)

¹⁸⁹ Ibid.

¹⁹⁰ James M. Goldgeier and Michael McFaul, *Power and Purpose*, p. 203; Norman Kempster, “Russia, NATO to Hammer Out a New Treaty,” *Los Angeles Times*, December 12, 1996, available at http://articles.latimes.com/1996-12-12/news/mn-8399_1_nato-expansion (accessed on May 8, 2010)

¹⁹¹ Michael L. Gordon, “Russia Drops Major Demand on Limiting NATO Forces,” *The New York Times*, May 3, 1997, available at <http://www.nytimes.com/1997/05/03/world/russia-drops-major-demand-on-limiting-nato-forces.html?scp=14&sq=primakov+nato+military+infrastructure&st=cse> (accessed on May 8, 2010); James M. Goldgeier and Michael McFaul, “Power and Purpose,” p. 200

For more than a decade, the Russian Federation has expressed concern that NATO enlargement would impose an added penalty of losing a traditional market, as former Warsaw Pact countries shift from Soviet-made and -standard weapons to those of the NATO alliance.¹⁹²

However, one of the disputable issues was the format of a new agreement. Moscow insisted on signing a legally binding treaty while Washington wanted it to be a political document without any legal commitment. The final document was not a legally binding treaty containing a number of wordy political commitments leading to future possible misinterpretations from both sides.

To sweeten the pill of NATO enlargement for Moscow, Clinton offered Yeltsin to promote the membership of the latter in the world clubs such as the WTO, the OECD, G-7 and the Paris Club. In March 1997, at the Helsinki summit, Clinton agreed to proceed to the next round of negotiations on strategic arms reductions (START III) on the condition that the Russian Parliament would ratify START II which was on hold due to the disagreement with some of its provisions. The new agreement would reduce the number of nuclear warheads on both sides to 2,000-2,500 by the year 2007 and diminish the disparity (the USA could maintain higher number of nuclear weapons than the Russian Federation) in the level of nuclear weapons possessed.¹⁹³ Clinton announced Moscow's participation in the Denver Summit of the world's most industrialized nations in 1997, which would be called the Summit of the Eight with Russia to become a fully-fledged member of it.

Though Yeltsin still considered the Eastern enlargement of NATO “a mistake, and a serious one,” he could see that it was inevitable and was “determined to squeeze the best possible deal out of the West in return for grudging tolerance.”¹⁹⁴

¹⁹² Robert E. Hunter, Sergey M. Rogov, “Engaging Russia as Partner and Participant: The Next Stage of NATO–Russia Relations,” *Conference Proceedings*, RAND Corporation, 2004, p. 11; Mustafa Türkeş, “Doksanlı Yıllarda NATO’nun öncelikleri ve Türkiye, En Uzun On Yıl,” İstanbul: Boyut Yayıncılık, 1998, p. 206

¹⁹³ James M. Goldgeier and Michael McFaul, *Power and Purpose*, p. 206

¹⁹⁴ Bruce W. Nelan, “Clinton and Yeltsin Agree to Disagree,” *CNN Time*, 31 March 1997, available at <http://edition.cnn.com/ALLPOLITICS/1997/03/24/time/clinton.yeltsin.html> (accessed on May 9, 2010)

Membership in the G-8 club was a compensation to Moscow for complying with the process of NATO expansion.

On 27 May 1997, in Paris, at a special summit meeting of NATO members and President Yeltsin the Founding Act¹⁹⁵ on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security between NATO and the Russian Federation was signed.

The Founding Act is a political document requiring no legal commitments from both parties due to Moscow's drop of its demand stating that "NATO and Russia do not consider each other as adversaries."¹⁹⁶

A new NATO-Russia Permanent Council (PJC) was created under the Founding Act with the aim of providing "a mechanism for consultations, coordination and, to the maximum extent possible, where appropriate, for joint decisions and joint action with respect to security issues of common concern." What is more, the PJC was supposed to be built on

the principles of reciprocity and transparency. In the course of their consultations and cooperation, NATO and Russia will inform each other regarding the respective security-related challenges they face and the measures that each intends to take to address them.¹⁹⁷

Thus, the formula "16+1" existing in the consultation mechanism between NATO and the Russian Federation before the creation of PJC was to be transformed into "17" which meant that from being a junior partner, Moscow would be granted "a special relationship with NATO in the sense that its level of representation and rights of consultation were greater than those accorded to any other non-member state."¹⁹⁸ The Russian Federation was to establish a mission to NATO headed by a representative at the rank of Ambassador and to consult with the NATO members on equal terms. However, the provisions of the Founding Act "do not provide

¹⁹⁵ Full text of the document is available at http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_25468.htm (accessed on May 9, 2010)

¹⁹⁶ "Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security between NATO and the Russian Federation," NATO, 27 May 1997

¹⁹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁹⁸ Martin A. Smith, "A Bumpy Road..." p. 65

NATO or Russia, in any way, with a right of veto over the actions of the other nor do they infringe upon or restrict the rights of NATO or Russia to independent decision-making and action.”¹⁹⁹ Practically, it meant that Moscow was allowed to participate in the PJC to discuss the policies of NATO but did not have the right to exercise veto power over the decisions of the latter. That is how Zbigniew Brzezinski and Anthony Lake commented on the role of the Russian Federation in the PJC:

Russia does gain a perch in the alliance's antechambers, but it is not seated within the North Atlantic Council, NATO's chief policy-making organ. The new Russian-NATO council provides for regular as well as special consultations regarding security matters of mutual concern. However, it is simply not correct to assert that alliance members, in times of crisis, would first have to have their security concerns addressed within the joint council. The agreement makes it clear that NATO would first formulate its own position before consultations with Russia.²⁰⁰

Some of Moscow's concerns found their reflection in the Founding Act while some others were circumvented. NATO reiterated that it had “no intention, no plan and no reason to deploy nuclear weapons on the territory of new members, nor any need to change any aspect of NATO's nuclear posture or nuclear policy - and do not foresee any future need to do so.” Furthermore, the Alliance pledged not to construct any nuclear weapons infrastructure on the territory of its new members. In addition, the Alliance had partially complied with another demand put forward by Moscow. The Founding Act states that

in the current and foreseeable security environment, the Alliance will carry out its collective defence and other missions by ensuring the necessary interoperability, integration, and capability for reinforcement rather than by additional permanent stationing of *substantial* combat forces.²⁰¹

¹⁹⁹ Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security between NATO and the Russian Federation

²⁰⁰ Zbigniew Brzezinski and Antony Lake, “For a New World, a New NATO,” *The New York Times*, 30 June 1997, accessible at <http://www.nytimes.com/1997/06/30/opinion/for-a-new-world-a-new-nato.html?scp=12&sq=Brzezinski+nato+enlargement&st=cse> accessed on May 11, 2010

²⁰¹ *Ibid.*, (italics are mine)

NATO confirmed not to station additional conventional forces on the soil of its new member states as it had been demanded by Moscow but avoided giving a specific number which was considered to be the limit for the deployment of such forces and to be regarded as “substantial.” Only NATO was entitled to decide on the number it deemed appropriate. Ted Galen Carpenter gave his interpretation to the loose wording of the Founding Act claiming that “intentions and plans can be changed at any time. The advent of a crisis somewhere in Eastern Europe might create the “reason” for altering plans and deploying conventional forces, and perhaps even nuclear weapons.”²⁰²

However, there was not any implication in the Founding Act that the Russian Federation would not be restricted access to the military markets of new NATO members in Central and Eastern Europe, though it had been expressed by Moscow as one of its main concerns. The USA could not give such a concession.

After all, in 1993-1994 when the West needed Moscow to withdraw its troops from the territory of Eastern Germany or the Baltic States or in 1993 when the USA insisted on cancellation of the cryogenic rocket sale to Delhi, Moscow was getting palpable benefits from the West in the form of new contracts or funds. However, after the Founding Act had been signed and Moscow acquiesced to NATO eastward enlargement, it started to get “symbols rather than substance.” Moscow’s cooperation on issues of troops’ withdrawal or sale of military technologies was necessary for the West. However, as soon as the accord between NATO and the Russian Federation had been concluded, the USA realized that it did not need Moscow’s consent to incorporate Poland into the Alliance.²⁰³

The overall attitude towards the Founding Act was rather controversial on both sides of the Atlantic. Some prominent American experts, such as Henry Kissinger, believed the new agreement was granting Moscow too many concessions

²⁰² Ted Galen Carpenter, “Strategic Evasions and the Drive for NATO Enlargement,” Chapter 1 in *NATO Enlargement : Illusions and Reality*, ed. by Ted Galen Carpenter and Barbara Conry, Cato Institute, Washington, D.C., 1998, p. 23

²⁰³ James M. Goldgeier and Michael McFaul, *Power and Purpose*, p. 205

which would dilute the Alliance. Apart from this, he claimed that “America's role in holding the alliance together will be severely weakened.”²⁰⁴

In the Russian Federation, the signing of the Founding Act was regarded by many as a defeat. The leader of the Communist Party, Genady Zyuganov, called the agreements “the Treaty of Versailles,” and said Mr. Yeltsin had “betrayed Russia’s national interest.”²⁰⁵ Aleksander I. Lebed, the Russian General, and Yeltsin’s rival, denounced the Founding Act as a “sell-out.”²⁰⁶ In response to all accusations in his address and the conclusion of the accord with NATO, Yeltsin said that “Of course, we could have furrowed our brows and pounded the table with our shoes as happened during the cold war years... But what would that have achieved? Another round of irreconcilable enmity, a new isolation for Russia?” The Russian President considered the accord the best deal for the Russian Federation in that unfavourable situation.

The first test case for the NATO-Russia relations under a new accord, though, was the Kosovo crisis in 1999 when NATO launched its air strikes against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. The newly created mechanism, the Permanent Joint Council was fully neglected by the USA and NATO members in spite of the fact that it was supposed to be “the principal venue of consultation between NATO and Russia in times of crisis or for any other situation affecting peace and stability.” Apart from that, in accordance with the provisions of the Founding Act, NATO members and the Russian Federation agreed to respect “the primary responsibility of the UN Security Council for maintaining international peace and security.” The

²⁰⁴ Henry Kissinger, “NATO Enlargement Will Dilute America’s Leadership Role,” *The New York Times*, July 8, 1997 accessible at <http://www.nytimes.com/1997/07/08/opinion/1-nato-enlargement-will-dilute-america-s-leadership-role-012025.html?scp=1&sq=permanent+joint+council+nato&st=cse> accessed on May 9, 2010

²⁰⁵ Alessandra Stanley, “Yeltsin Tells Russian that Bending on the NATO Issue Paid Off,” *The New York Times*, 27 March 1997 accessible at <http://www.nytimes.com/1997/03/27/world/yeltsin-tells-russians-that-bending-on-the-nato-issue-paid-off.html?scp=3&sq=zyuganov+nato+1997&st=cse> accessed on May 9, 2010

²⁰⁶ Micael R. Gordon, “Decision for NATO in Russia: From Public a Collective Ho-Hum,” *The New York Times*, May 28, 1997, accessible at <http://www.nytimes.com/1997/05/28/world/from-public-a-collective-ho-hum.html?scp=12&sq=lebed%20nato%201997&st=cse&pagewanted=1> accessed on May 9, 2010

military campaign against the FRY was launched by NATO without a UN mandate. Furthermore, there was a commitment on the part of NATO members and the Russian Federation, expressed in the Founding Act, to refrain “from the threat or use of force against each other as well as against any other state, its sovereignty, territorial integrity or political independence.”²⁰⁷ The military campaign of NATO violated the principle of territorial integrity of the FRY by defending the constituent part of the latter. Moscow accused NATO of breaching the provisions of the Founding Act and terminated its participation in the PJC. Hence, the Kosovo crisis revealed the fact that the PJC was ineffective. It failed to become a consultative mechanism to prevent conflicts and resembled more a talking club where the decisions were first made between the members of the Alliance and then presented to Moscow.

The first round of enlargement

On 8 July 1997, during NATO Madrid summit three countries Poland, the Czech Republic and Hungary were invited to start accession negotiations with the Alliance to complete the actual membership by April 1999.

Poland was the country which clamoured for NATO membership most, expounding it by the fear of the Poles to be marginalized into “a gray zone that leaves them vulnerable to Russia and without security guarantees from the West.” Lech Walesa claimed that “the West does not understand the dangers of leaving the former Warsaw Pact countries alone.” He also added that Russia might be tempted to become an imperial power again if “the post-Communist countries are left alone.”²⁰⁸ NATO membership of Poland and the Czech Republic was also supported by Germany since it would move NATO’s eastern border and secure Germany’s position in the middle of Europe and not on the borderline between East and West.

²⁰⁷ Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security between NATO and the Russian Federation

²⁰⁸ Jane Perlez, “Poles Will Press Clinton for NATO Membership,” *The New York Times*, 5 July, 1994 accessible at <http://www.nytimes.com/1994/07/05/world/poles-will-press-clinton-on-nato-membership.html?scp=2&sq=poland+nato+membership&st=cse> (accessed on May 11, 2010)

The aspirations of Eastern and Central European countries for NATO enlargement were also dictated by the desire to be incorporated into the European Union. The process of accession to the EU is a tedious, complex and arduous one requiring compliance with a lengthy list of requirements. The NATO accession process, in contrast, does not last long and is a great deal easier to achieve. The strong link which exists between EU and NATO and which is strongly maintained by the USA pushes the countries in Eastern and Central Europe to get access to NATO as a kind of precondition for further EU entrance. Many observers suggest that, if the process of EU enlargement was as easily achievable as the NATO one and if there was not a strong link between these two, the EU's expansion would make NATO's enlargement unnecessary.²⁰⁹

The United States in its turn motivated the need for NATO enlargement as a response to three main challenges. As Brzezinski and Lake wrote in their article "For a new world, a new NATO," that these challenges were:

to enhance the relationship between the United States and the enlarging democratic Europe; to engage the still-evolving, post-imperial Russia in a cooperative relationship with that Europe, and to reinforce the habits of democracy and the practices of peace in Central Europe.²¹⁰

Regarding the first reason, Brzezinski and Lake claimed that NATO expansion would help to maintain the trans-Atlantic link and would spread the security guarantee to the new member states which would result in prevention and management of such crises as the Bosnian one, since "only NATO could act effectively in Bosnia." By the second challenge it was meant that the enlarged NATO "provides a hedge against the unlikely but real possibility that Russia will revert to past behaviour." The newly created PJC was to contribute to keeping Russia at arm's length by incorporating it into a consultative process with the Alliance. Finally, future membership in NATO was to facilitate "democracy and

²⁰⁹ Zoltan Barany, *The Future of NATO Expansion*, Cambridge University Press, 2003, p. 21

²¹⁰ Brzezinski and Lake, "For a New World, a New NATO"

security cooperation among the Central European states of the former Soviet Union.”²¹¹

Anthony Lake, assistant to the U.S. President for National Security Affairs, argued that under leadership of the USA, NATO’s role as a security provider is essential and to achieve this goal the Alliance must go “out of area” since “there can be no lasting security at the center without security at the periphery.”²¹²

Hence, it was decided to continue further the policy of NATO expansion with Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic to be fully incorporated into NATO structures in 1999 and to “extend further invitations in coming years to nations willing and able to assume the responsibilities and obligations of membership.”²¹³ This was the stance of official Washington to promote a NATO open door policy and President Clinton unambiguously declared it:

My position also is -- and some of the members don't agree with this -- that we should leave the door open, that we should have a review, that we should take another look at it [enlargement] in 1999 and even at 1999 we should keep the door open.²¹⁴

Moscow, in its turn, has always argued that NATO expansion is unacceptable, but could do little to prevent it. It was really surprising for many Russian people that “the alliance is expanding at a time when Russia is so weak that the only security threat it poses is to itself...”²¹⁵ Being left out of an enlarged NATO, the Russian Federation started to seek closer strategic ties with other actors

²¹¹ Ibid.

²¹² Anthony Lake, “From Containment to Enlargement,” Speech at the Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies, Washington D.C., September 21, 1993, accessible at <http://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/lakedoc.html> (accessed on May 12, 2010)

²¹³ Madrid Declaration on Euro-Atlantic Security and Cooperation, Press Communiqué M-1(97)81 , Brussels, NATO, 8 July 1997 accessible at <http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/1997/p97-081e.htm>

²¹⁴ Alison Mitchel, “Clinton Adamant: 3 New NATO Members Now,” *The New York Times*, 4 July 1997 accessible at <http://www.nytimes.com/1997/07/04/world/clinton-adamant-3-new-nato-members-now.html?scp=2&sq=poland+motives+nato+membership&st=cse> (accessed on May 10, 2010)

²¹⁵ Cited by Susan Eisenhower in “The Perils of Victory,” p. 114

in the region. Thus, on 2 April 1999, the Russian Federation and Belarus formed the Commonwealth of Russia and Belarus²¹⁶ which was strengthened further on 2 April 1997, by the signature of the Treaty on the Union between Belarus and Russia (later renamed into the Union of Belarus and Russia). Belarus sought in this union the opportunity to tie its weak economy to Russia's, whereas Moscow pursued the establishment of strong political and economic ties with Belarus, not mainly due to a large number of ethnic Russian people living there but due to its strategic importance. Belarus is lying between an expanding NATO and Poland and is "an important security buffer."²¹⁷

Russia-China rapprochement and the signing of a joint declaration in April 1997, which expressed the commitment of both countries to seek a multipolar world with no single dominant power was the response of both Moscow and Beijing to the policies of the USA. "Some are pushing toward a world with one center," said Yeltsin, referring to the United States. "We want the world to be multipolar, to have several focal points. These will [be] for the basis for a new world order,"²¹⁸ he added. The resentment of China to the policy of Washington was dictated by the former's support for aspirations of Taiwan and Tibet seeking independence from China. Moscow took the side of China in the question of Taiwan and Tibet. China, in its turn, expressed understanding with Russia's concerns regarding NATO expansion posing a threat to Moscow's security interest and leading to destabilization in Europe as a whole.²¹⁹

The policy of NATO expansion prompted Moscow to intensify its efforts in establishing regional organizations. One of such organizations was the Shanghai

²¹⁶ The official website can be accessed at <http://www.soyuz.by/en/>

²¹⁷ Ted Galen Carpenter, "Strategic Evasions and the Drive for NATO Enlargement," Chapter 1 in *NATO Enlargement : Illusions and Reality*, ed. by Ted Galen Carpenter and Barbara Conry, Cati Institute, Washington, D.C., 1998, p. 24

²¹⁸ "Russia, China Sign a Pact: Oppose Any Single World's Power," *CNN Interactive*, 23 April, 1997 accessible at <http://edition.cnn.com/WORLD/9704/23/russia.china/index.html> (accessed on May 13, 2010)

²¹⁹ Xia Yishan, "Sino-Russian Partnership Marching into 21st Century," *Beijing Review*, May 5, 1997, p. 10

Five grouping, later renamed into the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, which was created on 26 April 1996, with the signing of the Treaty on Deepening Military Trust in Border Regions in Shanghai by the heads of states of Kazakhstan, the People's Republic of China, Kyrgyzstan, Russia and Tajikistan. On 24 April 1997, the five countries signed another agreement named the Treaty on Reduction of Military Forces in Border Regions. The main notion of the organization initially was to resolve border issues and to strengthen security in the signatory countries after the dissolution of the USSR. However, the scope of goals was gradually extended to “promoting effective cooperation in politics, trade and economy, science and technology, culture as well as education, energy, transportation, tourism, environmental protection and other fields.”²²⁰

In the late 1990s, the process of NATO expansion could not be reversed anymore. Russian leaders understood that, “given their country’s weakened condition, they could not block the first stage of enlargement.” Consequently, “they adopted a strategy to make the best of a bad situation and limit the damage to Russia’s interests.”²²¹ In this regard, the only tools being at Moscow’s disposal to counterweight the expansion were diplomatic maneuvering and forging new regional alliances.

3.3.4 Conclusion

The evolution of NATO-Russia relations in the 1990s was marked by three main developments: the Bosnian conflict, the Kosovo crisis and NATO expansion. In each of these developments, NATO-Russia relations underwent a friction-cooperation pattern. The NATO campaign in Bosnia, in spite of the fact that NATO was still in the process of re-invention of its new roles, could successfully assure all, even the strongest opponents that Europe could not yet make such interventions on its own and that U.S. leadership was a must. It could also prove NATO’s

²²⁰ The Shanghai Cooperation Organization, information from the official website <http://www.sectsco.org/EN/brief.asp>

²²¹ Ted Galen Carpenter, p. 6

sustainability in the contemporary world and legitimize U.S. presence in the Balkans, which was further reinforced by NATO's campaign in Kosovo. Bosnia was a test case for the Alliance with the experience gained to be implemented in future similar crises.

The NATO military campaign in Kosovo was a demonstration of the violation of international law and the resolutions of the UN, in particular Resolution 1244, in the name of promoting US geo-strategic interests and preserving NATO. The active participation of the Alliance in the Bosnian and Kosovo conflicts was promoted by the USA to sideline Moscow's influence in the Balkans, with which the Russian Federation had ethnic and historical ties and considered its sphere of interest, by taking advantage of Moscow's economic and political weakness. NATO had an instrumental role in promoting US agenda and exerting its political and military leverage over Europe.

