

NATO-EAPC Research Fellowship, Final Report.¹

Dr Deborah Sanders

Lecturer in Defence Studies for King's College London at the UK Defence Academy

**Defence Diplomacy: Optimising Foreign Military Assistance and Forging Mature
Relations between Russia and Ukraine.**

¹ The author would like to express her gratitude to the following people for providing information that proved invaluable in compiling this report. Stephen Pollard, former Director of Central & Eastern Europe Outreach at the UK MoD; Malcolm Haworth, current Director of Central & Eastern Europe Outreach at the UK MoD; Tony Russel, former advisor on the Ukrainian programme of Outreach at the UK MoD; Justin Henrick and John Carr advisors on Outreach at the UK MoD. Lee Merrick, NATO-Ukraine Liaison in Kiev and Rob Drewitt, UK Defence Attaché in Kiev.

1. Introduction and overview of the project

Relations between states are affected by many factors. Ten years after the collapse of the USSR, relations between Russia and Ukraine continue to be influenced by the process and shape of their mutual transition to a post-communist future as well as the external environment in which they operate as newly independent states struggling to define their post-Soviet identity. Relations between Russia and Ukraine have reached a qualitatively new level during the last few years. This is the culmination of a process that began in 2000 when the President of Ukraine replaced the pro-Western Borys Tarasyuk with a new foreign minister Anatoliy Zlenko. Kuchma later explained that the change in personnel was necessary to improve relations with the Russian Federation.² This improvement has been further accelerated by the interplay of political developments in both states. President Putin elected on a platform of restoring order, has moved to centralise the Russian state in an attempt to create stability, restore Russian power and create a market economy.³ In order to achieve these objectives Putin has pursued a pragmatic policy towards its neighbours, in particular Ukraine that has been devoid of much of its imperial baggage. Many contentious issues remain unresolved, but there is clear evidence of a normalisation in relations between these two states.⁴ Russia has begun to come to terms with an independent Ukrainian state on its borders and develop a coherent policy towards Kiev.⁵ Similarly, domestic political developments in Ukraine have created an enabling environment for better relations. The damage to President Kuchma's international and domestic standing by the 'Kuchmagate' scandal led to Ukraine's strategic reorientation towards the East and greater co-operation with its larger neighbour. The release of secret tape recordings allegedly from the President's Cabinet led to Kuchma being accused by the opposition of having

² This point is made by Valeriy Chaly, Mikhail Pahkov, 'Foreign Policy for Domestic use', **Zerkalo Nedeli**, 45/420 23 November 2002.

³ M A Smith, 'Putin's Regime: Administered Democracy', Conflict Studies Research Centre, June 2000; also see M A Smith, 'The Putin Presidency: Establishing Superpresidentialism', Conflict Studies Research Centre, February 2002.

⁴ For a discussion of this process see Arkady Moshes, 'Russian-Ukrainian Rapprochement of 2002, How Viable', **Security Dialogue**, 33/2, June 2002, pp.157-170.

sanctioned the kidnapping and murder in late 2000 of investigative journalist Georgiy Gongadze.⁶ Closer co-operation was reinforced with the meeting in January 2001 between the two Presidents when a 52-point military cooperation accord was signed. The signing of the border treaty in which Russia finally delineated the shared land borders with Ukraine also indicates closer co-operation.⁷ In a clear sign of Russia's interests in co-operating economically with Ukraine, Russia and Ukraine announced plans to jointly manage gas pipelines to Europe.⁸ Indicating that relations were improving more generally, Russia also initiated the appointment of President Leonid Kuchma of Ukraine to the head of the CIS. Kuchma suggested that his appointment should help overcome fears in Ukraine about Russia's imperial ambitions.⁹

This paper investigates how defence diplomacy programmes can facilitate and encourage good neighbourly relation between Russia and Ukraine. Since the early 1990s, Western liberal democracies have been engaged in a diverse range of security and defence diplomacy activities in Eastern Europe and the newly independent states of the former Soviet Union with the broad aims of transforming former Soviet satellite states' civil-military so that they meet the liberal and democratic norms of the West and their security organisations, as well as downsizing and developing military interoperability. This paper explores a common aspect of these defence diplomacy programmes, military assistance, by three donors the US, the UK and NATO. The US is the largest provider of bilateral assistance to Ukraine and Russia so is likely to have the greatest impact on shaping the transition in both states. In a bipolar world the US is also the most powerful international player and plays a crucial role in determining the security environment faced by both Russia and Ukraine. The UK programme is chosen for comparison and to determine the degree to

⁵ For an opposing view see Leonid Polyakov, 'Current Russia-Ukrainian Rapprochement: Forward or Backward? A Rejoinder', **Security Dialogue**, Vol 33/2, June 2002, pp.171-176.