Moscow's strong resistance to exercising military force in the Bosnia and Kosovo conflicts on the part of the Alliance led to a deterioration in relations with NATO but did not mean a complete break off. Both parties were mutually interested in sustaining cooperation further. The Russian Federation needed the West to reinforce its chances for entering financial Western clubs, receive additional funds for implementing reforms and avoid isolation from European affairs, whereas the West was interested in incorporating Moscow into the peace settlement process in Bosnia and Kosovo, though on the rights of a junior partner, to promote democratic reforms in the Russian Federation, be able to control its economic and political developments as well as to ensure that Moscow did not obstruct NATO's expansion.

The thorniest issue in NATO-Russia relations, though, was the expansion of NATO. In an anarchic, international system, each state is concerned with ensuring its own security through gaining more relative power. In this context, NATO was used as a tool box for acquiring relative power by the USA. By expanding NATO, Washington was trying to pursue a dual policy of keeping Moscow at arm's length through the establishment of the PJC and signing the Founding Act while at the same time establishing institutionalized relations with the countries in Eastern and Central Europe. In spite of the fact that US officials were ensuring Moscow that

NATO did not pose any threat to the Russian Federation, it actually was a policy of containment of the U.S.' former adversary since it created legal grounds for NATO's presence in Central and Eastern Europe, Moscow's former sphere of influence.

Indeed, expansion of NATO was a political decision rather than a military one since it was not beneficial in military terms. The states in Eastern Europe could not contribute to NATO's overall military might because they simply did not have any advanced armies with modern equipment. Whatever the Eastern European states possessed in military terms was not compatible with NATO standards and required a lot of time, efforts and financial resources to get restructured. As a matter of fact, NATO expansion was sustaining the geopolitical interests of the USA rather than the promotion of democracy or stability in the region. The military presence of the USA was firmly secured through the expansion process, which in its terms helped Washington to gain new allies in Eastern and Central Europe, whose political and military decisions could be affected by the USA.

CHAPTER IV

THE PUTIN FACTOR IN COOPERATION-CONFRONTATION PATTERN OF NATO-RUSSIA RELATIONS

4.1 Introduction

The heritage Vladimir Vladimirovich Putin acquired from his predecessor president Yeltsin in domestic and foreign affairs was rather obscure. The situation inside the Russian Federation was marked by the devastating effects of the 1998 economic crisis, the unstable situation in Chechnya and political rivalry. On top of that, the country Putin was going to head, lacked a well-developed strategy for political and economic reforms.

At the beginning of a new millennium the Russian Federation did not only lose its prestige as a super power in the global arena but was relegated to a more obscure position than it had been at the time of Yeltsin's accession to power. The Bosnian conflict, the Kosovo crisis and the expansion of NATO clearly demonstrated that the Russian Federation was hardly counted on by the West which resulted in ousting Moscow from its sphere of interest in Central and Eastern Europe and establishing a new NATO-centric geo-strategic architecture to be accepted by Moscow.

In this context, Putin had to opt either for isolation of the country further from the West and to pursue an independent policy from it or to take a pro-Western shift or maybe to combine both. It will be interesting to explore whether the trajectory chosen by Putin in the country's foreign policy will contribute to the restoration of its prestige as a superpower and regard as an equal partner in relations with NATO, its former adversary and the contemporary promoter of the Western hegemonic power.

4.2 Putin's Policy

4.2.1 Consolidating factors in relations with NATO

A number of disagreements which arose between NATO and the Russian Federation regarding the Bosnian conflict, the NATO air bombing campaign against Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the decision of NATO to expand eastward in the 1990s cooled the relations between Moscow and the Alliance but did not rupture them completely. Apart from this, the new U.S. administration of George W. Bush acceded to power and started to pursue a course of departure rather than engagement, as the previous administration, in its relations with Moscow, "moving toward isolating Russia and its president, Vladimir V. Putin."²²² The main emphasis in the Bush administration was not on promoting integration of the Russian Federation into Western international institutions but on "strengthen[ing] America's core alliances in Europe and Asia, rather than expanding the core to peripheral places like Russia."²²³ The U.S. national security priority was to advocate its "national interest" in relations with Moscow or Beijing in the context that these two great powers could pose a threat to the national security interest of America. Robert Blackwill, one of the advisors to Bush on national security, argued that "the governor [George W. Bush] had concentrated heavily today on Russia and China because those nations, "not Haiti, not Somalia," impinged directly upon the national interests of the United States."²²⁴ Thus, in Washington's view one of such threats to the American national security was posed by Moscow's relations with rogue states like Iran in military terms by selling nuclear and missile technologies to it. Paul D. Wolfowitz, the Deputy Secretary of Defense, called the Russian Federation "one of

²²² Jane Perlez, "Tougher on Russia," *The New York Times*, 24 March 2001 accessible at <http://www.nytimes.com/2001/03/24/world/tougher-on-russia.html?scp=2&sq=wolfowitz+to%20sell%20anything%20to%20anyone&st=cse> (accessed on May 16, 2010)

²²³ James M. Goldgeier and Michael McFaul, *Power and Purpose*, p. 305

²²⁴ Robert Blackwill cited by R.W.Apple in "Bush Questions Aid to Moscow in Policy Talk," *The New York Times*, 20 November 1999 accessible at <http://www.nytimes.com/1999/11/20/us/bush-questions-aid-to-moscow-in-a-policy-talk.html?scp=7&sq=apple%20november%2020%201999&st=cse&pagewanted=1> (accessed on May 17, 2010)

the worst proliferators of missile technology.” He also added that “these people seem to be willing to sell anything to anyone for money.”²²⁵

The Bush administration stated clearly that it would not try to gain Moscow’s consent for the American policies launched unilaterally. Hence, Bush announced his plan to withdraw from the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty (ABM) regardless of Moscow’s concerns on this issue. “We will withdraw from the ABM treaty on our timetable at a time convenient to America,”²²⁶ Bush said. The treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems was signed on 26 May, 1972 by the United States and the Soviet Union. In this treaty both countries agreed to have only two, subsequently reduced to one, ABM deployment areas, “so restricted and so located that they cannot provide a nationwide ABM defence or become the basis for developing one.”²²⁷ The decision of a new American administration was dictated by the necessity to develop its own National Missile Defence System, according to Bush, “to develop ways to protect our people from future terrorist or rogue-state missile attacks” and the ABM Treaty in this regard was “preventing us [Americans] from developing effective defences.”²²⁸

The position of the Russian Federation on the mutual withdrawal from the ABM Treaty, proposed by Bush, was marked by opposition but without any hysteria. Putin commented on this matter saying that

²²⁵ Paul D. Wolfowitz cited by Patrick E. Tyler, “Talks Don’t Calm Foes of Antimissile Plan,” *The New York Times*, 12 May 2001 accessible at <http://www.nytimes.com/2001/05/12/world/12MISS.html?scp=1&sq=wolfowitz+12%20may%202001&st=cse> (accessed on May 17, 2010)

²²⁶ George W. Bush cited by David E. Sanger in “Bush Flatly States U.S. Will Pull Out of Missile Treaty,” *The New York Times*, 24 August 2001 accessible at <http://www.nytimes.com/2001/08/24/world/bush-flatly-states-us-will-pull-out-of-missile-treaty.html?scp=2&sq=bush+withdrawal+ABM+treaty&st=cse> (accessed on May 19, 2010)

²²⁷ Treaty Between The United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems, 26 May 1972 accessible at <http://www.state.gov/www/global/arms/treaties/abm/abm2.html> (accessed on May 19, 2010)

²²⁸ George W. Bush cited by David E. Sanger in “Bush Offers Arms Talks to China as U.S. Pulls out of ABM Treaty,” *The New York Times*, 14 December 2001 accessible at <http://www.nytimes.com/2001/12/14/world/bush-offers-arms-talks-to-china-as-us-pulls-out-of-abm-treaty.html?scp=4&sq=bush%20withdrawal%20ABM%20treaty&st=cse&pagewanted=1> (accessed on May 19, 2010)

we don't violate any of the obligations that we undertook. We are told that something got obsolete like 1972 ABM treaty. It's not what we say, it's what we are told. We disagree that this treaty is obsolete; nevertheless, expressing good will, we are ready for negotiations.²²⁹

The main concern of Moscow was that the U.S. withdrawal could precipitate a new nuclear weapons race in countries like India, China or Pakistan.

However, by the summer 2001, the rhetoric of realpolitik towards Moscow had changed. Moscow was still severely criticized by Washington for its tough policy towards fighting terrorism in Chechnya. However, prompted by the European allies, Bush started to seek partnership with Moscow which resulted in a meeting between Putin and Bush in June 2001 in Slovenia. The sudden shift in U.S. policy towards the Russian Federation was brought forth by the desire of the U.S. administration to

establish a relationship with Putin to secure Russia's acceptance of American withdrawal from the ABM Treaty so that he [George W. Bush] could fulfill his campaign pledge to build a defence against missiles that might be launched by the likes of North Korea or Iraq.²³⁰

The summit helped to establish a rapport between two presidents but left the question of a new security framework and the ABM Treaty unresolved. The next six months of negotiations and consultations on the issue of U.S. withdrawal from the ABM Treaty were not crowned with success either since "the Bush administration was unwilling to discuss each missile test with Moscow in advance, ... and because Russia refused any change that would allow unrestricted testing."²³¹ Hence on 13 December 2001, Bush notified Moscow of America's withdrawal from the ABM Treaty which was to be terminated after six months since the notice had been given.

²²⁹ V.V. Putin cited by Patrick E. Tyler in "Putin, Sizing up Bush, Says the Retinue "Makes The King,"" *The New York Times*, 3 September 2001

²³⁰ James M. Goldgeier and Michael McFaul, *Power and Purpose*, p. 311-12

²³¹ David E. Sanger and Patrick E. Tyler, "Aides Recount Road to Deadlock with Russia over ABM Talks," *The New York Times*, 13 December 2001 accessible at <http://www.nytimes.com/2001/12/13/international/13CND-MISS.html?scp=17&sq=bush%20withdrawal%20ABM%20treaty&st=cse&pagewanted=1> (accessed on May 19, 2001)

In the meantime, knowing the fact that the ABM Treaty was a major post-Cold War international arms treaty for the Russian Federation, providing its own and world security, Tony Blair, the Prime Minister of the UK, made an attempt to soothe the frustration of Moscow by proposing the creation of the Russia-NATO Council²³² in his letter to Lord George Robertson, NATO's secretary General, on 16 November 2001.²³³ The new mechanism was to replace the Permanent Joint Council and to allow NATO members and the Russian Federation to work as equal partners in areas of common interest at "20" framework, which would replace the "19+1" formula existing in the PJC. Officially the Russia-NATO Council was established during the NATO-Russia summit in Rome on 28 May 2002, and

in accordance with the Rome declaration, NATO member states and Russia work as equal partners in areas of common interest in the framework of the NRC, which provides a mechanism for consultation consensus-building, cooperation, joint decision and joint action on a wide spectrum of security issues in the Euro-Atlantic region.²³⁴

The main goal of the Russia-NATO Council was to upgrade cooperation between NATO and the Russian Federation and to allow the latter to take part in NATO deliberations, though on a specific list of issues such as "the struggle against terrorism, crisis management, non-proliferation, arms control and confidence-building measures, theatre missile defence, search and rescue at sea, military-to-military cooperation, and civil emergencies."²³⁵ Undeniably, Moscow has been granted a say in NATO deliberations on some certain issues. However, as in the case with the Permanent Joint Council, Moscow still lacks veto power over NATO decisions and in times when the Alliance and the Russian Federation cannot reach

²³² The official web-site of Russia-NATO Council can be accessed at <http://www.nato-russia-council.info/htm/EN/index.shtml>

²³³ Lilia Shevtsova, *Putin's Russia*, Carnegie Endowment For International Peace: Washington D.C., 2003, p.214

²³⁴ NATO-Russia Council, <http://www.nato-russia-council.info/htm/EN/nrc.shtml> (accessed on May 29, 2010)

²³⁵ Ibid.

consensus on issues at “20,” NATO has the right to pull the issue back to the NAC to be discussed at “19.”

The proposal for creating a new mechanism, the Russia-NATO Council, looked like “moral compensation to the Kremlin for the liquidation of the old system of security,”²³⁶ the ABM Treaty. What is more, with the establishment of the Russia-NATO Council, the Alliance received unofficial consent from Moscow to proceed with NATO second round of enlargement, discussed later in this chapter, and invite another seven Central and Eastern European countries to start accession negotiations with the Alliance, among which were three Baltic States, former Soviet Union members, whose NATO membership was fiercely opposed by Moscow. Back in November 2001 after a meeting with Bush in Washington, Putin said that “Russia is prepared to broaden its cooperation with the alliance. If we change the quality of Russia-NATO relations, the issues of NATO expansion will cease to matter.”²³⁷ What is more, the decision to set up the “20” formula might have been the result of a trade-off between Washington and Moscow, for the consent of the latter for US operation in Iraq which will be examined in one of the sections further on.

The abrogation of the ABM Treaty had been also compensated to Moscow by the conclusion of the nuclear reduction treaty named the Strategic Offensive Reduction Treaty,²³⁸ which was signed on May 24, 2002, at the Bush-Putin Summit in Moscow. The Treaty was crucial for Putin since “he could prove to the Russian political class that he was not Gorbachev II who was only weakening Russia’s positions without reciprocity.”²³⁹

²³⁶ Lilia Shevtsova, *Putin’s Russia*, p. 214

²³⁷ V.V. Putin cited by Michael Wines in “NATO Plan Offers Russian Equal Voice in Some Policies,” *The New York Times*, November 23, 2001 accessible at <http://www.nytimes.com/2001/11/23/world/nato-plan-offers-russia-equal-voice-on-some-policies.html?scp=3&sq=russia-nato+council&st=cse> (accessed on May 30, 2010)

²³⁸ The full text of the document is available at <http://www.armscontrol.org/documents/sort> (accessed on May 30, 2010)

²³⁹ Lilia Shevtsova, *Putin’s Russia*, p. 236

The anti-terrorist endeavour in Afghanistan

The September 11 attacks brought Moscow and Washington to a strategic cooperation. In the first hours after the attacks, Putin was the first to call Bush and condemn the acts of terror calling them “a blatant challenge to humanity.” Putin also added that “Russia knows directly what terrorism means. And because of this we, more than anyone, understand the feelings of the American people. In the name of Russia, I want to say to the American people - we are with you.”²⁴⁰ Indeed, Moscow had been warning the international community of the threat of international terrorism which Moscow was fighting in the Chechen war and back in 2000, it was also emphasized in the Foreign Policy Concept of the Russian Federation.²⁴¹

Russia regards as its most important foreign policy task to combat international terrorism which is capable of destabilizing the situation not only in individual states, but in entire regions. The Russian Federation calls for the further measures to intensify cooperation among states in this area. It is the direct duty of every state to protect its citizens against terrorist encroachments, to prevent any activity on its territory aimed at organizing such acts against citizens and interests of other countries, and not to provide asylum to terrorists²⁴²

For the USA and its European allies, such justification for the war in Chechnya was unacceptable and they criticized the methods used by Moscow musing about cutting off IMF financial assistance and export/import loans.²⁴³ The September 11 attacks made Bush change his rhetoric and embark on fighting international terrorism as the main priority in the American foreign policy which was reflected in the U.S. National Security Strategy of 2002 in which terrorism was

²⁴⁰ V.V. Putin cited by Jill Dougherty in “9/11 a “Turning Point” for Putin,” *CNN World*, September 10, 2002 accessible at <http://archives.cnn.com/2002/WORLD/europe/09/10/ar911.russia.putin/> (accessed on May 21, 2010)

²⁴¹ The full text of the document is available at <http://www.fas.org/nuke/guide/russia/doctrine/econcept.htm> (accessed on May 21, 2010)

²⁴² Ibid.

²⁴³ James M. Goldgeier and Michael McFaul, *Power and Purpose*, p. 307-308

defined as the “enemy...— premeditated, politically motivated violence perpetrated against innocents.”²⁴⁴

In this regard, Moscow was given an opportunity for cooperation with Washington on the grounds of a common goal- fighting global terrorism by joining the US-led coalition against terrorism. September 11 generated a shift in Russian Foreign Policy from seeking integration with Europe, which was stated as the second main priority in the Foreign Policy Concept of the Russian Federation (2000) right after close integration with CIS countries, to a pro-American direction.

Only two weeks after the terrorist attacks on the USA, Putin started to back his support with concrete actions. The president faced a strong opposition from government officials on military cooperation with the USA and NATO in the fight against terrorism. “In the immediate days after September 11th, several senior Russian officials - including the Minister of Defence Sergei Ivanov - spoke openly against military cooperation with the United States to fight terrorism.”²⁴⁵ In his response to the question of possible NATO troops stationing in Central Asia, Russia’s backyard, Ivanov said: “I see absolutely no basis for even hypothetical suppositions about the possibility of NATO military operations on the territory of Central Asia nations.”²⁴⁶ On the 24 September 2001, however, Putin demonstrated unilateralism in decision-making and presented a five-point plan of action to be followed by Moscow in its contribution to the fight against terrorism in cooperation with the USA:

²⁴⁴ The U.S. National Security Strategy, September 2002 accessible at <http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/nsc/nss/2002/nss3.html> (accessed on May 21, 2010)

²⁴⁵ Michael McFaul, “U.S.-Russia Relations after September 11, 2001,” Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, accessible at <http://www.carnegieendowment.org/publications/index.cfm?fa=view&id=840&prog=zru> (accessed on May 21, 2010)

²⁴⁶ Sergei Ivanov cited by Suzanne Daley in “After the Attacks: In Europe; a Pause to Ponder Washington’s Tough Talk,” *The New York Times*, 16 September 2001 accessible at <http://www.nytimes.com/2001/09/16/us/after-the-attacks-in-europe-a-pause-to-ponder-washington-s-tough-talk.html?scp=2&sq=ivanov+no%20basis%20for%20even%20a%20hypothetical%20possibility&st=cse> (accessed on May 21, 2010)

- Firstly, the Russian Federation will advance cooperation in sharing intelligence service data regarding the location of international terrorists.
- Secondly, the Russian Federation will make its air-space available for the aircrafts delivering humanitarian cargo to the area of anti-terrorist operation.
- Thirdly, the Russian Federation came into an agreement with the Central Asian countries, allies of Moscow, who do not exclude the possibility of making their air bases available for anti-terrorist operations.
- Fourthly, the Russian Federation is ready, if necessary, to participate in international search and rescue operations.
- Fifthly, the Russian Federation will expand its cooperation with the internationally recognized Afghan government and support its military forces by providing arms and military hardware.²⁴⁷

Moscow refused, though, to send its troops and to take part in the actual fight against terrorists in cooperation with USA and its allies in Afghanistan justifying its decision by the ongoing participation in the Chechen war and impossibility to fight on two fronts simultaneously.

On the overall scale, there was realization on Putin's side that "a goal of a strong Russia could be achieved only through broader engagement with the West."²⁴⁸ Hence, Putin not only supported the US-led antiterrorist operation in Afghanistan by allowing U.S. presence in Central Asia, but, in spite of a strong opposition from the military officials, also made a decision to close the Russian military bases in Cuba (Lourdes) and Vietnam (Kamran) to demonstrate that the Russian Federation was ready to forget about its geopolitical rivalry of the past. It was an unprecedented decision on the part of the Russian president since "...Russia

²⁴⁷ Russian President's Statement, The Kremlin, Moscow, 24 September 2001 available at http://eng.kremlin.ru/speeches/2001/09/24/0002_type82912_138534.shtml (accessed on May 21, 2010)

²⁴⁸ Lilia Shevtsova, *Putin's Russia*, p.218

for the first time in its history recognized the hegemony of another state and voluntarily chose to play junior partner.”²⁴⁹

The new context of international relations after the September 11 attacks prompted the Bush administration to redefine its policy towards Russia. The earlier policy of ignoring Moscow’s concerns and interests was gradually changing into granting higher priority to it in relations with Washington. According to Sergei Rogov, a Director of the Institute of USA and Canada, redefinition of US policy was motivated by three reasons. Firstly, Moscow’s support and participation in the anti-terrorist coalition was crucial for the USA since it would give more legitimacy to it and “would create a picture of unanimous endorsement of US actions by the international community.” Moscow’s opposition to the anti-terrorist operation could be exercised through its veto power in the UN Security Council which in its turn could affect the stance of China or any other UN Security Council member. Secondly, undoubtedly Moscow was still a main player in the military operations in the Central Asia, whose consent for US military deployment on Central Asian bases was significant and third, the impediments caused by the political problems in Pakistan, the platform for operations in Afghanistan, impelled Washington to consider the Central Asian countries as a possible foothold for operations in Afghanistan, where the consent of Moscow was essential.²⁵⁰ Consequently, the immediate consequence of a shift in American policy towards Russia was the recognition of terrorism as a top-priority threat, which made Washington less critical of Moscow’s efforts to fight terrorists in Chechnya. Colin Powell, U.S. Secretary of State, commenting on the Chechen conflict stated in May 2002 that, “Russia is fighting terrorists in Chechnya, there is no question about that, and we understand that.”²⁵¹

²⁴⁹ Ibid., p. 205

²⁵⁰ Sergei Rogov, “A New Turn in Russian-American Relations,” Part III in *Russian Foreign Policy in Transition: Concepts and Realities* ed. by Andrei Melville and Tatiana Shakleina, Central European University Press: Budapest, 2005, p. 352

²⁵¹ Colin Powell, cited by James M. Goldgeier and Michael McFaul in *Power and Purpose*, p. 317

The September 11 attacks had brought a new sense of purpose for NATO as well. For the first time since the establishment of the Alliance, Article 5²⁵² of the NATO Treaty had been invoked, considering a terrorist attack on the USA as an attack on all members of the Alliance. The NATO members, on 4 October, 2001, had also agreed on eight measures to be taken in support of Article 5. The most important of them was to share the intelligence data among members, to provide overflight passage to the military aircrafts of the USA and its allies taking part in anti-terrorist operations, the deployment of NATO Standing Naval Forces to the Eastern Mediterranean to patrol the region of anti-terrorist operation and a NATO Airborne Early Warning force to patrol the US airspace.²⁵³

Despite the view that the USA preferred to set on the mission to fight terrorism in coalition with the UK and without the assistance of NATO as a whole, justifying it by the fact that “non-US NATO’s limited ability to project military power globally, combined with the difficulties of consensus politics decreased NATO’s importance among US policy makers, and for some, NATO as a whole was considered more of a hindrance than help,”²⁵⁴ Washington tried to make use of NATO assets. This, in its turn, represented an opportunity for NATO-Russia cooperation.