⁶ For the effect Kuchmagate had on Ukrainian society see, Taras Kuzio, 'Kuchmagate continues to dominate Ukrainian Politics', **Prism** 7/1 January 30, 2001.

⁷ 'Russia and Ukraine sign Border Treaty', The Associated Press, Wednesday January 29 2003. The contentious issue of the Sea of Azov was not addressed.

⁸ Michael Lelyveld, 'Russia/Ukraine: Questions Linger About Gas Consortium', RFE/RL, 4 February 2003.

which there is overlap and coordination between bilateral donors and the impact this is likely to have, if any, on relations between Russia and Ukraine. The UK, a key player in European security, shapes the post-Cold War security environment facing these states on the periphery of Europe. NATO has been selected, as this is an influential organisation with a large multilateral programme to both Russia and Ukraine. NATO's role and future role in the European geostrategic space also shapes the external environment in which both states interact.

Military assistance programmes have been chosen for a number of reasons. First, Russia and Ukraine have a long and difficult history, which has created a high degree of mistrust and suspicion on both sides.¹⁰ This historical legacy remains a potent force that continues to shape and influence relations between these states. Russia and Ukraine share a common history tainted by expansionism and insecurity. Programmes aimed at restructuring, democratising and increasing the interoperability of Russia and Ukrainian armed forces with the West and increasing democratic control over foreign and defence policy will ameliorate insecurity. Externally funded programmes can help ease the suspicion and mistrust between these neighbours that has coloured and damaged relations in the early years of independence, thereby creating and sustaining the enabling conditions for co-operation and regional stability.

Second, foreign military assistance is an essential part of security sector reform in both Russia and Ukraine. The security sector is a term that has been adopted by many countries and international organisations as well as non-governmental organisations working in the field of security. The security sector reform (SSR) agenda calls for a wider and deeper understanding of the security transition in newly independent states. Widening the definition would necessitate including all organisations and institutions responsible for the provision of security in a state – this would include the regular armed forces, paramilitary

⁹ Askold Krushelnycky, 'CIS: What Does Kuchma's New Post Say about the Alliance?' RFE/RL, 30 January 2003.

¹⁰ For a discussion of this issues see, Deborah Sanders, **Security Cooperation between Russia and Ukraine in the Post-Soviet Era**, Palgrave, 2001. pp.40-42, 64-68.

and irregular forces, police and other law enforcement forces, judiciary and the wider societal groups with a role to play.¹¹ Deepening would necessitate placing the security sector within the large context of democratisation taking place within a state. Democracy in Russia and Ukraine cannot succeed without the transformation of the security sector, and vice versa: the two are inseparably linked and interdependent. An unreformed security sector can denude society of resources and the control needed for the transition process. It can act as a barrier to democratisation.¹² In addition, security sector reform is an important criterion for newly independent states that want to join or participate in Euro-Atlantic institutions.¹³ Foreign military assistance programmes have an invaluable role to play in encouraging democratic control and oversight of the security sector, promoting democratic professionalism and supporting military reform. Taken together these three aspects of military assistance programmes are the key component of any successful SSR agenda.

Bilateral and multilateral programmes to Ukraine and Russia aimed at facilitating democratic control over their security sector also play an important role in ameliorating Cold War security concerns and shapes perceptions of the external environment in which both states operate. This synergy between the external environment and the internal transition creates the enabling conditions for good neighbourly relations between Russia and Ukraine. Using the democratic peace theory literature this paper will argue that these programmes promote not only SSR but also the democratic transition because of the co-dependent relationship between these two processes. Progress in these realms then creates the necessary condition for mature and stable relations between these two neighbours. The next section examines this literature and its applicability to newly independent states as well as what it can tell us about relations between Russia and Ukraine. Democratic peace theory allows this paper to link the programmes of democratic control of the security sector to the transition process in both states with the external security environment. It will argue that

¹¹ For a discussion see Tim Edmunds, 'Defining Security Sector Reform', CMR Network, October 2001.

¹² For further discussion see, Islam Yusufi, 'Security Sector Reform in South East Europe', Centre For Policy Studies, International Policy Fellowships, Gostivar, March 6 2003.

foreign military assistance programmes can play an important role in encouraging the evolution of democratic and liberal states through the development of institutions and norms and values. These programmes also create and sustain a benign security environment in which relations between states are given the space to normalise and ultimately flourish. A benign security environment coupled with the development of a democratic liberal state are the enabling conditions for good neighbourly relations between Russia and Ukraine.