After September 11 the USA referred to NATO again on 21-22 November, 2002, at the NATO Prague Summit with the extension of accession negotiations to another seven Central and Eastern European countries (the enlargement issue will be

²⁵² Article 5 of the NATO Treaty stated that “The Parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all and consequently they agree that, if such an armed attack occurs, each of them, in exercise of the right of individual or collective self-defence recognised by Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, will assist the Party or Parties so attacked by taking forthwith, individually and in concert with the other Parties, such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force, to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area.” The full text of the Treaty is available at http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_17120.htm

²⁵³ Statement to the Press on the North Atlantic Council Decision On Implementation Of Article 5 of the Washington Treaty following the 11 September Attacks against the United States, 4 October 2001 available at http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/opinions_19009.htm

²⁵⁴ Charly Salonijs-Pasternak ed, “From Protecting Some to Securing Many NATO’s Journey from a Military Alliance to a Security Manager,” p. 48

discussed later in this chapter) and more importantly adoption of measures to improve military capabilities of the Alliance which included the Prague Capabilities Commitment, the NATO Response Force and the streamlining of the military command structure. The Prague Summit had also adopted a Military Concept for Defence against terrorism and made the decision to support NATO member countries in Afghanistan. The aim of adopting new measures was to “ensure that NATO can fulfill its present and future operational commitments and fight new threats such as terrorism and the spread of weapons of mass destruction” which was “particularly important as NATO takes on new missions in faraway areas such as Afghanistan.”²⁵⁵ The Alliance members, under the new measures, were to release forces quickly deployable to out-of-area missions which would perform a variety of missions and remain in the region of operation for a long period of time.

The measures adopted at the Prague Summit were revised two years later in the 2004 Istanbul Summit. Meanwhile, though, the new military relevance of the Alliance to the mission of fighting terrorism was exercised by the USA in Afghanistan by taking over the command of the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) in August 2003. Initially, the ISAF was created on December 20, 2001, by the UN Council Resolution 1386,²⁵⁶ led by the USA being limited only to the Kabul area. Upon request of the UN and the new Afghan government NATO was asked to participate in ISAF. According to NATO commanders, over time not only Kabul but the whole of Afghanistan was to be brought under NATO’s operational responsibility in four stages-north, west, south and east respectively.

NATO and the Russian Federation had one common threat – terrorism – which brought them into cooperation over Afghanistan. Thus, apart from allowing to use its land for the delivery of NATO non-lethal supplies to the troops of the Alliance in Afghanistan and giving its consent for the deployment of NATO troops

²⁵⁵ Prague Capabilities Commitment, NATO Prague Summit, 2002 accessible at http://www.nato.int/cps/en/SID-12857281-07335390/natolive/topics_50087.htm (accessed on May 24, 2010)

²⁵⁶ The full text of the resolution is available at <http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N01/708/55/PDF/N0170855.pdf?OpenElement>

on the bases in Uzbekistan and Kyrgystan, Moscow had also appointed the Russian State Committee for Control over the Illegal Trafficking of Narcotics and Psychotropic Substances to join its efforts with NATO's Research and Technology Agency in "jointly examining the consequences of drug trafficking out of Afghanistan."²⁵⁷ In spite of having a common threat and unanimously forging cooperation, NATO and the Russian Federation had quite polar motives for that. Lilia Shevtsova, a professor of political science at Moscow State University, claims that the motive Putin perceived for forging a coalition with the USA against terrorism was an "excuse for a military decision in Chechnya that he was sure was an important piece in the global terrorist chain."²⁵⁸ Andrei Kazantsev, a Russian scholar, assumes that Moscow "had a unique opportunity to destroy its worst enemies with American hands,"²⁵⁹ which prompted it to cooperate with the Alliance. The driving force behind the US decision could be explained not only by its desire to combat terrorism or secure the stability in Afghanistan by transforming it into a democratic country but, mainly, by the far-reaching goal of securing its presence in the Middle East and the Central Asia through military operations in Afghanistan. There was a fear on the part of Moscow that "America was trying to encircle Russia with its military bases and to create a cordon sanitaire around Russian territory"²⁶⁰ through permanent stationing of its troops in Central Asian countries.

Moreover, the consensus between Washington and Moscow became feasible since European NATO members and the USA had quite different ideas on the issue of fighting terrorism. The French premier, Lionel Jospin, said that "the problems of the world cannot be reduced simply to the struggle against terrorism, however vital that struggle may be. Nor can such problems be solved by overwhelming military

²⁵⁷ Robert E. Hunter, Sergey M. Rogov, "Engaging Russia as Partner and Participant: The New Stage of NATO-Russia Relations," *Conference Proceedings*, RAND Corporation, National Security Research Division, 2004, p. 18

²⁵⁸ Lilia Shevtsova, *Putin's Russia*, p. 232

²⁵⁹ Andrei Kazantsev, "Russian Policy in Central Asia and the Caspian Sear Region," *Europe-Asia Studies*, Vol. 60, No. 6, August 2008, p. 1081

²⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 1082

power.”²⁶¹ This was the beginning of a breakdown in the Northern Alliance coalition which would show its effect a year later in America’s new endeavour in Iraq.

4.2.2. The main cornerstones in relations with NATO

The U.S. endeavor in Iraq

In addition to some certain calculations and the trade-offs indicated in the previous section, Moscow did have hope that the Bush administration would repeal the Jackson-Vanik amendment,²⁶² the remnant of the Cold War period, and raise the status of the Russian Federation to a market-economy. However, the US Congress left the amendment intact. What is more, the US administration’s preference for unilateralism in fighting terrorism in Afghanistan started to be seen in Moscow as an excuse to raise U.S. relative power and spread its hegemony in the world. In the new National Security Strategy of the United States or so called Bush Doctrine, which was published on 17 September, 2002, the USA launched a new policy of pre-emptive war to replace the traditional military doctrine of defensive nature. President Bush made it clear in the Doctrine that America “will not hesitate to act alone, if necessary, to exercise our [its] right of self-defence by acting pre-emptively against such terrorists, to prevent them from doing harm against our [its] people and our country.”²⁶³ The primary goal of the Bush Doctrine was “to retain and secure the

²⁶¹ Lionel Jospin cited by John Lloyd, “An Old Continent, Tired and Impotent,” *New Statesman*, 18 February, 2002 accessible at <http://www.newstatesman.com/200202180014> (accessed on May 24, 2010)

²⁶² The Jackson-Vanik amendment (Section 401, Title IV of the Trade Act of 1974, P.L. 93-618) affects U.S. trade relations with communist or former communist countries that restrict freedom of emigration and other human rights. It was a response to the Soviet Union's "diploma taxes" levied on Jews attempting to emigrate. It was signed into law on January 3, 1975 by President Gerald Ford following a unanimous Congressional vote and continues to influence trade relations with a number of states, http://www.cfr.org/publication/18844/jacksonvanik_amendment.html#

²⁶³ National Security Strategy of the United States, September 17, 2002

position of the United States in the twenty-first-century system of international relations as the only superpower, with no serious rival.”²⁶⁴

On the wave of seeming success in Afghanistan and in unison with the new U.S. National Security Strategy, President Bush proceeded with Iraq accusing it of possession of Weapons of Mass Destruction and cooperation with terrorist groups such as Al-Qaeda. The support in the face of the UN condemning Saddam Hussein’s regime was crucial for Bush and it prompted the American president to give a speech at the United Nations on 12 September 2002 to facilitate the acceptance of new resolutions and to make Saddam comply with already passed ones.

My nation will work with the U.N. Security Council on a new resolution to meet our common challenge. If Iraq's regime defies us again, the world must move deliberately and decisively to hold Iraq to account. The purposes of the United States should not be doubted. The Security Council resolutions will be enforced, the just demands of peace and security will be met, or action will be unavoidable. And a regime that has lost its legitimacy will also lose its power.²⁶⁵

Bush’s speech had its impact on the members of the UN Security Council who, on 8 November, 2002, unanimously voted for the resolution 1441 aimed at providing

a final opportunity [to Iraq] to comply with its disarmament obligations under relevant resolutions of the Council; and accordingly [UN Security Council] decides to set up an enhanced inspection regime with the aim of bringing to full and verified completion the disarmament process established by resolution 687 (1991) and subsequent resolutions of the Council.²⁶⁶

America’s closest ally, the United Kingdom, staunchly supported the resolution and Tony Blair, the UK Prime Minister, was more than explicit in his

²⁶⁴ Sergei Rogov, “The Bush Doctrine,” *Russian Social Science Review*, Vol.44, No. 3, May-June 2003, p. 5

²⁶⁵ George W. Bush, Text of Bush Iraq Speech to UN, *CBS News*, 12 September 2002, available at <http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2002/09/12/national/main521781.shtml> (accessed on June 4, 2010)

²⁶⁶ United Nations Security Council, Resolution 1441, 8 November 2002, available at <http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N02/682/26/PDF/N0268226.pdf?OpenElement> (accessed on June 4, 2010)

intention to use force should Saddam breach the UN Security Council resolutions, which was undeniably going beyond resolution 1441.

I am delighted that the Security Council has risen to the challenge, by unanimously adopting the US/UK Resolution 1441... Saddam must now make his choice. My message to him is this: disarm or you face force. There must be no more games, no more deceit, no more prevarication, obstruction or defiance. Co-operate fully and despite the terrible injustice you have often inflicted on others, we will be just with you. But defy the United Nation's will and we will disarm you by force. Be under no doubt whatever of that.²⁶⁷

Moscow had also voted in support of the resolution. There was a strong belief in the United States that not only the antiterrorism coalition formed between Moscow and Washington in the aftermath of September 11, but also

the perspectives of cooperation in the newly created NATO-Council of 20 in a global energy alliance (which was to replace OPEC) as well as in controlling the nonproliferation of WMD, were more important for Putin than the risk of confrontation over Saddam Hussein.²⁶⁸

The USA assumed that it would not allow Moscow to use its veto power in the UN Security Council in regard to Iraq. Until February 2003 the Russian Federation seemed to comply with this belief.

However, after Putin's trip to Germany and France in February 2003, a shift from a strategic partnership with the USA initiated by the fight against terrorism in the aftermath of September 11 could be observed in Moscow's foreign policy. Moscow was still in favour of sustaining a partnership with the USA, however was not ready to extend its support to another U.S. military campaign, this time in Iraq. From the pragmatic standpoint, the war in Iraq was strongly opposed by Moscow. Geostrategically, it was believed in the Russian Federation that the American

²⁶⁷ Tony Blair, PM Statement on Iraq following UN Council Resolution, 8 November 2002, *Number 10*, The Official Site of the UK Prime-Minister's Office, available at <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/+http://www.number10.gov.uk/Page3206> (accessed on June 5, 2010)

²⁶⁸ Alexander Rahr, "Russia-European Union-Germany after September 11 and Iraq," Chapter 11 in *Russia's Engagement with the West* ed. by Alexander J Motyl, Blair A. Ruble, Lilia Shevtsova, M.E. Sharpe Inc.: Armonk, New York, 2005, p. 226

presence in Iraq, along with Afghanistan, could lead to its dominance in the region in the short run and the sole world hegemony in the long term. Moreover, military conflict in Iraq could destabilize the region spreading the consequences to the Central Asian states; members of the CIS. Economically, the war in Iraq and the change in regime would mean a loss of a total amount of US\$48 billion.²⁶⁹ This amount was comprised of US\$40 billion under the program for Russian-Iraqi cooperation and US\$8 billion of Iraq's old debt to the Russian Federation. What is more, the Russian oil company, Lukoil, would be repudiated the licence for West Kurna-2 oil-field exploration, granted to it by Saddam's regime.²⁷⁰

Thus, in regard to the war in Iraq, Moscow tended to prevent America's "breakthrough to sole world domination"²⁷¹ and after his trip to Berlin and Paris, Putin even verbally changed his rhetoric. Putin said: "I am absolutely confident that the world will be predictable and stable only if it is multi-polar."²⁷²

Washington was still trying to trade off the support of Moscow in the UN Security Council for the promises to repeal the Jackson-Vanik amendment, which seems to circulate in the relations between Washington and Moscow every time Moscow's consent is at stake; to incorporate Moscow into the post-war Iraq reconstruction process and to grant assurances to Moscow regarding US\$8 billion debt owed to it by Iraq. That is how one of the senior officials from the Bush administration commented on the compensation carrots to Moscow:

What we've said is that if you are legitimately concerned with recouping your \$8 billion of debt, and if you are interested in economic opportunities in a liberated Iraq, then it would be helpful if you are part of the prevailing coalition.²⁷³

²⁶⁹ Mikhail Golubev, *Nezavisimaya gazeta*, 27 March 2003 available at http://www.ng.ru/economics/2003-03-27/1_rikoshet.html (accessed on June 5, 2010)

²⁷⁰ Ibid.

²⁷¹ Alexander Rahr, *Russia-European Union-Germany after September 11 and Iraq*, p. 225

²⁷² Interview Granted by President Vladimir Putin to France-3 Television, February 9, 2003, Embassy of the Russian Federation in Australia, Embassy Press-Releases, available at <http://www.australia.mid.ru/press2003/05.html> (accessed on June 5, 2010)

²⁷³ Cited by Michael Wines in "Putin Again Rejects U.S. Calls for Support of a War, Fearing Effect on the Mideast," *The New York Times*, 1 March 2003, available at

The Russian President turned the offers of Washington down by saying that

Russia -- and I am profoundly convinced of it -- is a reliable partner in international affairs, because we are not being guided by short-term benefits, expediency or any emotions. We have certain principles and we abide by them. We have our own interests there, not only in the oil sphere. But we are not going to bargain, as if we were in an oriental market, selling our position in exchange for some economic benefits.²⁷⁴

At last, after the meeting with Schröder and Chirac in February 2003, Putin, as at the beginning of his presidency, in his foreign policy again gave priority to the relations with Europe over the anti-terrorist coalition with the USA and joined an anti-war coalition headed by Germany and France. On March 5, 2003, in a joint statement, Germany, the Russian Federation and France declared that they “will not allow a draft resolution authorizing the use of force to go through. Russia and France, as permanent members of the Security Council, will assume all their responsibilities on this point.”²⁷⁵ The duet of France and the Russian Federation had been joined by China in the UN Security Council which represented the majority in the number of permanent members of the Security Council and meant that the proposed resolution by the USA and the UK, allowing military action in Iraq, would be rebuffed. Knowing this fact, the USA and the UK made a unilateral decision and supported by small contingents from Poland and Australia, invaded Iraq.

NATO has never been involved in any combat mission or in the international stabilization force in Iraq which can be explained by the differences in NATO members’ stance on this issue. The French President, Jacques Chirac, objected to the proposal of Bush for a wider role for the Alliance in post-occupation Iraq, saying that he did not believe it was NATO’s purpose to intervene in Iraq. He also added that any NATO role could only be justified “if the sovereign Iraqi government were

<http://www.nytimes.com/2003/03/01/international/europe/01MOSC.html?scp=2&sq=putin%20again%20rejects%20us%20calls%20for%20support%20of%20a%20war%20march%201.%202003&st=cs&pagewanted=1> (accessed on June 5, 2010)

²⁷⁴ Interview Granted by President Vladimir Putin to France-3 Television.

²⁷⁵ Iraq - Joint statement by Russia, Germany and France, Paris, 3 March 2003, French Embassy in the United Kingdom, Statements, available at <http://www.ambafrance-uk.org/Iraq-Joint-statement-by-Russia.html> (accessed on June 5, 2010)

to ask for it.”²⁷⁶ Consequently, NATO’s mission in Iraq comes to training and mentoring under the NATO Training Mission-Iraq (NTM-I) which was set up in 2004 at the request of the Iraqi Interim Government and in accordance with UN Security Council Resolution 1546.²⁷⁷

The Iraqi conflict clearly demonstrated that Moscow had acquired the lesson of the Kosovo war, when the Russian Federation stood alone in the UN Security Council opposing military action against the FRY, which precipitated its self-isolation. However, “in the Iraqi war, Putin managed, with the help of Germany and France, to isolate America in the Security Council.”²⁷⁸

The war in Iraq led to the division, not only in the UN Security Council, but in the EU and NATO as well. In January 2003, U.S. Secretary of Defence, Donald Rumsfeld, called Germany and France “Old Europe,” justifying it by the fact that “Germany has been a problem and France has been a problem” in cooperation with the USA over Iraq, while the new NATO member states and some prospective candidates he called “New Europe.”²⁷⁹ The states comprising “New Europe” expressed their support for the US/UK coalition since “they see NATO as the key guarantor of their security.”²⁸⁰ On the overall scale the issue of the military operation in Iraq posed a big blow to the integrity of the Western Alliance as a whole and NATO-Russia cooperation in particular. The members of NATO were divided, which obstructed the cooperative atmosphere in the NATO-Russia Council to resolve the differences over Iraq. Moreover, American unilateralism and “the lack

²⁷⁶ Jacques Chirac cited in “Bush seeks NATO role in Iraq, Chirac objected,” *China Daily*, 2004-06-10 available at http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/english/doc/2004-06/10/content_338195.htm (accessed on June 6, 2010)

²⁷⁷ NATO Assistance to Iraq, North Atlantic Treaty Organization, available at http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics_51978.htm (accessed on June 6, 2010)

²⁷⁸ Alexander Rahr, *Russia-European Union-Germany after September 11 and Iraq*, p. 227

²⁷⁹ “Outrage at “Old Europe” Remarks,” *BBC News World Edition*, 23 January, 2003 available at <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/2687403.stm> (accessed on June 5, 2010)

²⁸⁰ Heather Grabbe, “Is an Old versus New European Divide Replacing East against West?” *Center For European Reform Bulletin*, February/March 2003, Issue 28 available at http://www.cer.org.uk/articles/28_grabbe.html (accessed on June 5, 2010)

of legitimacy of the invasion of Iraq severely damaged America's reputation and Washington has recognized the importance of allies."²⁸¹ Washington had to return back to the multilateral framework of the UN and to reconstruct its relations with "Old Europe."

The Iraqi war marked the time of fundamental change in Moscow's foreign policy. It embarked on rediscovering itself as a great power once again. "This time, however, the claim is not based solely on military force and political influence, but also underpinned by economic factors."²⁸² Being able to pay back its debt to the Western financial clubs, without even asking for restructuring, made the Russian Federation less dependent on the West and allowed it to take an independent stance from Western policy. Relations with NATO lost their previous actuality. "It dropped integrationist illusions, and replaced them with economic expansionism, with a full use of Russia's comparative advantages."²⁸³ Hence, on 19 September, 2003, during the CIS Summit in Yalta/Russia, the Single Economic Space between Kazakhstan, the Russian Federation, Ukraine and Belarus was established to achieve economic integration between the signatory states. Moreover, the vast reserves of oil and gas facilitated the establishment of close ties with the European Union and prompted it to seek the ownership of European oil refineries and gas distribution networks which could lead to a more cooperative Europe.

The second round of enlargement and more

One of the bones of contention between the Russian Federation and the Alliance, which has been topical for years, represents the enlargement process of NATO. The process of enlargement which started in the 1990s got its continuation at the beginning of a new millennium. Hence, on 21-22 November, 2002, at the

²⁸¹ Robert E. Hunter, Sergey M. Rogov, "Engaging Russia as Partner and Participant: The New Stage of NATO-Russia Relations," p. 49

²⁸² Dmitri Trenin, *Getting Russia Right*, p. 73

²⁸³ *Ibid.*, p. 75

NATO Prague Summit, another seven countries such as Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia were invited to start accession negotiations with NATO. Two years later on 28-29 June, 2004, at the NATO Istanbul Summit, the above mentioned member-candidates acquired the official status of NATO new members.

Before September 11 among all the countries invited for the accession negotiations, only Slovenia and Slovakia, though politically and militarily still being far from fulfilling the criteria for NATO membership, seemed to have chances of receiving invitations from NATO at the Prague Summit. However, “after September 11, Washington, searching for dependable and dedicated allies, intensively campaigned for a “big bang expansion.””²⁸⁴ Bulgaria and Romania could hardly claim NATO membership due to economic instability, corruption in the government and being militarily handicapped, but “the United States needed all the potential allies it could get, regardless of their deficiencies.”²⁸⁵

The reasons advocated by the United States in favour of the second round of enlargement were as follows. Firstly, it was an old promise given by NATO members at the Madrid Summit in 1997 to the states aspiring NATO membership, which meant that “the Alliance had a moral obligation to make good on its promise.”²⁸⁶ The second reason indicated by Zoltan Barany was the opportunity for NATO to “expand its deterrent potential and enhance its rapid intervention capability in the Balkans and further to the east” being achievable through the incorporation of Romania, Slovakia, Bulgaria and Slovenia. Moreover, accession of new Eastern and Central European States was beneficial in geo-strategic terms since it would link up “Hungary with new members on its borders (Slovakia, Romania and Slovenia) and Greece and Turkey with the rest of the Alliance through

²⁸⁴ Zoltan Barany, “NATO’s Post-Cold War Metamorphosis: From Sixteen to Twenty-Six and Counting,” *International Studies Review*, Volume 8, Issue 1, March 2006, p. 171

²⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 172

²⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 170

Bulgaria.”²⁸⁷ What’s more, accession of new members geographically could bring the Alliance closer to the Middle East, one of the new strategic regions for Washington.

Thirdly, to remove the dividing lines between NATO members and the Baltic States as well as the Balkans, further enlargement rounds were necessary which otherwise could pose the threat to European security by “reversing democratic transition and reinforcing nationalist tensions and leaving the Baltic States vulnerable to Russian pressures.” However, the most essential reason for the United States to promote the successive round of NATO enlargement was that “enlargement by definition brings further real estate into the Alliance on which US-NATO military installations can be based,”²⁸⁸ at a lower price and with less resistance compared to the states in “Old Europe.”

The aftermath of September 11, characterized by the improvement in relations between the United States and the Russian Federation, laid the ground for U.S. aspirations to move forward with further NATO enlargement to the east and include even the former Soviet Republics of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. Indeed, Putin made a number of statements signalling a change in Moscow’s stance on NATO eastern enlargement. Hence, Putin stated that “if NATO takes on a different shape and is becoming a political organization, of course, we would reconsider our position with regard to such expansion, if we are to feel involved in the processes.”²⁸⁹ This did not mean though that Moscow submitted to the process of expansion. It was still perceived negatively on all political levels in the Russian Federation, particularly the accession of the Baltic States. However, Moscow could do nothing to obstruct or reverse the process of NATO enlargement. Moreover, isolating itself from the West on the issue of NATO enlargement would do

²⁸⁷ Ibid.

²⁸⁸ Ibid., pp. 170-171

²⁸⁹ V.V. Putin, cited by Suzanne Daley in “A Nation Challenged: The Allies; Putin softens His Stance Against NATO Expansion,” *The New York Times*, 4 October 2001 available at <http://www.nytimes.com/2001/10/04/world/a-nation-challenged-the-allies-putin-softens-his-stance-against-nato-expansion.html?scp=4&sq=putin+nato%20enlargement&st=cse> (accessed on June 12, 2010)

irreparable harm to the NATO-Russian relations which was of no advantage to Moscow.

The main concerns in Moscow regarding NATO expansion in its former Soviet Republics of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania were lying mainly in the military and political spheres. Hence, according to scholars Leonid Karabeshkin and Dina Spechler, “from the outset, Moscow regarded the prospect of Baltic membership in NATO as a threat to Russia’s military security,”²⁹⁰ which meant bringing NATO to the Russian border and the prospective possibility of the deployment of NATO forces in the Baltic States. In spite of the fact that the Founding Act of 1997 signed between the Russian Federation and NATO clearly reiterated that the member states of the Alliance “have no intention, no plan and no reason to deploy nuclear weapons on the territory of new members, nor any need to change any aspect of NATO's nuclear posture or nuclear policy - and do not foresee any future need to do so,” the clause in the Founding Act stating that the Alliance will not resort to “stationing of substantial combat forces”²⁹¹ on the territory of the new members raised suspicion in Moscow. The credibility of NATO collective security guarantees would be under a big question if the Alliance did not permanently station its troops on the territory of new members, since the geo-strategic location of the Baltic States would be connected to the Alliance by a narrow corridor from Poland.²⁹² The Russian Minister of Defence, Sergei Ivanov, said that:

Russia's military and political leadership has good reason to be concerned about the integration of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, particularly if NATO decides to create large military bases in those countries. The alliance is gaining greater ability to control and monitor Russian territory. We cannot turn a blind eye as NATO's air

²⁹⁰ Leonid A. Karabeshkin and Dina A. Spechler, “EU and NATO Enlargement: Russia’s Expectations, Responses and Options for the Future,” *European Security*, Volume 16, Nos. 3-4, September-December 2007, p. 314

²⁹¹ Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security between NATO and the Russian Federation, NATO, 27 May 1997

²⁹² Nadezhda Arbatova, “Paradoksy Bezopasnosti v Baltiiskom Regione [The Paradoxes of Security in the Baltic Region],” *Nezavisimaya Gazeta*, 30 January 2001 available at http://www.ng.ru/politics/2001-01-30/3_paradoks.html (accessed on June 12, 2010)

and military bases get much closer to cities and defense complexes in European Russia.²⁹³

What is more, the disagreements about the ratification of the Agreement on Adaptation of the CFE Treaty raised more concerns in Moscow regarding the accession of the Baltic States. To allow the accession of the four new NATO member states such as Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and Slovenia, the Russian Federation insisted on their immediate ratification of the CFE Treaty since they were not and are currently not the parties to it. The Baltic States do not consider themselves the “successor states” to the Soviet Union whereas Slovenia was never a part of the Warsaw Pact, being a Former Yugoslav Republic and thus was not included into the Treaty.²⁹⁴ Officially, NATO countries justify their refusal to ratify the CFE Treaty by Moscow’s failure to fully implement “the political commitments (which are not legally binding) that Russia undertook at the 1999 Istanbul OSCE Summit to resolve questions related to compliance with treaty host-state consent requirements in Georgia and Moldova”²⁹⁵ by withdrawing its troops and munitions from the territory of these states.

Another concern of Moscow was the encirclement of the Russian enclave, Kaliningrad, by the new NATO member states. The apprehension of Moscow was that the existing military transit through the territory of Lithuania would be disrupted.²⁹⁶ In the light of the vulnerability of the Kaliningrad region, Moscow started seriously thinking of deploying tactic nuclear warheads in the Kaliningrad region.

There was also “the fear that NATO membership would act as a shield for more radical exclusionary policies toward the Russian immigrant populations in

²⁹³ Sergei Ivanov, “As NATO Grows, So Do Russia’s Worries,” *The New York Times*, 7 April 2004 available at <http://www.nytimes.com/2004/04/07/opinion/07IVAN.html?scp=1&sq=ivanov%20nato%20enlargement&st=cse&pagewanted=1> (accessed on June 12, 2010)

²⁹⁴ Robert E. Hunter, Sergey M. Rogov, p. 13-14

²⁹⁵ Ibid.

²⁹⁶ Nadezhda Arbatova, “Paradoksy Bezopasnosti v Baltiiskom Regione [The Paradoxes of Security in the Baltic Region]”

Latvia and Estonia.”²⁹⁷ After being accepted to the Alliance, the new member states of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania would be less sensitive to the interests and concerns of the Russian minority and would be less willing to follow the advice of the Western powers on this issue.

Consequently, the refusal of the new NATO member states to ratify the CFE Treaty, the still on-going suppression of the Russian minority in the Baltic States and the overall negative anti-Russian rhetoric on the part of the Baltic States, being members of NATO, left Moscow with no other choice than to resort to diplomatic maneuvering. Hence, the Russian Federation launched its famous “divide and rule” policy. It decided to strengthen its bilateral relations with France and Germany which, in the framework of the European Union, resulted in the signing of a contract with the German Chancellor, Gerhard Schröder, in 2005 on construction of the Northern European Gas Pipeline (Nord Stream) connecting St. Petersburg with north-eastern Germany under the Baltic Sea and bypassing Lithuania, Belarus and Poland.

There was a strong assurance in Moscow that the expansion of NATO to the former Soviet Republics represented a red-line which Moscow should not allow the Alliance to cross.

Despite fierce opposition from Moscow, the Bush administration not only ignored Moscow’s national interests and concerns but also took advantage of its prevailing relative power to push forward with the eastern enlargement with even more determination. The Baltic States were given a special role in the process of NATO eastern enlargement on the territory of the former Soviet Union, that is the role of a promoter of “reforms and policy changes that could lead to the inclusion of CIS members in NATO”²⁹⁸ The Rose Revolution in Georgia in 2003 and the Orange Revolution in Ukraine in 2004, with the accession of pro-Western presidents to power facilitated the promotion of pro-NATO aspirations and the demise of

²⁹⁷ Anatol Lieven, “The NATO-Russia Accord: An Illusory Solution,” Chapter 2 in *NATO Enlargement : Illusions and Reality*, ed. by Ted Galen Carpenter and Barbara Conry, Cato Institute, Washington, D.C., 1998, p. 145

²⁹⁸ Leonid A. Karabeshkin and Dina A. Spechler, p. 318

Moscow's influence in its sphere of influence. The spillover effect of the colourful revolutions was described by Dmitri Trenin, a deputy director of the Carnegie Moscow Center:

The 2004 Orange Revolution in Ukraine and the 2003 Rose Revolution in Georgia offered a prospect for the triumph of Western ideas and principles all the way to the Russian border. The hope was that the progress in Ukraine would positively affect Belarus to the north and Moldova to the southwest, and that Georgia's success would turn the South Caucasus into a new Southeast Europe.²⁹⁹

Since the geographic border of the former USSR, with the accession of the Baltic States, has been crossed, the "eastward NATO expansion can not stop with the second wave." The main interest of the USA, with the accommodation of NATO to the achievement of its policy interests, is to secure its presence in zones rich in energy resources and containing strategic energy routes as well as to obtain a strategically more favourable position in regard to the regional powers such as the Russian Federation and China, capable of even potentially disrupting the realization of the U.S. goals.³⁰⁰ Moscow's and U.S. interests are at stake in the Caucasus, Black Sea and Caspian regions for the control of energy resources and energy routes. Hence, the USA strongly promoted the construction of the Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan oil pipeline, carrying Caspian oil to the Mediterranean Sea and the Baku-Tbilisi-Erzurum gas pipeline. There are also plans initiated by the USA for the construction of the Nabucco gas pipeline from Turkey across Bulgaria-Greece-Romania diluting to Austria and Italy.

What is more, according to Daniel Hamilton, a professor at Johns Hopkins University, the region of the Black Sea has strategic importance to the USA in relation to challenges in the broader Middle East. Hamilton claims that:

²⁹⁹ Dmitri Trenin, *Getting Russia Right*, p. 32

³⁰⁰ Aleksey Bogaturov, "Pererozhdenie NATO, [The Transformation of NATO]," *Nezavisimaya Gazeta*, 28 June 2004, available at http://www.ng.ru/world/2004-06-28/6_nato.html (accessed on June 12, 2010)

The U.S. is interested in the ability of states in the region to facilitate the projection of military power to the Caspian, Central Asia and the Middle East and perhaps the deployment of radars and interceptors as part of a nascent missile defense system to counter Iranian or other missiles deployed in the Middle East.³⁰¹

For the Russian Federation, the cases of Ukraine and Georgia are certainly not the same as the cases of the Baltic States. The Russian Federation has its Black Sea Fleet stationed in Sevastopol, Ukraine whose presence was extended until 2042 in April 2010, by the law signed by the Russian President, Medvedev, and the Ukrainian President, Yanukovich. The military and the heavy industry in both countries are intertwined and the second biggest nationality after Ukrainians living in the country is Russian.

In the case of Georgia, the Russian Federation has its peacekeepers still remaining in Georgia's breakaway regions of Abkhazia and South Ossetia. The cultural and religion ties are very strong between the Russian and Georgian people. Certainly, Moscow does not favour any foothold of NATO in the Black Sea region having vast energy resources and routes to transport them.

If in the case of the accession of the Baltic States into NATO, Moscow's reaction was muted, the accession of Ukraine and Georgia met furious opposition from Moscow. The Russian Foreign Minister, Sergei Lavrov, stated that "We will do everything possible to prevent the accession of Ukraine and Georgia to NATO and to avoid the possible worsening of relations with the alliance, its leading member states and our neighbors." Lavrov also added that "In Ukraine about 70% of the population is against joining NATO. If we take Georgia, then [the unrecognized republics of] Abkhazia and South Ossetia don't even want to hear about Georgia becoming a NATO member."³⁰² The Russian State Duma lawmakers unanimously, with one abstention, voted for a resolution criticizing the aspirations of Ukraine for

³⁰¹ Daniel Hamilton, "A Transatlantic Strategy for the Wider Black Sea?" in *The Wider Black Sea Region in the 21st Century: Strategic, Economic and Energy Perspectives*, ed. by Daniel Hamilton and Gerhard Mangott, (Washington D.C.: Center for Transatlantic Relations, 2008), p.323

³⁰² Sergei Lavrov, "Moscow to Prevent Ukraine, Georgia's NATO Admission," *RIA NOVOSTI*, 8 April 2008 available at <http://en.rian.ru/russia/20080408/104105506.html> (accessed on June 13, 2010)

NATO membership since it would “lead to very negative consequences for relations between our fraternal peoples.”³⁰³

The Russian Federation backed its rhetoric by subtle diplomacy. Putin was able to gain the support of Moscow’s old European allies in Germany³⁰⁴ and France on granting Membership Action Plan (MAP) neither to Ukraine nor to Georgia at the NATO Bucharest Summit on 2-4 April 2008. It was a big blow to President Bush, who was “lobbying hard to extend membership to Ukraine and Georgia, but [he] failed to rally support for the move among key allies.”³⁰⁵ This did not mean though that Germany and France rebuffed the chances of Ukraine and Georgia for NATO membership completely. The German Chancellor, Angela Merkel, reaffirmed that both candidates should be prospective members of the Alliance in the long run, “but there is one difference with the United States: we believe the time for MAP is not ripe.”³⁰⁶ Earlier, Merkel stated that “Countries that are enmeshed in regional and internal conflicts cannot become NATO members.”³⁰⁷ Indeed, there were problems in Georgia with the breakaway regions of Abkhazia and South Ossetia whereas in Ukraine the majority of public opinion was against NATO membership as such.

³⁰³ Cited in “Russia calls NATO plans 'colossal' shift,” *The New York Times*, 7 June 2006, available at http://www.nytimes.com/2006/06/07/world/europe/07iht-kyev.1915928.html?_r=1&scp=19&sq=lavrov+Ukraine+nato+membership&st=cse (accessed on June 13, 2010)

³⁰⁴ Italy, Hungary, Belgium, Luxemburg and Netherlands also supported Germany in its opposition to Ukraine and Georgia’s membership in the Alliance.

³⁰⁵ Steven Erlanger and Steven Lee Myers, “NATO Allies Oppose Bush on Georgia and Ukraine,” *The New York Times*, 3 April 2008, available at <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/04/03/world/europe/03nato.html?pagewanted=1&sq=putin%20Ukraine%20nato%20membership&st=cse&scp=8> (accessed on June 13, 2010)

³⁰⁶ Angela Merkel cited by Colin Brown in “EU allies unite against Bush over Nato membership for Georgia and Ukraine,” *The Independent*, 3 April 2008, available at <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/europe/eu-allies-unite-against-bush-over-nato-membership-for-georgia-and-ukraine-804000.html> (accessed on June 13, 2010)

³⁰⁷ Angela Merkel cited in “Merkel Against NATO Membership of States with Conflicts,” *Civil Georgia*, 10 March 2008, available at <http://www.civil.ge/eng/article.php?id=17321>, (accessed on June 13, 2010)

In his speech at the NATO Bucharest Summit on 3 April, 2008, the French President, Nicolas Sarkozy, said that “on Georgia and Ukraine, we don’t accept any veto by anyone. These two countries are destined to join NATO.”³⁰⁸

During the NATO Bucharest Summit, the NATO members “decided to invite Albania and Croatia to begin accession talks” to join the Alliance. It was also decided that “an invitation to the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia will be extended as soon as a mutually acceptable solution to the name issue has been reached.”³⁰⁹ Greece objected to the constitutional name of the Republic of Macedonia since the same name was given to the Greek region of Macedonia

On the issue of Ukraine and Georgia’s membership in the Alliance, the NATO members came to the consensus that

...these countries will become members of NATO...MAP is the next step for Ukraine and Georgia on their direct way to membership. Today we make clear that we support these countries’ applications for MAP. Therefore we will now begin a period of intensive engagement with both at a high political level to address the questions still outstanding pertaining to their MAP applications.³¹⁰

The decision of the Bucharest Summit could be considered as a small victory for Putin, who threatened to cancel his visit to the NATO Summit meeting in Bucharest, if Georgia and Ukraine became eligible for the NATO membership program. NATO members, though avoiding granting MAP to the former Soviet Republics, did not exclude any possibility for their prospective membership. This could be read as a clear signal to the West that in the next few years, some of the most serious challenges and tests for Moscow’s foreign policy will come from the Black Sea region. The importance of the Black Sea region on the NATO agenda was underlined in the Bucharest Summit declaration:

³⁰⁸ Nicolas Sarkozy, NATO Summit Speech, The French Embassy in the United Kingdom, 3 April 2008, available at <http://www.ambafrance-uk.org/President-Sarkozy-speaks-at.html>, (accessed on June 14, 2008)

³⁰⁹ Bucharest Summit Declaration Issued by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Bucharest on 3 April 2008, available at http://www.summitbucharest.ro/en/doc_201.html (accessed on June 14, 2010)

³¹⁰ Ibid.

We reaffirm the continued importance of the Black Sea region for Euro Atlantic security. In this regard, we welcome the progress in consolidation of regional ownership, through effective use of existing initiatives and mechanisms. The Alliance will continue to support, as appropriate, these efforts guided by regional priorities and based on transparency, complementarity and inclusiveness, in order to develop dialogue and cooperation among the Black Sea states and with the Alliance.³¹¹

In this sense, the way Russia deals with Ukraine and Georgia's NATO bids; the "frozen conflicts" in the Caucasus and Moldova; and the issue of Europe's energy security will help define the kind of player Russia will become during Medvedev's presidency.³¹²

Missile defence shield in Poland and the Czech Republic

The issue of Ukraine and Georgia's membership in the Alliance divided the NATO members and raised doubts over the expediency of further expansion of the Alliance to the former Soviet Republics. However, the NATO allies demonstrated consensus over another issue actively promoted by the Bush administration but severely opposed by Moscow- the deployment of a US ballistic missile defence shield in the Czech Republic and Poland. Hence, at the Bucharest Summit the NATO members agreed that

Ballistic missile proliferation poses an increasing threat to Allies' forces, territory and populations. Missile defence forms part of a broader response to counter this threat. We therefore recognise the substantial contribution to the protection of Allies from long range ballistic missiles to be provided by the planned deployment of European based United States missile defence assets. We are exploring ways to link this capability with current NATO missile defence efforts as a way to ensure that it would be an integral part of any future NATO wide missile defence architecture.³¹³

³¹¹ Ibid.

³¹² Dmitri Trenin, "Russia's Perspective on the Wider Black Sea Region" in *The Wider Black Sea Region in the 21st Century: Strategic, Economic and Energy Perspectives*, ed. by Daniel Hamilton and Gerhard Mangott, Washington D.C.: Center for Transatlantic Relations, 2008, p.117

³¹³ Bucharest Summit Declaration

The renewed idea of missile defence shield dates back to 1 May 2001, when at the National Defence University, located in Washington, President Bush made a number of statements which later formed the core of the American Foreign Policy for the rest of his presidency. Thus, Bush indicated the need for “a new framework that allows us [the American Nation] to build missile defenses to counter the different threats of today's world.” He also added that to enable the launch of a new project, the USA “must move beyond the constraints of the 30-year-old ABM Treaty.”³¹⁴ In his speech, Bush strove to justify Washington’s withdrawal from the ABM Treaty with Moscow in the light of new circumstances threatening the national interests of the USA, while pushing forward with the new mechanism allowing USA to appease Moscow.

From the outset, Moscow strongly opposed any initiative which could undermine the ABM Treaty, since it could lead to the proliferation of the missile technology. Regarding the missile defense project, President Putin said, “I am confident that at least for the coming 25 years” the U.S. missile defense “will not cause any substantial damage to the national security of Russia,” but he added, “We will reinforce our capability” by “mounting multiple warheads on our missiles” and “that will cost us a meager sum.” So, he concluded, “the nuclear arsenal of Russia will be augmented multifold.”³¹⁵ Putin had also mentioned about the negation of START I and START II by the decision of Washington, to build a missile defense shield in violation of the ABM Treaty of 1972, which would result in the elimination of verification and inspection requirements eroding any transparency in the relations between Moscow and Washington on this issue.³¹⁶

³¹⁴ George W. Bush, The Transcript of President Bush Speech on Missile Defence at National Defence University in Washington, *CNN*, 1 May 2001, available at <http://archives.cnn.com/2001/ALLPOLITICS/05/01/bush.missile.trans/> (accessed on June 16, 2010)

³¹⁵ V.V. Putin, cited by Patrick E. Tyler in “Putin Says Russia Would Counter U.S. Shield,” *The New York Times*, 20 June 2001, available at http://www.nytimes.com/learning/teachers/featured_articles/20010620wednesday.html?scp=6&sq=us%20missile%20defence%20shield+russia+2001&st=cse (accessed on June 17, 2010)

³¹⁶ *Ibid.*

The U.S. officials justified the deployment of missile defence shield in Europe by the necessity to protect itself and Europe against long range missile attacks by such rogue states as Iran and North Korea. According to an unnamed official in Pentagon, the decision to start negotiations with the Czech Republic on the construction of tracking radars on its territory and with Poland on the deployment of interceptor missiles there started in 2002.³¹⁷ Poland and the Czech Republic being accepted to the Alliance in 1999 demonstrated an unfeigned interest in the negotiations. Both were seeking to enhance their security against the Russian Federation and were eager to express their solidarity with NATO's main security provider – the USA. Hence, the Czech Prime Minister, Mirek Topolanek, welcomed the U.S. request by pointing out that “We are convinced that a possible deployment of the radar station on our territory is in our interest.... It will increase security of the Czech Republic and Europe.”³¹⁸

The Polish Prime Minister, Kazimierz Marcinkiewicz, stated that hosting a U.S. missile base was “an important issue for Poland, related to our security and to our cooperation with an important ally.”³¹⁹ The Polish administration considered the new initiative as a way to strengthen the mutual commitment of Washington to defend Warsaw. The next Polish Prime Minister, Donald Tusk, stressed out that:

Poland and the Poles do not want to be in alliances in which assistance comes at some point later — it is no good when assistance comes to dead people... Poland wants to be in alliances where assistance comes in the very first hours of — knock on wood — any possible conflict.³²⁰

³¹⁷ “US Considers Polish Missile Base,” *BBC NEWS*, 17 November 2005, available at <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/4445284.stm> (accessed on June 17, 2010)

³¹⁸ Mirek Topolanek cited in “Missile Shield “Threatens Russia,”” *BBC NEWS*, 22 January 2007, available at <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/6286289.stm> (accessed on June 17, 2010)

³¹⁹ Kazimierz Marcinkiewicz, cited in “US Considers Polish Missile Base,” *BBC NEWS*, 17 November, 2005, available at <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/4445284.stm> (accessed on June 17, 2010)

³²⁰ Donald Tusk, cited by Thom Shanker and Nicolas Kulich in “Russia Lashes Out on Missile Deal,” *The New York Times*, 15 August 2008, available at <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/08/15/world/europe/16poland.html> (accessed on June 17, 2010)

Under the deal Washington was planning to relocate its Patriot battery from Germany to Poland along with 100 military personnel members, which meant that “the United States would be more likely to respond if they had Americans on the ground.”³²¹ Moreover, in exchange for leasing its base to the USA, it would get not only the U.S. verbal commitment to Poland, but also, as both sides called it, the “enhanced security cooperation, notably a top-of-the-line Patriot air defense system that can shoot down shorter-range missiles or attacking fighters or bombers.”³²²

On the part of the USA and NATO, the stationing of forces on the territory of Poland can be considered as the violation of the principles of the Founding Act between the Russian Federation and NATO underlining that NATO members will not resort to “stationing of substantial combat forces” on the territory of new member states. To continue, in the same Founding Act, the NATO allies reiterated that they “have no intention, no plan and no reason to deploy nuclear weapons on the territory of new members, nor any need to change any aspect of NATO's nuclear posture or nuclear policy - and do not foresee any future need to do so.”³²³ Though the missile defence shield was not a direct deployment of nuclear weapons, it would certainly result in “tremendous change to the strategic balance in Europe, and to the world's strategic stability.”³²⁴

In spite of the assurances from Washington stressing that the new initiative was not aimed at the Russian Federation, Moscow considered it as a direct military threat against itself. The chief of Russia's space forces, Lieutenant General Vladimir Popovkin, stated that:

³²¹ Victor Ashe, American Ambassador to Warsaw, cited by Peter Baker in “Mending Fences, Biden Assures Poland that US is Watching Over It,” *The New York Times*, 21 October 2009, available at <http://www.nytimes.com/2009/10/22/world/europe/22biden.html> (accessed on June 17, 2010)

³²² Thom Shanker and Nicolas Kulich in “Russia Lashes Out on Missile Deal.”

³²³ Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security between NATO and the Russian Federation, NATO, 27 May 1997

³²⁴ Dmitry Peskov, Kremlin’s chief spokesman, cited by Luke Harding in “Russia Threatening New Cold War Over Missile Defence: Kremlin Accuses US of Deception on East European Interceptor Bases,” *The Guardian*, 11 April 2007, available at <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2007/apr/11/usa.topstories3> (accessed on June 17, 2010)

Our analysis shows that the deployment of a radar station in the Czech Republic and a counter-missile position in Poland are an obvious threat to us. It is very doubtful that elements of the national US missile defence system in Eastern Europe were aimed at Iranian missiles, as has been stated.³²⁵

Another Russia's leading expert on anti-ballistic weaponry, General Vladimir Belous, claimed that “The geography of the deployment doesn't give any doubt the main targets are Russian and Chinese nuclear forces.”³²⁶ This fact was one more time reaffirmed when Washington declined the proposal of Moscow, delivered by Putin to Bush at their meeting in Kennebunkport, Maine, in July 2007, to jointly use the Soviet-era missile tracking radar in the town of Gabala, Azerbaijan, connected to a new radar facility being built in southern Russia, instead of deploying a new missile defence shield in Eastern Europe. Washington justified its refusal by the fact that the aging radar was incapable of the precise tracking and targeting required by the interceptors.³²⁷ Indeed, one of the objections of Moscow to the missile defence system based in Europe was the fact that while intercepting a missile launched from Europe and flying through the Russian airspace, it would lead to the collision of two military missiles over Russian, the debris of which could harm Russian people and property. In this sense, “locating the system in Azerbaijan could alleviate this risk, and that interceptors could be fired from Aegis cruisers, rather than from Poland.”³²⁸

Being sidelined in the new U.S. initiative of missile defence shield, Moscow made it clear that it would have to counter-act and this time not with diplomatic methods, but with military-technical ones. The first step on the way of Russian counter-actions was the unilateral withdrawal of Moscow on 10 February, 2007,

³²⁵ Vladimir Popovkin, cited in “Missile Shield “Threatens Russia””

³²⁶ Vladimir Belous, cited by Luke Harding in “Russia Threatening New Cold War Over Missile Defence: Kremlin Accuses US of Deception on East European Interceptor Bases,”

³²⁷ Thom Shanker and Steven Lee Myers, “U.S. and Russia Are Still Apart on Arms Reduction,” *The New York Times*, 10 October 2007, available at <http://www.nytimes.com/2007/10/10/world/europe/10iht-russia.3.7833362.html?scp=15&sq=gabala&st=cse> (accessed on June 17, 2010)

³²⁸ V.V.Putin, cited by Sheryl Gay Stolberg, Thom Shanker, C.J. Chivers in “Putin Surprises Bush with Plan on Missile Shield,” *The New York Times*, 7 June 2007, available at <http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=990CE3DA1F30F93BA35755C0A9619C8B63&sec=&spn=&pagewanted=2> (accessed on June 18, 2010)

from the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty³²⁹ which required “destruction of the Parties' ground-launched ballistic and cruise missiles with ranges of between 500 and 5,500 kilometers, their launchers and associated support structures and support equipment within three years after the Treaty enters into force.”³³⁰ The withdrawal from the treaty could allow the Russian Federation to modernize its Iskander missile system and extend the range of it. Colonel General Vladimir Zaritsky, commander of the Russian Missile and Artillery Troops said that

The current version of Iskander is in full compliance with the INF treaty, but should the Russian leadership decide to pull out of the agreement, we will immediately enhance the capabilities of the system, including its range.³³¹

The next warning to the USA and NATO allies could be the deployment of Russian Iskander missiles in the heart of the European Union, that is in the Baltic Sea region of Kaliningrad which borders Poland. What is more, the Russian officials were considering the creation of another anti-missile launch pad in Belarus, where it had been negotiating for several years with the Belarus authorities about the “delivery of the Iskander-E complexes to equip at least one Belarus missile brigade by 2015.”³³²

Finally, on 13 July, 2007, President Putin officially notified NATO members on Moscow's suspension of its obligations under the Conventional Forces in Europe (CFE) Treaty which came into force 150 days later on 12 December 2007. The Russian Foreign Ministry in its statement stated that

the provision by it [CFE Treaty] of information and the acceptance and conduct of inspections are brought to a halt. During the suspension period, Russia will not be

³²⁹ The full text of The Treaty Between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of the Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles can be accessed at <http://www.state.gov/www/global/arms/treaties/infl.html>

³³⁰ Ibid.

³³¹ “Russia to Compensate for INF Losses with Iskander Missile System,” *RIA NOVOSTI*, 14 November 2007, available at <http://en.rian.ru/russia/20071114/88066432.html> (accessed on June 18, 2010)

³³² Ibid.

bound by restrictions, including flank restrictions, on the number of its conventional weapons. At the same time we have no plans for their massive buildup or concentration on the borders with neighbors in the present circumstances. Later on, the real quantities and stationing of weapons and equipment will depend on a concrete military-political situation, particularly the readiness of our partners to show restraint.³³³

The unilateral suspension of the Treaty reflected the growing anti-American sentiments in the Kremlin and suspicion of the West and resulted in the further escalation of tensions between Moscow and NATO. The New York Times on 15 July, 2007 characterized the decision of Putin as “a powerful diplomatic tool to fend off what he [Putin] has described as American bullying and NATO and European encirclement, both economic and military, that the Kremlin believes encroaches into a Russian sphere of influence.”³³⁴

The reaction of NATO allies followed immediately and was rather disapproving though without hysteria and limited only by verbal criticism. Gordon D. Johndroe, the National Security Council spokesman, expressed the position of the Alliance:

We’re disappointed Russia has suspended its participation for now, but we’ll continue to have discussions with them in the coming months on the best way to proceed in this area, that is in the interest of all parties involved and provides for security in Europe.³³⁵

The unilateral withdrawal of the USA from the ABM Treaty created the precedent for the Russian Federation to decide on the agreements and policies bolstering its own national interests. Along with Moscow’s withdrawal from the INF Treaty and suspension of the CFE Treaty, the trajectory of its foreign policy had

³³³ Statement by Russia's Ministry of Foreign Affairs Regarding Suspension by Russian Federation of Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE Treaty), 12 December 2007, available at http://www.mid.ru/brp_4.nsf/e78a48070f128a7b43256999005bcbb3/10da6dd509e4d164c32573af004cc4be?OpenDocument (accessed on June 18, 2010)

³³⁴ Andrew E. Kramer and Thom Shanker, “Russia Suspends Arms Agreement over U.S. Shield,” *The New York Times*, 15 July 2007, available at http://www.nytimes.com/2007/07/15/world/europe/15russia.html?pagewanted=1&_r=1&sq=us%20missile%20defence%20shield%20russia&st=cse&scp=13 (accessed on June 18, 2010)

³³⁵ Ibid.

also changed. In his Munich speech³³⁶ at the Security Conference on 10 February, 2007, Putin had clearly demonstrated the departure from the previously undertaken policy of US trusteeship to a more independent and assertive foreign policy. The Russian President said, “Russia is a country with a history that spans more than a thousand years and has practically always used the privilege to carry out an independent foreign policy. We are not going to change this tradition today.”³³⁷ Putin expressed dissatisfaction with U.S. unilateralism and regarded the unconditional compliance with the policies of the West as a rudiment of the past.

One state and, of course, first and foremost the United States, has overstepped its national borders in every way. This is visible in the economic, political, cultural and educational policies it imposes on other nations. Well, who likes this? Who is happy about this?³³⁸

The Munich speech was a signal to the USA and NATO allies that the Russian Federation was taking on a new mantle of acquiring a greater role in international relations. It was seeking to increase its prestige in world affairs and ready to confront U.S. and NATO policies unfavourable to Moscow or infringing upon its interests. The aspirations of the Russian Federation as a great power were to be accepted by the West and counted on in all major developments in global affairs.

4.3 Conclusion

The internal and international position of Yeltsin’s Russia could hardly allow the Russian Federation to claim a great power status in world affair. It was crucial for a new Russian President to revise the policies of Yeltsin in order to redefine the Russian Federation’s global status.

³³⁶ The full text of the Speech of the President of the Russian Federation Vladimir V.Putin at the Munich Conference on Security Policy is available at http://www.mid.ru/brp_4.nsf/e78a48070f128a7b43256999005bcbb3/284b878ca1370c27c32572800033694a?OpenDocument (accessed on June 19, 2010)

³³⁷ Ibid.

³³⁸ Ibid.

President Putin's presidency can be divided into two periods. During his first term as a president, Putin focused on the Russian Federation's economic growth and development to enable the promotion of its national interests in international politics later. The need for integration into the main financial organizations, for the time being, made Putin accept the rules of the game instituted by the West.

At the outset of his presidency, in the Foreign Policy Concept of the Russian Federation, Putin put emphasis on improving relations with the EU and only then with NATO and the United States. However, the September 11 attacks prompted Putin to redefine the Russian Foreign Policy objectives and forge close cooperation with the USA and NATO allies. Coalition with Washington against terrorism was met with strong opposition by the Kremlin elite and in this sense Putin's authoritarianism, the principle he had been many times criticized for by the West, played a crucial role in consolidating Russian Foreign Policy. Putin's authoritarianism was backed by the idea that to achieve the main goal of a great Russian Federation could be feasible only through engagement with the USA and NATO while September 11 represented the best opportunity for that.

Anti-terrorist coalition with the USA and NATO backed by a number of concessions such as granting airspace passage over the Russian territory to the coalition forces and giving its consent to the U.S. and NATO allies forces' presence in Central Asia, the Russian sphere of influence, did not bring the desired results to Moscow. On the contrary, Washington exercised Moscow's economic and political weakness to encroach into Moscow's sphere of influence by extending NATO membership to the former Soviet Republics, to encircle the Russian Federation by the U.S. missile defence shield in Poland and the Czech Republic and to unilaterally withdraw from the ABM Treaty.

Moreover, the unilateral dimension of Bush foreign policy implemented in the decision to invade Iraq in 2003 without any UN resolution and in spite of a great divide among NATO members on the American new endeavour, left no choice to Russia as to balance American hegemony by reinforcing regional organizations such as the CIS, the Shanghai Cooperation Organization and the Collective Security Treaty Organization. Moscow had reached an agreement with Kazakhstan and

Belarus to establish Single Economic Space. Putin was still keeping on enhancing cooperation with the West while keeping the door open in the east and south to demonstrate to the West that it had some other alternatives for cooperation as well. While advancing its cooperation with Iran in the nuclear energy sector, China in the military sphere and restoring its ties with North Korea, Moscow was trying to pursue a new role of a mediator between the West and its allies and the rogue and problematic states. This would allow Moscow to raise its prestige as a great power and mitigate the hegemony of the USA.

The failure of the United States and NATO allies in Afghanistan and Iraq prompted Moscow to exercise this as an opportunity to stress on multilateralism in world affairs. In relations with NATO, the Russian Federation preferred “divide and rule” strategy by integrating closely with the Old Europe comprised of Germany and France in order to balance against such NATO policies as prospective expansion to Ukraine and Georgia and the deployment of missile defence shield in Eastern Europe as well as to prevent the United States from using the Alliance as an instrument for achieving U.S. national interests and containing the Russian Federation. While Washington opted for cooperation with the New Europe, Moscow considered the relation with the Old Europe as its foreign policy priority.

Hence, during the second term of Putin’s presidency, the Russian Federation was able to repay its Soviet debt to the Western financial clubs, to boost its economic growth by revenues received from soaring oil and gas prices and become the main provider of gas to Europe which meant gaining greater EU’s dependency on Moscow. All these factors along with Putin’s assertiveness in the foreign policy agenda made Moscow less cooperative with the West and at times confront the policies of the latter if they impeded the national and international interests of the Russian Federation. Moscow was ready to play on its own terms which demonstrated the restoration of its great power status. Putin made a number of statements in his second term as a president such as withdrawal from the INF Treaty, suspension of the CFE Treaty with NATO and the intention to deploy Iskander missiles in the Baltic region of Kaliningrad as a counter-action to US/NATO deployment of a missile defence shield in Poland and the Czech Republic to

demonstrate that Moscow's interests and concerns have to be counted on in its sphere of influence in particular and in the international context as a whole.

CHAPTER V

CONTINUITY AND CONSOLIDATION OF RUSSIA'S NATO POLICY UNDER MEDVEDEV

5.1. Introduction

The course undertaken by President Putin in internal and international affairs has been further carried on by President Dmitry Anatolievich Medvedev. The primary goal of a new Russian president was to sustain and promote further the international prestige of the Russian Federation as a great power rose during Putin's presidency. If Moscow was to have a lead in international affairs, it had to propose an alternative to the existing NATO-centric relations which did not respond to its interests and concerns.

On the international arena a new Russian president, had to go through some test cases such as the conflict with Georgia and the signing of an agreement between USA and Poland and the Czech Republic for stationing its missile defence shield on the territory of the latter, in order to reaffirm his ability to enhance the capacity of the Russian Federation as a great power.

In relations with NATO and the USA, the Russian Federation still had a number of concerns regarding such policies as the expansion of the Alliance further to the Russian border and the deployment of a missile defence shield in Poland and the Czech Republic. Medvedev had a clear realization that it would be impossible to prevent NATO and the USA from pursuing their goals by diplomatic maneuvering for a long time. Open confrontation with NATO or granting endless concessions to it was also not in the interests of Moscow. Hence, the Russian Federation had to put forward an initiative or a proposal not only to peacefully counter-weight the unfavourable policies of NATO but also to enable the Russian Federation to play a leading role in the formation of a new international order as a revived great power.

Thus this chapter will explore the initiatives proposed by the new Russian president in regard with Russia's NATO policy to sustain its great power status.

5.2 Reinvigoration of Russia's European Security Strategy

In the first days as a president of the Russian Federation, President Medvedev made it clear that he would pursue a continuity pattern in foreign policy, previously undertaken by president Putin, which was stated in the Foreign Policy Concept of the Russian Federation, approved on 12 July, 2008. It is emphasized that the Concept "shall supplement and develop the provisions of the Foreign Policy Concept of the Russian Federation, approved by the President of the Russian Federation on 28 June 2000."³³⁹

In the context of strengthening the positions of the Russian Federation in international affairs, Medvedev has reiterated the need for the reassessment of the overall situation around Russia, so far having been characterized by "the continued political and psychological policy of "containing" Russia," motivated by the reaction of the West to the prospect of its monopoly loss in global developments. As the means of containing Moscow, the Foreign Policy Concept condemns the unilateral policies of some states as leading to "destabilization of international situation, provoking tensions and arms race, exacerbating interstate differences, stirs up ethnic and religious strife, endangering security of other States and fuels tensions in intercivilizational relations." To counterbalance the unilateralism in international relations, Medvedev following Putin's line, expressed Moscow's readiness to strengthen the principle of multilateralism and develop the principle of "security indivisibility" to be recognized by the international community and to be in strict

³³⁹ The Foreign Policy Concept of the Russian Federation, The Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 12 July 2008, available at <http://www.mid.ru/ns-osndoc.nsf/0e9272befa34209743256c630042d1aa/cef95560654d4ca5c32574960036cddb?opendocument> (accessed on June 20, 2010)

compliance with international law and the United Nations Charter, whose role as the main provider of international peace and security, Moscow is to enhance further.³⁴⁰

To achieve the goal of a more multi-polar world, the Russian Federation seeks to establish “a self-regulating international system” with the leading States of Group Eight, BRIC Four (Brazil, Russia, India and China) and the Troika (Russia, India, China). This demonstrates the multivector character of Russia’s foreign policy and its capacity and capability to play “a well-developed role globally” by acquiring the role of a mediator between the West and the problematic for the West countries such as the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (DPRK) and the Islamic Republic of Iran.³⁴¹ Moscow, having established friendly ties with these countries, would be able to provide the West with the political solutions to the nuclear threat posed by North Korea and Iran’s nuclear programs, which in its turn would enhance the status of the Russian Federation as a global power.

The main priority in Russia’s Foreign Policy has been given to the development of bilateral and multilateral relations with the CIS Member States and the promotion of the development of such regional organizations as the Collective Security Treaty Organization (CSTO) and the Eurasian Economic Community (EurAsEC).³⁴²

Moscow is interested in a strategic partnership with the USA, which has influence over the global strategic stability and international situation. However, in continuation of the policies pursued under President Putin regarding the U.S. missile defence shield in Poland and the Czech Republic, Medvedev’s Russia opposes “unilateral actions in the field of strategic anti-missile defence”³⁴³ as the factor destabilizing the international situation. Moreover, in regard to NATO the one and only form of cooperation acceptable by Moscow is on equal terms without enhancing one’s security at the expense of another. In this sense, Medvedev

³⁴⁰ Ibid.

³⁴¹ Ibid.

³⁴² Ibid.

³⁴³ Ibid.

reiterated Moscow's opposition to the expansion of the Alliance, characterized by a "selective and restrictive nature,"³⁴⁴ further eastward with the accession of Ukraine and Georgia as well as the deployment of the NATO military infrastructure right at the doorway of the Russian Federation. In Moscow's view, NATO poses dividing lines on the European continent by consistently excluding and bypassing the Russian Federation's interests. Hence, as a counter measure to NATO's aggressive policy, President Medvedev revived the idea of a regional collective security as the principal objective of his foreign policy on the European continent. The old idea of decoupling NATO from Europe became evident not only in Medvedev's rhetoric but in Russia's Foreign Policy Concept whose objective is

to create a truly open, democratic system of regional collective security and cooperation ensuring the unity of the Euro-Atlantic region, from Vancouver to Vladivostok, in such a way as not to allow its new fragmentation and reproduction of bloc-based approaches which still persist in the European architecture that took shape during the Cold War period.³⁴⁵

The idea of the regional collective security was reformulated into the pan-European Security Treaty which will be discussed in details in the next section.

5.2.2 Medvedev's proposal

It had been many times underlined by the previous Presidents of the Russian Federation, Yeltsin and Putin, that the rudiment of the Cold War period, the Northern Alliance, was creating dividing lines in Europe and posed a military threat to Moscow. Although in the aftermath of the Cold War period Gorbachev revived the idea of a Common European Home, only during Medvedev's presidency did Moscow feel confident to assume "a more active role in international affairs"³⁴⁶ by

³⁴⁴ Ibid.

³⁴⁵ Ibid.

³⁴⁶ Bobo Lo, "Medvedev and the New European Security Architecture," Center for European Reform, July 2009, p. 2, available at http://www.cer.org.uk/pdf/pbrief_medvedev_july09.pdf (accessed on June 24, 2010)

proposing a new European Security architecture as an alternative to a NATO-dominated European Security environment.

Hence, on 5 June 2008, at a meeting with the representatives of German political, parliamentary and public circles in Berlin, President Medvedev suggested developing a legally binding treaty on European security based on the Helsinki Act (1975). Medvedev said:

I also propose that we consider holding a general European summit to start the process of drafting this agreement. Absolutely all European countries should take part in this summit as individual countries, leaving aside any allegiances to blocs or other groups. National interests stripped bare of any distorting ideological motivations should be the starting point for all taking part.³⁴⁷

By proposing a new European Security Treaty limited to “absolutely all European countries,” Moscow attempted to diminish the U.S. and NATO influence on the European continent. Further in his speech, Medvedev undermined the role of U.S. and NATO by saying that

It is my conviction that Atlanticism as a sole historical principle has already had its day. We need to talk today about unity between the whole Euro-Atlantic area from Vancouver to Vladivostok.³⁴⁸

In Medvedev’s view the unity of the European civilization could have been reached through OSCE organization, whose principal objective was to become “a fully-fledged general regional organization.” However, the OSCE failed due to “not just [in] the organisation’s own incomplete institutional development but also [in] the obstruction created by other groups intent on continuing the old line of bloc politics.” Consequently, Medvedev pointed out that “Europe’s current architecture still bears the stamp of an ideology inherited from the past.”³⁴⁹

³⁴⁷ President of Russia Dmitry Medvedev's Speech at Meeting with German Political, Parliamentary and Civic Leaders, Berlin, June 5, 2008, available at http://www.in.mid.ru/brp_4.nsf/0/C080DC2FF8D93629C3257460003496C4 (accessed on 24 June 2010)

³⁴⁸ Ibid.

³⁴⁹ Ibid.

The time the Russian President decided to put forward a new proposal regarding the European security architecture was not accidental. The division among the members of EU regarding the prospective NATO membership of Georgia and Ukraine, opened up during the April Bucharest Summit of NATO, had prepared a fertile ground for an alternative proposal on European security architecture and could find support within the countries of Old Europe, notably Germany and France, who “believed that the West had pushed Russia too far, and that NATO enlargement had reached its natural – and safe – limits for the foreseeable future.”³⁵⁰

The same policies of NATO result in the impediment of the restoration of Moscow’s influence in the former Soviet area and prevent the consolidation of Moscow’s role as a “regional superpower.” Bobo Lo, the director of the Russia and China programmes at the Center for European Reform, pointed out that the major hindrance to the reassertion of Russia’s hegemonic power in its neighbourhood is “the existing Euro-Atlantic security system, dominated by the US and NATO” and in this respect, Moscow is seeking for such a “framework that would legitimise its indirect control over the FSU [Former Soviet Union].”³⁵¹

Moreover, the Russian Federation, being a member of neither the European Union nor the Northern Alliance, felt itself isolated from the mainstream developments on the European continent and in world affairs. Moscow’s “so called “strategic partnership” with the EU and participation in the NRC [NATO-Russia Council] offer a measure of formalistic recognition” and have hardly allowed Moscow’s incorporation into European and world affairs. What’s more, the turmoil of the Yeltsin’s period with its political and economic problems and the revival of Putin’s Russia being preoccupied with internal issues left little space for promoting Moscow’s global role on international agenda. In this sense, “the general rationale behind the Medvedev security concept is to redefine Europe in ways that are more inclusive of Russia and its interests.”³⁵²

³⁵⁰ Bobo Lo, “Medvedev and the New European Security Architecture,” p. 3

³⁵¹ Ibid.

³⁵² Ibid.

The Russian Federation would rather see the Alliance not as a collective defence organisation but as the one exclusively focused on peacekeeping and crisis management operations under UN or OSCE authority. Javier Morales, a researcher at Madrid's Universidad Carlos III, noted:

From the Kremlin point of view, NATO's "limited membership" makes it inadequate for solving international security problems; this Russian frustration with its inability to influence NATO underlies its proposal of a new European Security Treaty...³⁵³

The reaction of the international community to Medvedev's proposal was rather reserved right until 8 October, 2008, when the World Policy Forum was held in Evian, France and where President Medvedev shed light on the details of his new European Security System. The international situation in regard to the world economic crisis and Georgia's military campaign in South Ossetia (to be examined in details further in this chapter) made Moscow's aspirations for "building an integrated and solid system of comprehensive security"³⁵⁴ more vocal. Medvedev explained this fact by the inability of the existing international system based on bloc approaches and unipolarity to appease or contain an aggressor, that is Georgia, since adventurous actions by the ruling regime of a small country (Georgia in this particular case) were capable of destabilizing the situation in the world.³⁵⁵

Hence, the Russian President stated the principal tenets of the new European Security Treaty which are first, to "affirm the basic principles for security and intergovernmental relations in the Euro-Atlantic area" in accordance with international law; second, to make the use of force or the threat of its use in

³⁵³ Javier Morales, "Russia's New National Security Strategy: Towards a "Medvedev Doctrine"?" Real Instituto Elcano, ARI 135/2009- 25/09/2009, available at http://www.realinstitutoelcano.org/wps/portal/rielcano_eng/Content?WCM_GLOBAL_CONTEXT=/elcano/elcano_in/zonas_in/defense+security/ari135-2009 (accessed on June 25, 2010)

³⁵⁴ Dmitry Medvedev's Speech at World Policy Conference, Evian, France, 8 October 2008, available at <http://www.natocommission.ru/en/society/article/society/artnews/21/> (accessed on June 26, 2010)

³⁵⁵ Ibid.

international relations inadmissible; third, to guarantee equal security to all parties of the treaty to be based on three “noes”:

no ensuring one’s own security at the expense of others; no allowing acts (by military alliances or coalitions) that undermine the unity of the common security space; and finally, no development of military alliances that would threaten the security of other parties to the Treaty³⁵⁶

Fourthly, it is essential to confirm the inability of any state or international organization to have exclusive rights to maintain peace and stability in Europe; fifthly to establish basic arms control parameters and reasonable limits on military construction.³⁵⁷

Most importantly, Medvedev stressed that the prospect Treaty does not aim at abolishing or weakening the existing organizations.

Our joint work on the Treaty should also assess how the structures established in the past meet modern requirements. I stress that we do not seek to abolish or even weaken anything that we have now. All we want is to achieve more harmonious work together on the basis of a common set of rules.³⁵⁸

This statement could be read as a redefinition of the OSCE and NATO’s existing policies. The OSCE would be given a greater role in European affairs while for the Alliance, redefinition would mean getting more preoccupied with the crisis management and peace-keeping missions, repudiating its ambitions for the policies of further eastern expansion and the deployment of the missile defence shield in Poland and the Czech Republic, since these policies, if implemented further, would directly violate the article 2.2 of the prospect European Security Treaty in which it was stated that

A Party to the Treaty which is a member of military alliances, coalitions or organizations shall seek to ensure that such alliances, coalitions or organizations

³⁵⁶ Ibid.

³⁵⁷ Ibid.

³⁵⁸ Ibid.

observe principles set forth in the Charter of the United Nations, Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, Helsinki Final Act, Charter for European Security and other documents adopted by the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, as well as in Article 1 of this Treaty, and that decisions taken in the framework of such alliances, coalitions or organizations *do not affect significantly security* of any Party or Parties to the Treaty.³⁵⁹

Russian officials of all ranks had noted in innumerable statements that NATO policies of expansion and the deployment of the missile defence shield do threaten the national interests and security of the Russian Federation, which means they can not be compatible with the principles of the new European Security Treaty.

The first official reaction to Medvedev's proposal was expressed at the same Forum in Evian by the French President, Nicolas Sarkozy, who underlined the importance of the transatlantic link and insisted on the incorporation of the USA into a new security arrangement:

...our American friends and allies must be involved in this dialogue that we are ready to enter into. I don't get my instructions from America, but America is our friend and ally. This relationship between Europe and the United States should not be feared. We are friends; we are allies. We have our own vision. We are not the agents of any power. But talks about security from Vladivostok to Vancouver also concern our allies. It concerns security on our continent, because our continent's security is based on a strong transatlantic link.³⁶⁰

On 4 February, 2009 in their joint article, Nicolas Sarkozy and Angela Merkel, reiterated their support for Medvedev's proposal and readiness "to debate these issues, with our [France and Germany's] allies, and with our [France and Germany's] European partners, and to consider everyone's points of view."³⁶¹

³⁵⁹ The Draft of the European Security Treaty, 29 November 2009, available at <http://eng.kremlin.ru/news/275> (accessed on June 26, 2010). Italics are mine.

³⁶⁰ Speech by M. Nicolas Sarkozy, President of the Republic of France, World Policy Conference, 8 October 2008, available at <http://www.ambafrance-uk.org/President-Sarkozy-s-World-Policy.html> (accessed on June 26, 2010)

³⁶¹ "Security, Our Joint Mission," President Sarkozy and Chancellor Merkel's joint article in "Le Monde" Newspaper, Paris, 4 February 2009, available at <http://www.ambafrance-uk.org/Security-our-joint-mission.html> (accessed on June 26, 2010)

However, the EU members lack unity over Medvedev's proposal. The countries, comprising New Europe, who view NATO as "the main pillar of Europe's security, remain either openly hostile to, or extremely wary of the Russian security proposal."³⁶² In their view the Kremlin seeks to undermine the role of NATO and OSCE in Europe and institutionalize its own sphere of influence through a new security treaty.

The NATO Secretary-General, Anders Fogh Rasmussen, rebuffed the proposal of the Russian President for a new security arrangement declaring that he did not see any need for a new treaty on European security.

I don't see a need for new treaties or new legally binding documents because we do have a framework already. We have already a lot of documents, so my point of departure is: I don't see a need for new treaties. But let me reiterate, we are of course prepared to discuss the ideas in the right forum.³⁶³

Kremlin put forward the idea about the European Security in June 2008 and little more than one year later on 29 November, 2009, Moscow released a draft of the Treaty on European Security.³⁶⁴ The copies of the draft European Security Treaty were sent to the heads of states and such international organizations as NATO and the EU.

By proposing the alternative security architecture, the Russian Federation demonstrated its ability to play a role of a constructive player in international affairs. Much will depend on the readiness of the EU member states to depart from the existing NATO-centric security structure, to a more Euro-centric one free of unilateralism and hegemonic ambitions.

³⁶² Jean-Christophe Peuch, "Russian Proposal for New European Security Pact Encounters Skepticism," *Eurasianet*, 3 March 2009, available at <http://www.eurasianet.org/departments/insightb/articles/eav030409a.shtml> (accessed on June 26, 2010)

³⁶³ Anders Fogh Rasmussen, cited by Gary Cartwright in "European Security Treaty Rejected," *EU Reporter Independent*, 22 December 2009, available at <http://www.eureporter.co.uk/story/european-security-treaty-rejected> (accessed on June 26, 2010)

³⁶⁴ The full text of the draft European Security Treaty is available at <http://eng.kremlin.ru/news/275> (accessed on June 25, 2010)

5.3 Undermining the restoration of Russia's great power status

Georgia's test of the Russian Federation's capabilities

On the way of acquiring a greater role for the Russian Federation in international politics, President Medvedev had to reaffirm his competence as a leader capable of embarking on this mission. In the first months of Medvedev's presidency, his leadership was undermined by Georgia's attack on South Ossetia, a break-away region of Georgia. The Rose Revolution of 2003 brought a pro-American president, Mikhail Saakashvili, to power who eagerly supported a US/UK coalition in Iraq by dispatching 850 troops, later increasing its contingent to 2000 troops, to take part in the fight against terrorists; reinforced aspirations for NATO membership and demonstrated a confrontational stance against Moscow. According to Newsweek newspaper in 2002, the Pentagon trained three Georgian infantry battalions and equipped them with everything "even uniforms and boots."³⁶⁵ What is more, during Saakashvili's presidency, the defence budget of Georgia "grew from \$30 million in 2003 to more than \$750 million"³⁶⁶ in 2007.

Naturally, Moscow became concerned that

Georgia would seek to provoke Russia into military action in the zones of conflict, which would be sure to galvanize a strong Western response, paint Russia as an aggressor unfit to be a peacekeeper, and cast Georgia as a victim of aggression, a front-line state deserving Western support in restoring its unity.³⁶⁷

Military conflict with Moscow could enhance the chances of Georgia being incorporated into the Alliance and with its help, absorb the break-away regions of South Ossetia and Abkhazia. That could have been possible in 1990s when the Russian Federation was plunged into internal economic and political problems, but

³⁶⁵ John Barry, "Georgian Army, American Made," *Newsweek*, 6 September 2008, available at <http://www.newsweek.com/2008/09/05/georgian-army-american-made.html#> (accessed on June 28, 2010)

³⁶⁶ *Ibid.*

³⁶⁷ Dmitri Trenin, "Russia's Perspective on the Wider Black Sea Region," p. 110

in Putin's and Medvedev's Russia this was a total miscalculation on the part of the Georgian authorities.

Hence, on the night of August 7-8, 2008, when Saakashvili ordered an attack on South Ossetia's capital, Tskhinvali, Medvedev did not hesitate a second to give a military response. It was precisely Georgia which initiated the military conflict by brutally invading South Ossetia, the fact of which was confirmed after lengthy inspections by the Human Rights Watch:

After months of escalating tensions between Russia and Georgia and following skirmishes between Georgian and South Ossetian forces, on August 7, 2008, Georgian forces launched an artillery assault on Tskhinvali, South Ossetia's capital, and outlying villages. Assaults by Georgian ground and air forces followed. Russia's military response began the next day, with the declared purpose of protecting Russian peacekeepers stationed in South Ossetia and residents who had become Russian citizens in recent years. Beginning on August 8, Russian ground forces from the 58th Army crossed into South Ossetia and Russian artillery and aircraft hit targets in South Ossetia and undisputed Georgian territory.³⁶⁸

The Russian Army rolled the Georgian troops back to the Georgian city of Gori and on 10 August 2008 Saakashvili had to command the withdrawal of his troops from the territory of South Ossetia. On August 14-15 the Russian Federation and Georgia signed a ceasefire deal which was brokered by the French President, Nicolas Sarkozy. The ceasefire plan consisted of six points which were firstly, no resort to force; secondly; a definitive halt to hostilities; thirdly, provision of free access for humanitarian assistance; fourthly, the withdrawal of Georgian forces to the places they are usually stationed; fifthly, Russian armed forces to be pulled back on the line, preceding the start of hostilities; sixthly; to open international discussions on security and stability modalities in Abkhazia and South Ossetia.³⁶⁹ Later on in his speech at World Policy Conference in Evian, France on 8 October, 2008, President Medvedev would one more time underline the role of France and

³⁶⁸ Human Rights Watch, *Up In Flames: Humanitarian Law Violations and Civilian Victims in the Conflict over South Ossetia*, 23 January 2009,

³⁶⁹ Six-point ceasefire plan reached by Medvedev and Sarkozy on August 12, 2008, *Civil Georgia*, Tbilisi, 20 August 2008, available at <http://www.civil.ge/eng/article.php?id=19478> (accessed on June 28, 2010)

the European Union in the peaceful resolution of the conflict in South Ossetia “at a time when other forces in the world had no good will or ability to do this [to find a peaceful solution to the crisis], we found in the EU an active, responsible and pragmatic partner.”³⁷⁰

Indeed, in the first days of the conflict, the Kremlin had to fight not only a military war but also an information war. Some Western media and countries’ officials depicted the Russian Federation as an aggressor launching a massed military campaign against its small neighbour. Thus Condoleezza Rice, the U.S. Secretary of State, claimed that “Georgia has been attacked. Russian forces need to leave Georgia at once.”³⁷¹ U.S. Vice President, Dick Cheney, expressed support with the Georgian authorities by condemning Russian aggression. He said:

Russian aggression must not go unanswered, and that its continuation would have serious consequences for its relations with the United States, as well as the broader international community.³⁷²

The Wall Street Journal called Moscow’s aggression as a challenge to world order.³⁷³ However, all these accusations would prove to have no ground by the results of the report prepared by an independent international fact-finding mission appointed by the EU Council on 2 December 2008, to investigate the August 2008 conflict in Georgia. Thus the mission came to the conclusion that

...it was Georgia that triggered the war when it attacked Tskhinvali with heavy artillery on the night of 7 and 8 August 2008. None of the explanations given by the Georgian authorities in order to provide some form of legal justification for the attack offered a valid explanation. In particular, to the best of the mission’s

³⁷⁰ Dmitry Medvedev’s Speech at World Policy Conference, Evian, France, 8 October 2008

³⁷¹ Condoleezza Rice, cited by Ian Traynor, Luke Harding and Helen Womack in “Georgia and Russia declare ceasefire,” *The Guardian*, 16 August 2008, available at <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2008/aug/16/georgia.russia2> (accessed on June 28, 2010)

³⁷² Dick Cheney, cited by Matt Spetalnick in “Cheney: “Russian aggression must not go unanswered,”” *Reuters*, 10 August 2008, available at <http://www.reuters.com/article/idUSN1049425020080811> (accessed on June 28, 2010)

³⁷³ Lindsey Graham and Joe Lieberman, “Russia’s Aggression is a Challenge to World Order,” *The Wall Street Journal*, 26 August 2008, available at <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB121970826711471167.html> (accessed on June 28, 2010)

knowledge there was no massive Russian military invasion under way that had to be stopped by Georgian military forces shelling Tskhinvali.³⁷⁴

In the light of the decision taken by the NATO Bucharest Summit in April 2008, initiating a conflict with Moscow could be assumed as the last resort for Saakashvilli to demonstrate that the decision for postponing Georgia's membership in NATO needed revising since such a small country as Georgia was in desperate need of Western protection against imperial Russia. Without a military build-up, assisted by the USA, Georgia would hardly embark on such a dangerous adventure.

Given that Georgia was a U.S. client, that the United States (along with Israel) had armed and trained Georgian forces, that only days before the Georgian attack it had participated in joint maneuvers with Georgian forces, and that U.S. and Israeli personnel were present in Georgia at the time of the attack, it is very possible—even very likely—that the Georgian attack was not a foolish mistake by the Georgian leadership, but rather a proxy action carried out on behalf of the United States.³⁷⁵

On the part of the USA, support for Georgia's actions in South Ossetia could be explained by a number of reasons. In the regional context, firstly, it was an opportunity to justify to the NATO allies and the international community, the U.S. motives for granting NATO membership to Georgia especially by fulfilling the military capability criteria through assisting Georgia's armament; secondly, to diminish the role of the Russian Federation in its historical sphere of influence; thirdly, to test President Medvedev and his capabilities as a new leader to respond to the new threats infringing on Russia's national interests. In the overall global context, the motives of the USA could be read as the determination of the Bush administration "to enforce US global hegemony and prevent any regional challenge,

³⁷⁴Statement by Ambassador Heidi Tagliavini, Former Head of the International fact-finding mission on the conflict in Georgia, Council of Europe, Parliamentary Assembly Session, Strasbourg, 28 April 2010, available at http://www.coe.int/t/dc/files/pa_session/april_2010/20100428_disc_tagliavini_EN.asp (accessed on June 28, 2010)

³⁷⁵Edward S. Herman, "Russia, Georgia & the U.S.: A Double Standard in Action," *Z Magazine*, October 2008, available at <http://www.zcommunications.org/russia-georgia-and-the-u-s-a-double-standard-in-action-by-edward-herman> (accessed on June 29, 2010)

particularly from a resurgent Russia”³⁷⁶ through tighter encirclement of Moscow by a potentially hostile power.³⁷⁷

The military action of the Russian Federation to counter Georgia’s calculated attack on South Ossetia showed that Moscow had finally revived as a global power and was ready to defend its interests not only by diplomatic means but by military ones as well, if required.

It allowed the Russian Federation to continue rebuffing Georgia’s NATO membership since Georgia’s attack on South Ossetia led to the destabilization of the border region. Accepting such a new member into NATO would inevitably put a burden on all NATO members, including the countries of Old Europe such as Germany and France, who would hesitate to support the NATO membership of such a troublesome member.

Moreover, Medvedev made it clear that his country was taking a course on a tougher foreign policy intolerable towards external interference in its sphere of influence. Indirectly, the West recognised the Russian Federation as an equal partner, whose interests and concerns have to be counted on. Hence the reaction of the West to the conflict was limited by a verbal criticism of Russia’s disproportionate use of force resulting in the suspension of formal meetings in the NATO-Russia Council, though without extending the long-awaited NATO collective security guarantee to Georgia. In this sense, Georgia’s membership in NATO comes under question.

...given the ostensibly close diplomatic and military relationship between the United States and Georgia, and Georgia’s repeated and unanswered calls for American, European, and NATO military assistance during the 2008 conflict, it does not appear that NATO allies are willing, at least at this time, to provide a meaningful promise to collective defence—all of which raises doubts over the wisdom of further NATO expansion to Georgia³⁷⁸

³⁷⁶ Seumas Milne, “This is a Tale of US Expansion not Russian Aggression,” *The Guardian*, 14 August 2008, available at <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2008/aug/14/russia.georgia> (accessed on June 28, 2010)

³⁷⁷ Ibid.

³⁷⁸ Travis L. Bounds and Ryan C. Hendrickson, “Georgian Membership in NATO: Policy Implications of the Bucharest Summit,” *Journal of Slavic Military Studies*, Volume 22, Issue 1, January 2009, p. 30

Indeed, if Georgia had been given a NATO Membership Action Plan during the NATO Bucharest Summit in April 2008, the consequences of the conflict in South Ossetia could have been much more devastating for the international community. It could have resulted in military conflict between the Russian Federation and NATO member states, who would have been obliged to extend their security guarantee to a candidate state, Georgia.

US-Poland deal – pushing the Russian Federation’s capabilities further

The second test case, Medvedev had to go through on the way to Russia’s restoration as a great power was the agreement signed on 20 August 2008 between Poland and the United States of America on the deployment of ten anti-ballistic defensive missile interceptors on the territory of Poland. Moscow has always been opposed to such systems as threatening its security. In the light of Georgia’s attack on South Ossetia, the signing of the agreement raised assurance in Moscow that the missile defence system in Europe “can have no other target for a long time to come but Russia’s strategic forces.”³⁷⁹ The signing of the agreement led to the exacerbation in the, already strained by the South Ossetian conflict, relations between Washington and Moscow. That is how Russia’s envoy to NATO, Dmitry Rogozin, commented on the situation:

The fact that this was signed in a period of very difficult crisis in the relations between Russia and the United States over the situation in Georgia shows that, of course, the missile defence system will be deployed not against Iran but against the strategic potential of Russia³⁸⁰

³⁷⁹ Sergey Lavrov, cited in “Poland is Warned by Russia on Pact,” *The New York Times*, 11 September 2008, available at <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/09/12/world/europe/12poland.html?scp=11&sq=us-poland+missile+deal&st=cse> (accessed on June 29, 2010)

³⁸⁰ Dmitry Rogozin, cited in “Russia Angry Over US Missile Shield,” *Al Jazeera*, 15 August 2008, available at <http://english.aljazeera.net/news/europe/2008/08/200881514010734640.html> (accessed on June 29, 2010)

In this sense, the conflict in South Ossetia was used by Poland and the United States as a pretext to accelerate the process of signing the agreement. Poland got a chance to motivate its decision by the threat posed by an aggressive and imperial Russia, whose next so called target after Georgia could have been Poland and the new agreement in this respect would reinforce the U.S. “unwavering”³⁸¹ commitment to Poland. Washington, in its turn, exercised the turmoil in South Ossetia and the fears of Poland as the fertile ground to making Poland more cooperative on the issue.

Officially, though, the U.S. Secretary of State, Condoleezza Rice, underlined that the missile defence system “will help both the [NATO] alliance and Poland and the United States respond to the coming threats. Missile defense, of course, is aimed at no one. It is in our defense that we do this.”³⁸²

The new American President, Barack Obama, faced a dilemma of either promoting the missile defence initiative launched by his predecessor, President Bush, further and thus antagonize Moscow or scraping the plan which could be regarded as the appeasement of Moscow. According to the New York Times, before taking the final decision on the issue, in February 2009 Obama sent a secret letter to Medvedev suggesting backing off the deployment of the missile defence shield in Poland and the Czech Republic in return for Moscow’s help in stopping Iran from developing long-range weapons.³⁸³ The same idea was reiterated on 20 February 2009 by U.S. Secretary, Robert Gates, who said, “I told the Russians a year ago that if there were no Iranian missile program, there would be no need for the missile

³⁸¹ John Biden, cited by Peter Baker in “Mending Fences: Biden Assures Poland that U.S. is Watching Over it,” *The New York Times*, 21 October 2009, available at <http://www.nytimes.com/2009/10/22/world/europe/22biden.html> (accessed on June 28, 2010)

³⁸² Condoleezza Rice cited in “Poland signs missile shield deal with U.S.,” *CNN International*, 20 August 2008, available at <http://edition.cnn.com/2008/WORLD/europe/08/20/poland.us.missile/index.html?iref=allsearch> (accessed on June 28, 2010)

³⁸³ Peter Baker, “Obama Offered Deal to Russia in Secret Letter,” *The New York Times*, 2 March 2009, available at <http://www.nytimes.com/2009/03/03/washington/03prexy.html?scp=2&sq=Obama%20letter%20medvedev&st=cse> (accessed on June 28, 2010)

sites.”³⁸⁴ Moscow could have used its diplomatic ties to somehow try to influence Iran, but the Russian Federation’s strong opposition made it clear that Moscow would not accept any trade-offs on the issue. Yet, the secret letter and numerous statements of Obama showed the U.S. willingness to forge close cooperation with Moscow on missile defence architecture. Moreover, it opened up a new avenue for NATO and the Russian Federation to rehabilitate their relations and exchange views on regional and global problems considering its vital interests.

The first step, taken by Washington, on the way to resetting relations with Moscow, was the decision made by Obama on 17 August, 2009, to reconfigure the missile defence project, having been launched by the previous administration, into a more mobile “flexible, capable, and cost-effective”³⁸⁵ sea-based missile defence architecture.

Starting around 2011, this missile defense architecture will feature deployments of increasingly-capable sea- and land-based missile interceptors, primarily upgraded versions of the Standard Missile-3 (SM-3), and a range of sensors in Europe to defend against the growing ballistic missile threat from Iran.³⁸⁶

The reaction of Moscow to a redefined U.S. missile defence project was rather positive which allows us to assume the existence of a qualitative change in the US-Russia and NATO-Russia relations. The deterioration which existed in the relations in the last few years was gradually transforming into a cooperation based on mutual interests.

³⁸⁴ Robert Gates, cited by Peter Baker in “Obama Offered Deal to Russia in Secret Letter,”

³⁸⁵ Fact Sheet on U.S. Missile Defense Policy: A “Phased, Adaptive Approach” for Missile Defense in Europe, The White House, 17 September 2009, available http://www.whitehouse.gov/the_press_office/FACT-SHEET-US-Missile-Defense-Policy-A-Phased-Adaptive-Approach-for-Missile-Defense-in-Europe/ (accessed on June 28, 2010)

³⁸⁶ Ibid.,

5.4 Conclusion

NATO-Russia relations during Medvedev's presidency have gone through a transformation process from deterioration, posed by the Bush administration's unilateralism in its aspirations to promote such policies as NATO expansion to Georgia and Ukraine and the deployment of missile defence shield in Poland and the Czech Republic, to an opportunity for cooperation created by the Obama administration's will to reexamine the most sensitive for Moscow policies of Washington.

The Russian President, Medvedev, played a pivotal role in the transformation of NATO-Russia relations. Medvedev took a tougher stance in the Russian Foreign Policy in regard to NATO expansion further eastward and the deployment of the missile defence shield in Eastern Europe which demonstrated the readiness of Moscow to acquire a greater role in the international arena. To enhance the status of the Russian Federation as a great power, it reaffirmed its capacity to oppose the policies of the West infringing on and subsiding Russia's national interests which was clearly seen in Medvedev's response to the conflict in Georgia. What is more, the new European Security Treaty, proposed by Medvedev, was a counter-project to the existing NATO-centric relations and could be regarded as a signal to the Western community that Moscow had aspirations for taking a leading role in the construction of a new European Security architecture which would be more inclusive of Russia's interests.

As a whole, the test cases mentioned in this chapter have demonstrated the revival of Russia as a great power being able to withstand the unfavourable policies of NATO and the West in the regional context.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

The impetus for Russia-NATO close relations was laid in a post-Cold War environment characterized by the unipolarity of the international world order. The dissolution of the Soviet Union created the “momentum” for the USA to exercise its relative power and the political and economic weakness of its former adversary, the USSR, for imposing its hegemony in the world through the promotion of its own model of democracy and capitalist market economy. The possession of this power allowed the USA to redirect the strategic balance of the Cold War period and, through NATO structure by inclusion of East Germany, make the Soviet Union accept a new American-dictated settlement.

In the anarchic, international system, each state is concerned with ensuring its own security through gaining more relative power using any tools at its disposal. In this sense, the instrumental role of the Northern Alliance was widely exercised by the USA in achieving American national interests in global politics. Hence, the USA launched the reinvention of NATO new roles and redefinition and restructuring of NATO policies such as involvement in the peace enforcement and stabilization processes in the Balkans, the territory lying beyond the borders of NATO, and expansion to the states of former Soviet Union. The USA and its allies attempted to transform a military alliance of the Cold-War period into a political tool for implementing its own political agenda and give the Alliance a second chance to sustain its existence in the post-Cold War era when its primary threat, the USSR, ceased to exist.

However, while promoting the agenda of restructuring NATO policies, the USA faced fierce opposition from the Russian Federation, which in spite of its political and economic turmoil could still exercise its influence in the Balkans and the territory of the former Soviet Union. This thesis aimed to examine the course in

NATO-Russian relations formed under two different leaderships of the Russian Federation: Yeltsin and Putin-Medvedev, whose choice of foreign policy trajectory and not, merely, the relative power and the pressure of the international anarchic system, was decisive.

During Yeltsin's presidency the Russian Federation lacked a unified well-developed foreign policy. In comparison with Gorbachev, whose main foreign policy's priority was to enhance Moscow's relations with the West through Europe, expressed in the idea of "Common European Home," Yeltsin opted for better relations with the West in the face of the USA and NATO. This move led to a total dependency of the Russian foreign policy on the West and guidance by it. In spite of the promise given by Baker to Gorbachev "not to move an inch eastward," NATO successfully initiated its policy of expansion first, through the establishment of the NACC in 1991, whose main idea was to put relations between NATO and the countries of Central and Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union on an institutionalized ground, leading further to the signing of the PfP program and finally enabling the Alliance to embrace the first three members in the form of Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic in 1999. NATO expansion was a neo-containment of Moscow leading to the demise of Moscow's influence first on the territory of Central and Eastern Europe and then former Soviet Union and legitimizing NATO's presence in Central and Eastern Europe, Moscow's former sphere of influence.

What is more, Russia's policy of compliance with the West paved the way for unilateralism in Washington's approach towards Moscow, totally disregarding its needs and national interests. The aspirations of Moscow for a greater role in the Bosnian and Kosovo crises were sidelined by the USA and its NATO allies. The Kosovo case demonstrated the neglect of international law on the part of the USA and planted the seeds of Kosovo secessionism to bear fruit in 2008. A new NATO-Russia consultative mechanism, the PJC, created to prevent future conflicts such as the Bosnian one, proved to be a talking club with pre-cooked decisions served to the Russian Federation by the member states of the Alliance. Moscow's weakened economic and political position and desire to be integrated into the Western clubs

made it extremely cooperative with the West, even in the times of crises in NATO-Russia relations, granting numerous concessions without getting much in return.

NATO-Russian relations during Putin's presidency can be divided into two periods. During his first term as a president Putin focused on the development and growth of the Russian economy to enable the redefinition of Moscow's global status. In this sense, Putin made the establishment of friendly relations with Europe, one of the priorities in the Russian Foreign Policy Concept, approved by him at the outset of his first term as president. However, the September 11 attacks prompted Putin to redefine the Russian Foreign Policy objectives and forge close cooperation with the USA and NATO allies. September 11 created an impetus for the realignment between Russia and NATO. In spite of being opposed by his elite, Putin took his line and proposed a policy of strategic cooperation with the West in fighting terrorism and non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. The insight of the neo-classical realism, underlining the influence of domestic intervening variables on the course of a country's foreign policy, proves to be sustainable in the case of Putin's Russia since the unilateral and sometimes authoritarian approach of Putin in the domestic and international agenda, allowed the Russian Federation to embark on the revival of its status as a great power in world politics and promote its national agenda.

Hence, while cooperating with the West, Putin started to take a more independent and assertive policy regarding Russia's traditional sphere of influence in the former republics of the Soviet Union. Moscow's decision to join the anti-terrorist coalition in Afghanistan resulted in its consent to allow the stationing of the coalition forces on the territory of Central Asia. However, when the USA came to the stage of reproducing its hegemonic power in the states of Central Asia, Moscow changed its rhetoric about the anti-terrorist cooperation with the US/UK coalition and ceased its support to Washington's new endeavour in Iraq making it clear that it would not allow Western interference in its backyard, Central Asia. Consequently, the USA failed in its plan to encircle the Russian Federation with its bases in the Central Asia because having historical, cultural and economic ties with Central Asian states, Moscow's consent was required to set up the U.S. military bases in the

region. Furthermore, Putin exercised its diplomatic maneuvering to enhance cooperation with China in SCO, India in BRIC and bilaterally with Germany and France to balance the U.S. attempt to make use of a renewed NATO as a tool for containing the Russian Federation and sidelining its role in the former Soviet Union region as well as in the global arena.

Moreover, the US-initiated division of Europe into “Old” and “New” in the light of the Iraq invasion was a miscalculation of the Bush administration. Trying to gain support if not of the whole European Union, but at least its new member states such as Poland, the Czech Republic and Hungary, the USA totally disregarded the fact that this division would lay the grounds for close cooperation between Old Europe and the Russian Federation.

Although Moscow was a strong opponent of the U.S. invasion in Iraq due to geostrategical, economic (the Russian economy would lose \$48 billion dollars in unpaid Iraqi debt and cancellation of the program of Russian-Iraqi cooperation) and security reasons, it brought positive impact on the Russian economy due to the rocketing oil prices and, as a result, a sudden economic boost.

During Putin’s second term as a president, soaring oil and gas prices, resulting in the increase of Russia’s economic power, strong presidential leadership and pursuit of domestic policy, closely interconnected with the foreign one, made Russia’s stance more vocal in relations with NATO and the USA, which could be clearly seen in Moscow’s response to the issues of Georgia and Ukraine’s membership in NATO and the missile defence shield in Poland and the Czech Republic. The former Soviet Union Republics were considered by Moscow the “red line” for NATO eastern expansion which Moscow should not allow the Alliance to cross.

As a counter-action to NATO enlargement, Moscow tried to get the CIS member states involved in such regional organizations as EurAsEC and CSTO to tie them closer to its orbit. The USA, in its turn, tried to advance bilateral relations with the CIS member states by initiating the Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan oil pipeline, the Baku-Tbilisi-Erzurum gas pipeline and the prospective Nabucco gas pipeline bypassing

the territory of the Russian Federation and support such regional organization as GUAM with Moscow not being a member.

The confrontational posture of the Kremlin in regard to the U.S. initiative to deploy the missile defence shield in Poland and the Czech Republic could be regarded as the readiness of Moscow, from that time on, to go into cooperation with the West on its own or equal terms and not as a junior partner. The 2007 Putin Munich Speech was a turning point underlining the inadmissibility of U.S. hegemony and imposition of its policies in economic, political and humanitarian spheres.

The cases explored in this thesis suggest that by the end of Putin's presidency, in spite of sustaining cooperation with the USA, he preferred cooperation with Europe to cooperation with the West which is likely to continue during Medvedev's period.

In regard to Medvedev's presidency, a continuity pattern in Russia's foreign policy towards NATO can be observed. As his predecessor, Putin, President Medvedev started his term as a president by outlining the Russian Foreign Policy Concept which aimed at the realization of the policies launched by Putin in internal and international spheres. To enhance Moscow's status as a great power in the international arena, in his term as president, Putin emphasized the soft security issues like economic growth and political restructuring, whereas Medvedev continued to achieve the same objective in hard security issues – military ones. Putin made a number of statements hostile to NATO acting on an ad hoc basis. Medvedev continued this line by attempting to establish a broader security pact, called the European Security Treaty, institutionalizing Russia's status as a builder of the European Security and asserting its role as a great power. Indeed, throughout the history of Russian Foreign Policy a tendency of decoupling the USA and NATO from the European continent could be seen. In this sense, Medvedev's proposal on the pan-European security System which aimed at undermining NATO and the US' roles in Europe, takes roots in 1954, in Molotov's European Collective Security System, which was further reiterated by Brezhnev in 1981, in 1987 Gorbachev's "Common European Home" concept and Putin in his 2007 Munich speech.

However, although the Russian Federation proposed a pan-European security architecture, the role of small powers in this initiative remains a question.

The expansion of NATO and the deployment of the missile defence shield in Eastern Europe were seen in Moscow as the main hindrance for the restoration of Moscow's influence in the former Soviet area and consolidation of Russia's role as a "regional superpower." Putin's Russia could not prevent the expansion of NATO and thus, made efforts to postpone the issue in order meanwhile to gain time to work out an alternative pan-European architecture to a NATO-centric one, which materialised in Medvedev's proposal.

The conflict in Georgia revealed not only the capacity of the Russian Federation to withstand the threats to its security by all means, including the military ones, but the indirect Western recognition of the Russian Federation as an equal partner, whose interests and concerns have to be counted on.

The research done in this thesis allows to suggest that in the post-Cold War era the NATO-Russian relations went from a one-sided cooperation in 1990s with Moscow granting numerous concessions and not getting much in return, to a cooperation-confrontation pattern in 2000s with the reassertion of Russia's aspirations for a greater role in world politics, and finally to the opportunity for cooperation on a par with the reset in Russia-US relations under Medvedev's leadership.

It is likely that the continuity in consolidating relations with Europe will continue throughout Medvedev's presidency. However, this does not mean that it will lead to the confrontation in Russia's relations with NATO. On the contrary, the Russian Federation will try to refrain from the confrontation with the Alliance, while emphasizing its relations with Europe which is clearly the continuity of Putin's policy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Published Reports and Documents

Agreement on Russian Participation in KFOR, 18 June, 1999, Helsinki, available at <http://www.nato.int/koSovo/docu/a990618a.htm> (accessed on May 2, 2010)

Bucharest Summit Declaration Issued by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Bucharest on 3 April 2008, available at http://www.summitbucharest.ro/en/doc_201.html (accessed on June 14, 2010)

Convention on Relations between the Three Powers and the Federal Republic of Germany, *The American Journal of International Law*, Vol. 49, No. 3, Official Documents (Jul., 1955)

Foreign Policy Concept of the Russian Federation, 28 June 2000, available at <http://www.fas.org/nuke/guide/russia/doctrine/econcept.htm> (accessed on May 21, 2010)

Foreign Policy Concept of the Russian Federation, The Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 12 July 2008, available at <http://www.mid.ru/ns-osndoc.nsf/0e9272befa34209743256c630042d1aa/cef95560654d4ca5c32574960036cddb?opendocument> (accessed on June 20, 2010)

Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security between NATO and the Russian Federation,” NATO, 27 May, 1997, available at http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_25468.htm (accessed on May 9, 2010)

Madrid Declaration on Euro-Atlantic Security and Cooperation, Press Communiqué M-1(97)81 , Brussels, NATO, 8 July 1997 available at <http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/1997/p97-081e.htm> (accessed on May 10, 2010)

NATO’s Developing Partnerships, 165 PCNP 08 E bis, NATO Parliamentary Assembly, available at <http://www.nato-pa.int/default.asp?SHORTCUT=1469> (accessed on March 31, 2010)

NATO Rome Declaration on Peace and Cooperation, 8 November, 1991, available at <http://www.nato.int/docu/comm/49-95/c911108a.htm> (accessed on May 3, 2010)

NATO Strategic Concept, 7-8 November, 1991 available at http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_23847.htm (accessed on May 3, 2010)

“III. NATO Summit in Rome: A New Strategic Doctrine,” *Foreign Policy Bulletin*, Special Double Issue, January-April 1992

Partnership for Peace : Framework Document, 10-11 January 1994 available at http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_24469.htm?mode=pressrelease (accessed on May 5, 2010)

Prague Capabilities Commitment, NATO Prague Summit, 2002, available at http://www.nato.int/cps/en/SID-12857281-07335390/natolive/topics_50087.htm (accessed on May 24, 2010)

Press Communiqué M-NAC-2(96)165, Brussels, NATO, 10 December 1996, available at <http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/1996/p96-165e.htm> (accessed on May 8, 2010)

Resolution 757, The United Nations, 30 May 1992, available at [http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/RESOLUTION/GEN/NR0/011/16/IMG/NR001116.pdf?OpenElement](http://daccess-dds.ny.un.org/doc/RESOLUTION/GEN/NR0/011/16/IMG/NR001116.pdf?OpenElement) (accessed on April 14, 2010)

Resolution 1160, The UN Security Council, March 31, 1998, available at <http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N98/090/23/PDF/N9809023.pdf?OpenElement> (accessed on April 25, 2010)

Resolution 1199, The UN Security Council, September 23, 1998, available at <http://www.un.org/peace/kosovo/98sc1199.htm> (accessed on April 25, 2010)

Resolution 1244, The UN Security Council, June 10, 1999 available at <http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N99/172/89/PDF/N9917289.pdf?OpenElement> (accessed on May 1, 2010)

Resolution 1386, The UN Security Council, 20 December 2001, available at <http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N01/708/55/PDF/N0170855.pdf?OpenElement>

Resolution 1441, The UN Security Council, 8 November 2002, available at <http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N02/682/26/PDF/N0268226.pdf?OpenElement> (accessed on June 4, 2010)

“Russia and NATO: Partners in Peacekeeping,” NATO Office of Information and Press, available at <http://www.nato.int/docu/presskit/010219/brocheng.pdf> (accessed on April 24, 2010)

Soviet Transcript of the Malta Summit December 2-3, 1989, Source: Archive of the Gorbachev Foundation, Fond 1. Opis 1. Excerpts published in: M.S. Gorbachev, Gody Trudnykh Reshenii, 1985-1992 [Years of Difficult Decisions], (Moscow: Alfa-print, 1993). Translated by Vladislav Zubok and Svetlana Savranskaya for the National Security Archive, available at <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB298/Document%2010.pdf> (accessed on March 13, 2010)

START II Treaty, available at <http://www.state.gov/www/global/arms/starthtm/start2/st2intal.html> (accessed on April 8, 2010)

Statement issued at the Extraordinary Ministerial Meeting of the North Atlantic Council held at NATO Headquarters, “The Situation in and around Kosovo,” Brussels, April 12, 1999, available at http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_27435.htm (accessed on April 29, 2010)

Strategic Offensive Reduction Treaty, 24 May 2002, available at <http://www.armscontrol.org/documents/sort> (accessed on May 30, 2010)

The Draft of the European Security Treaty, 29 November 2009, available at <http://eng.kremlin.ru/news/275> (accessed on June 26, 2010)

The North-Atlantic Treaty, 4 April, 1949, Washington D.C., available at http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_17120.htm

The Treaty Between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles (The INF Treaty), 8 December, 1987, Washington D.C., available at <http://www.state.gov/www/global/arms/treaties/inf1.html>

The U.S. National Security Strategy, September 2002, available at <http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/nsc/nss/2002/nss3.html> (accessed on May 21, 2010)

Treaty Between The United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems, 26 May 1972, available at <http://www.state.gov/www/global/arms/treaties/abm/abm2.html> (accessed on May 19, 2010)

Treaty for Good Neighborliness, Friendship and Cooperation between China and the Russian federation, July 2001, available at <http://www.chinese-embassy.no/eng/dtxw/t110017.htm> (accessed on May 2, 2010)

Treat on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE Treaty), 13 November 1992, Vienna, available at <http://www.state.gov/www/global/arms/treaties/cfe.html> (accessed on June 18, 2010)

Treaty on the Final Settlement with Respect to Germany, September 12, 1990 available at <http://usa.usembassy.de/etexts/2plusfour8994e.htm> (accessed on March 18, 2010)

United States-France-Great Britain-Soviet Union; Declaration Regarding the Defeat of Germany and the Assumption of Supreme Authority with Respect to Germany and Supplementary Statements, *The American Journal of International Law*, Vol. 39, No. 3, Official Documents (Jul., 1945).

Books and Articles

- Ambrosio, Thomas, "The Russo-American Dispute over the Invasion of Iraq: International Status and the Role of Positional Goods," *Europe-Asia Studies*, Vol. 57, No. 8, December, 2005
- Adomeit, Hannes, "Gorbachev's Consent to Unified Germany's Membership in NATO," Working Paper, FG 5 2006/11, December 2006, Research Unit Russia/CIS, Stiftung Wissenschaft and Politik German Institute for International and Security Affairs
- Arbatova, Nadia, A., "European Security after the Kosovo Crisis: The Role of Russia," *Southeast European and Black Sea Studies*, Vol. 1, No. 2, May 2001
- Baev, Pavel K., "External interventions in secessionist conflicts in Europe in the 1990s," *European Security*, Issue 8, Volume 2, Summer 1999
- Baranovsky, Vladimir, "The international implications of the terrorist attacks", *The International Spectator*, Vol. 36, Issue 4, October-December, 2001
- Baranovsky, Vladimir, "The Kosovo factor in Russia's Foreign Policy," *The International Spectator*, Issue 35, No: 2, April-June 2000
- Barany, Zoltan, "NATO's Post-Cold War Metamorphosis: From Sixteen to Twenty-Six and Counting," *International Studies Review*, Volume 8, Issue 1, March 2006
- Barany, Zoltan, *The Future of NATO Expansion*, Cambridge University Press, 2003
- Bounds, Travis L. and Hendrickson, Ryan C., "Georgian Membership in NATO: Policy Implications of the Bucharest Summit," *Journal of Slavic Military Studies*, Volume 22, Issue 1, January 2009,

- Brzezinski, Zbigniew "An Agenda for NATO," *Foreign Affairs*, 88/5, Sep/Oct 2009
- Carter, Ashton B. and Perry, William J., *Preventive Defense: A New Security Strategy for America*, The Brookings Institution, 1999
- Dobrynin, Anatoly, *In Confidence: Moscow's ambassador to America's six Cold War presidents*, Times Books-Random House, 1995
- Eyal, Jonathan, "NATO's Enlargement: Anatomy of a Decision," *International Affairs*," Vol. 73, No. 4, October, 1997
- Galen Carpenter, Ted and Conry, Barbara, *NATO Enlargement : Illusions and Reality*, Cati Institute: Washington, D.C., 1998
- Goldgeier, James M. and McFaul, Michael, *Power and Purpose: U.S. Policy toward Russia after the Cold War*, Brookings Institution Press: Washington, D.C., 2003
- Goldgeier, James M. and McFaul, Michael, "A Tale of Two Worlds: Core and Periphery in the Post-Cold War Era," *International Organization*, Vol. 46, No. 2, Spring, 1992
- Gorbachev, Mikhail, *On My Country and the World*, New York: Columbia University Press, 2000
- Grabbe, Heather, "Is an Old versus New European Divide Replacing East against West?" Center For European Reform Bulletin, February/March 2003, Issue 28 available at http://www.cer.org.uk/articles/28_grabbe.html (accessed on June 5, 2010)
- Guicherd, Catherine, "International Law and the War in Kosovo," *Survival*, Vol. 41, Issue 2, Summer 1999

- Hagel, Chuck and others, "The Right Direction for U.S. Policy Towards Russia," A *Report from the Commission on U.S. Policy toward Russia*, Washington D.C.: The Nixon Center, March 2009
- Hamilton, Daniel and Mangott Gerhard, *The Wider Black Sea Region in the 21st Century: Strategic, Economic and Energy Perspectives*, Washington D.C.: Center for Transatlantic Relations, 2008
- Headley, Jim, "Sarajevo, February 1994: the first Russia NATO crisis of the post-Cold War era," *Review of International Studies*, 29,(2003)
- Hunter, Robert E. and Rogov, Sergey M., "Engaging Russia as Partner and Participant: The Next Stage of NATO–Russia Relations," *Conference Proceedings*, RAND Corporation, 2004
- Isakova, Irina, "The Kosovo air campaign's impact on Russian military thinking", *The RUSI Journal*, Issue 145, Volume 4, August, 2000
- İşeri, Emre, "The US Grand Strategy and the Eurasian Heartland in the Twenty-First Century," *Geopolitics*, Volume 14, Issue 1, 2009
- Karabeshkin, Leonid A. and Spechler, Dina A., "EU and NATO Enlargement: Russia's Expectations, Responses and Options for the Future," *European Security*, Volume 16, Nos. 3-4, September-December 2007, p. 314
- Kazantsev, Andrei, "Russian Policy in Central Asia and the Caspian Sear Region," *Europe-Asia Studies*, Vol. 60, No. 6, August 2008
- Keller, Patrick "The Future of NATO: Between Overstretch and Irrelevance," *American Foreign Policy Interests*, 29: 207–217, 2007
- Keohane, Robert O., *After Hegemony*, Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1984
- Kitchen, Nicolas, "Systemic pressures and domestic ideas: a neoclassical realist model of grand strategy formation," *Review of International Studies*, 36, 2010

- Kotz, David M. and Weir, Fred, *Russia's Path from Gorbachev to Putin: The demise of the Soviet system and the new Russia*, Routledge Taylor&Francis Group, London and New York, 2007
- Kramer, Mark, "The Myth of a No-NATO-Enlargement Pledge to Russia," *The Washington Quarterly*, April 2009
- Kubicek, Paul, "Russian Energy Policy in the Caspian Basin," *World Affairs*, Vol. 166, No. 4, Spring 2004
- Lievin, Anatol, "Russian Opposition to NATO Expansion," *World Today*, Volume 51, Issue 10, October 95
- Lievin, Anatol and Trenin Dmitri ed, *Ambivalent Neighbors*, Carnegie Endowment For International Peace: Washington D.C, 2003
- Layne, Christopher, "US hegemony and the perpetuation of NATO," *Journal of Strategic Studies*, Sep2000, Vol. 23, Issue 3
- Lo, Bobo., "Medvedev and the New European Security Architecture," Center for European Reform, July 2009, available at http://www.cer.org.uk/pdf/pbrief_medvedev_july09.pdf (accessed on June 24, 2010)
- Lobell, Steven E., Ripsman Norrin M., Taliaferro Jeffrey W., ed, *Neoclassical Realism, the State and Foreign Policy*, Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2009
- Lynch, David, "Walking the tightrope": The Kosovo Conflict and Russia in European security, 1998–August 1999', *European Security*, 1999, vol. 8, no.4
- Melville, Andrei and Shakleina, Tatiana, *Russian Foreign Policy in Transition*, CEU Press: Budapest, New York, 2005

- McWilliams, Wayne C. and Piotrowski, Harry, *The World since 1945 : A History of International Relations*, 6th edition, Boulder, Colo. : Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1997
- Mitcha, Andrew, "NATO Enlargement post-1989: Successful Adaptation or Decline," *Contemporary European History*, Vol. 18, Issue 3, 2009
- Morales, Javier, "Russia's New National Security Strategy: Towards a "Medvedev Doctrine"?" Real Instituto Elcano, ARI 135/2009- 25/09/2009, available at http://www.realinstitutoelcano.org/wps/portal/rielcano_eng/Content?WCM_GLOBAL_CONTEXT=/elcano/elcano_in/zonas_in/defense+security/ari135-2009 (accessed on June 25, 2010)
- Motyl, Alexander J., Ruble, Blair A. and Shevtsova Lilia, *Russia's Engagement with the West*, Sharpe Inc.: Armonk, New York, 2005
- Posen, Barry R., "The war for Kosovo", *International Security*, Vol. 24, Issue. 4, 2000
- Press-Barnathan, Galia., "Managing the Hegemon: NATO under Unipolarity," *Security Studies*, Vol. 15, No. 2, April–June 2006
- Pushkov, Alexei, "Letter from Eurasia: Russia and America: The Honemoon's over," *Foreign Policy*, Winter 93/94, Issue 93
- Ratti, Luca, "Post-Cold War Nato and International Relations Theory: The case for Neo-classical Realism," *Journal of Transatlantic Studies*, 4(1), 2006
- Reding, Andrew, "Georgian and Ukrainian Conflicts: The limitation of NTO," *The Brown Journal of World Affairs*, Vol. 15, Issue 2, Spring/Summer 2009
- Rogov, Sergei, "The Bush Doctrine," *Russian Social Science Review*, Vol.44, No. 3, May-June 2003
- Rose, Gideon, "Neoclassical Realism and Theories of Foreign Policy," *World Politics*, Vol. 51, No. 1, (Oct., 1998)

- Salonius-Pasternak Charly, "From Protecting Some to Securing Many NATO's Journey from a Military Alliance to a Security Manager," The Finnish Institute of International Affairs, FIIA Report 17/2007
- Saunders, Paul J., "Russian Energy and European Security: A Transatlantic Dialogue," *Working Paper*, The Nixon Center: Washington D.C., 2008
- Shevtsova, Lilia, *Putin's Russia*, Carnegie Endowment For International Peace: Washington D.C, 2003
- Skinner, Kiron K., *Turning Points in Ending the Cold War*, Hoover Institution Press Publication, 2007
- Smith, Martin, A., *Russia and NATO since 1991: From Cold War through Cold Peace to Partnership*, Routledge Taylor&Francis Group, London and New York, 2006
- Smith, Martin A., in "A Bumpy Road to an Unknown Destination? NATO-Russia Relations, 1991-2002," *European Security*, Volume 11, Issue 4, Winter 2002
- Smith, Martin A., Timmins, Graham, *Uncertain Europe: Building a New European Security order*, Routledge: London, UK, 2001
- Spohr, Kristina, "German Unification: Between Official History, Academic Scholarship, and Political Memoirs," *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 43, No. 3, September, 2000
- Stent, Angela, *Russia and Germany Reborn*, Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1998
- Trenin, Dmitri, *Getting Russia Right*, Washington, DC : Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2007
- Türkeş, Mustafa, *Doksanlı Yillarda NATO'nun öncelikleri ve Türkiye*, *En Uzun On Yıl*, İstanbul: Boyut Yayıncılık, 1998

Türkeş, Mustafa, “New vs. Old Europe”: Contested Hegemonies and the Dual-Guarantee Strategy of the East European Countries,” *International Problems*, No. 3, 2005

Walt, Stephen M., “The ties that fray,” *National Interest*, Winter 98/99, Issue 54

Weller, Mark, “The Rambouillet Conference on Kosovo,” *International Affairs*, 1999, Vol. 75, no. 2

William Curti Wohlforth, *The Elusive Balance: Power and Perceptions during the Cold War*, Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1993

Winrow, Gareth M., “Energy Security in the Black Sea Region: Economic interdependence or Commercial and Political Rivalry,” *Southeast European and Black Sea Studies*, Vol. 2, No. 2, May 2002

Yishan, Xia “Sino-Russian Partnership Marching into 21st Century,” *Beijing Review*, May 5, 1997

Zelikow, Philip and Rice, Condoleezza, *Germany Unified and Europe Transformed: a Study in Statecraft*, Cambridge, England: Harvard University Press, 1998

News and Electronic Sources

Al Jazeera, <http://english.aljazeera.net/>

BBC News, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/>

Bulletin des Presse- und Informationsamtes der Bundesregierung [Bulletin of the Press and Information Office of the Federal Government], Helmut Kohl, “Zehn-Punkte-Programm zur Überwindung der Teilung Deutschlands und Europas” [“Ten Point Program for Overcoming the Division of Germany and Europe”] (November 28, 1989. Translated by Jeremiah Riemer and available

at http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/pdf/eng/Chapter1_Doc10.pdf
(accessed on March 8, 2010)

CNN News, <http://www.cnn.com>

Los Angeles Times, <http://articles.latimes.com>

NATO Office of Information and Press, <http://www.nato.int>

NATO-Russia Council, <http://www.nato-russia-council.info/htm/EN/nrc.shtml>

Nezavisimaya Gazeta, <http://www.ng.ru>

Pravda and Izvestia, “Vstrecha M.S. Gorbacheva s pravitel’svennoy delegatsiyeyi GDR,” *Pravda and Izvestiya*, 7 March 1990

Public Papers of the President of the United States: George Bush, “Joint News Conference Following Discussions With Chancellor Helmut Kohl of the Federal Republic of Germany,” 1990-02-25, available at http://bushlibrary.tamu.edu/research/public_papers.php?id=1585&year=1990&month=2 (accessed on March 8, 2010 at)

CBS News, <http://www.cbsnews.com>

China Daily, <http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/>

Civil Georgia Daily News Online, <http://www.civil.ge/eng/>

Human Rights Watch, <http://www.hrw.org/>

Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation,
http://www.mid.ru/brp_4.nsf/main_eng

Newsweek, <http://www.newsweek.com>

President of Russia, the Official Web-site of the President of the Russian Federation,
<http://eng.news.kremlin.ru/>

Reuters, <http://www.reuters.com>

RIA Novosti, <http://en.rian.ru/>

Seattle Times, <http://community.seattletimes.nwsourc.com>

Segodnya Archive, <http://www.segodnya.ru/w3s.nsf/Archive/Archive.html>

Sun-Journal, "Russians Claim Credit for Serb Arms Withdrawal," Lewiston, Maine, February 19, 1994, available at <http://news.google.com/newspapers?nid=1914&dat=19940219&id=-RIgAAAAIIBAJ&sjid=6mUFAAAAIIBAJ&pg=1497,4183790> (accessed on April 22, 2010)

The Guardian, <http://www.guardian.co.uk>

The Independent, <http://www.independent.co.uk/>

The New York Times, <http://www.nytimes.com>

The Shanghai Cooperation Organization, <http://www.sectesco.org/EN/brief.asp>

The Union State between the Russian Federation and Belarus,
<http://www.soyuz.by/en/>

The Wall Street Journal, <http://online.wsj.com>

Time, Taber, George M., "RX for Russia: Shock Therapy," January 27, 1992 available at <http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,974758,00.html> (accessed on April 8, 2010)

Times Daily, "Yeltsin Seeks NATO Membership," December 21, 1991, available at <http://news.google.com/newspapers?nid=1842&dat=19911220&id=6E4gAA AAIBAJ&sjid=0McEAAAIBAJ&pg=1576,3230693> (accessed on March 28, 2010)

Times Online, <http://www.timesonline.co.uk>

Z Magazine, <http://www.zcommunications.org>

Speeches

Blair, Tony, PM Statement on Iraq following UN Council Resolution, 8 November 2002, *Number 10*, The Official Site of the UK Prime-Minister's Office, available at <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/+http://www.number10.gov.uk/Page3206> (accessed on June 5, 2010)

Bush, Geroge W., Text of Iraq Speech to UN, *CBS News*, 12 September 2002, available at <http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2002/09/12/national/main521781.shtml> (accessed on June 4, 2010)

Bush, George W., The Transcript of President Bush Speech on Missile Defence at National Defence University in Washington, *CNN*, 1 May 2001, available at <http://archives.cnn.com/2001/ALLPOLITICS/05/01/bush.missile.trans/> (accessed on June 16, 2010)

Christopher, Warren, Intervention by U.S. Secretary of State, North Atlantic Council Meeting, 1 December, 1994, Brussels, Belgium. Electronic version can be found at <http://www.nato.int/docu/speech/1994/s941201b.htm> (accessed on May 7, 2010)

Claes Milly, Remarks by NATO Secretary General, Budapest CSCE Summit, 5 December 1994. See the full text at <http://www.nato.int/docu/speech/1994/s941205b.htm> (accessed on May 7, 2010)

Gorbachev, Mikhail S., Personal Message from president gorbachev to Heads of State or Government Attending the G7 Meeting in London, G7 Summit: London, July 15-14, 1991, available at <http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/summit/1991london/personal.html> (accessed on March 18, 2010)

Gorbachev, Mikhail S., “Common European Home” July 6, 1989 available at <http://www.coe.int/aboutCoe/index.asp?page=nosInvites&sp=gorbachev> (accessed on March 22, 2010)

Ivanov, Sergey, Russian First Dputy Prime Minister’s speech, Munich Security Conference, 6 February, 2009, available at <http://www.acronym.org.uk/docs/0902/doc11.htm> (accessed on June 12, 2010)

Iraq - Joint statement by Russia, Germany and France, Paris, 3 March 2003, French Embassy in the United Kingdom, tatemts, available at <http://www.ambafrance-uk.org/Iraq-Joint-statement-by-Russia.html> (accessed on June 5, 2010)

Lake, Anthony, “From Containment to Enlargement,” Speech at the Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies, Washington D.C., September 21, 1993, accessible at <http://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/lakedoc.html> (accessed on May 12, 2010)

Medvedev, Dmitry A., Speech at Meeting with German Political, Parliamentary and Civic Leaders, Berlin, June 5, 2008, available at http://www.ln.mid.ru/brp_4.nsf/0/C080DC2FF8D93629C3257460003496C4 (accessed on 24 June 2010)

Medvedev Dmitry A., Speech at World Policy Conference, Evian, France, 8 October 2008, available at <http://www.natomission.ru/en/society/article/society/artnews/21/> (accessed on June 26, 2010)

Putin, Vladimir V., Speech of the President of the Russian Federation at the Munich Conference on Security Policy is available at http://www.mid.ru/brp_4.nsf/e78a48070f128a7b43256999005bcbb3/284b878ca1370c27c32572800033694a?OpenDocument (accessed on June 19, 2010)

President Sarkozy and Chancellor Merkel, “Security, Our Joint Mission,” joint article in “*Le Monde*” Newspaper, Paris, 4 February 2009, available at <http://www.ambafrance-uk.org/Security-our-joint-mission.html> (accessed on June 26, 2010)

Sarkozy, Nicolas, NATO Summit Speech, The French Embassy in the United Kingdom, 3 April 2008, available at <http://www.ambafrance-uk.org/President-Sarkozy-speaks-at.html>, (accessed on June 14, 2008)

Sarkozy, Nicolas, Speech of the President of the Republic of France, World Policy Conference, 8 October 2008, available at <http://www.ambafrance-uk.org/President-Sarkozy-s-World-Policy.html> (accessed on June 26, 2010)

Tagliavini, Heidi., Former Head of the International fact-finding mission on the conflict in Georgia, Council of Europe, Parliamentary Assembly Session, Strasbourg, 28 April 2010, available at http://www.coe.int/t/dc/files/pa_session/april_2010/20100428_disc_tagliavini_EN.asp (accessed on June 28, 2010)