2. Democratic peace theory

Democratic peace theory comprises a well-developed body of empirical research based loosely on liberal ideas, which examines how the level of democratisation and political culture in a state affects relations between states.¹⁴ It has a long and impressive pedigree. The idea that democracies are less likely to wage war against each other than non-democracies can be traced back to the late 18th Century writings of Immanuel Kant.¹⁵ The observation that democracies do not fight each other was first made empirically about forty years ago.¹⁶ These ideas have since gathered momentum within key sections of the academic community leading to a proliferation of research into the link between democracy and war. This literature has gained mainstream credibility with the collapse of the Soviet Union and the rise in the number of democracies throughout the world. These ideas have also been picked up on by the policy-making community within the US. A good example of how far these ideas have permeated thinking in Washington was seen when President Bill Clinton made democratisation the 'third pillar' of US foreign policy; in his 1994 State of the Union address Clinton explicitly linked democracy and peace.¹⁷

¹³ Andrew Cottey, Timothy Edmunds and Anthony Forster, **Democratic Control of the Military in Postcommunist Europe Guarding the Guards**, Palgrave 2002 also makes this point. p.1

¹⁴ There is some discussion as to whether this body of empirical research constitutes a theory and even within this approach there are considerable differences of opinion as to what causes the democratic peace.

¹⁵ Immanuel Kant, **Perpetual Peace**, Translated by Lewis White Beck, New York: The Library of Liberal Arts, Bobs-Merrill, 1957

¹⁶ Dean V Babst, 'Elective Governments- A Force for Peace' **The Wisconsin Sociologist**, 3 1964, pp.9-14.

¹⁷ See 'Transcript of Clinton's Address' **New York Times**, January 26 1994 and Anthony Lake, 'The Reach of Democracy' **New York Times**, September 23 1994.

Democratic peace theory claims that there is a sufficient body of empirical evidence to suggest a positive link between democracy and peace. One version of the democratic peace theory is the dyadic.¹⁸ The dyadic suggests that democratic states are unlikely to wage war against each other, but as likely to engage in war with non-democracies. It argues that peace or a lack of conflict can be traced to the domestic political system of a state. Both states have to be democratic for war to cease to be a possibility. The regime type of an opponent matters in any calculation of co-operation rather than conflict and it is only when both states are democratic that peace becomes a possibility. Within the democratic peace theory literature two explanations are advanced for the dyadic one structural and the other normative. These will be explored in some detail as donor programmes in Russia and Ukraine have both normative and institutional elements. The structural school of thought emphasises the institutional constraints to war within a democracy such as approval from cabinet, legislatures and the electorate.¹⁹ Democratically elected leaders face higher costs in going to war and longer time lines than non-democratic leaders in making this decision. These institutional constraints on warfare result in cautious foreign policy behaviour that ultimately reduces the likelihood that a conflict will escalate to war. According to the normative school, democratic political culture encourages peaceful means of internal conflict resolution.²⁰ War is avoided because democratic decision makers expect the leaders of other democracies to follow the norms of conflict resolution that characterise their own domestic political process. Democratic leaders assume that their counterparts will be more accustomed to compromise in their foreign policy and therefore war can be avoided. Normative and institutional explanations are not however mutually exclusive as both are necessary, but not sufficient, components for explaining relations between democratic

¹⁸ Nils Petter Gleditsch, 'Democracy and Peace', **Journal of Peace Research**, 29/4 1992, pp.369-376.

¹⁹ Bruce Bueno de Mesquita and David Lalman, **War and Reason: Domestic and International Imperatives**, New Haven, Conn: Yale University Press, 1992. Margaret G Hermann and Charles W Kegley Jr, 'Rethinking Democracy and International Peace: Perspectives from Political Psychology', **International Studies Quarterly**, 39/4 (December 1995).

²⁰ R J Rummel, 'Libertarianism and International Violence', **Journal of Conflict Resolution**, 27/1, pp.27-71; Bruce Russett, **Grasping the Democratic Peace: Principles for a Post-Cold War World**, Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press 1993; Steve Chan, 'Mirror, Mirror on the Wall..' **Journal of Conflict Resolution**, 28/4 December 1984, pp.617-648.

states.²¹ Democratic structures and norms work in tandem – liberal norms prohibit war amongst democracies and democratic institutions ensure that this is followed.²² In practise, the dyadic variant of this theory suggests that domestic regime type is the key variable in explaining relations between states. The more democratic and liberal Russia and Ukraine are the more likely they are to have good relations.²³

The literature on democratic peace theory refers interchangeably to mature, developed, consolidated and stable democracies. It does, however, distinguish older democracies where institutions and political norms and values are well established from newer democracies where they are not. The former are states with fairly contested elections, virtually universal suffrage, restrictions on government power, accountability of political leaders and a developed political culture underpinned by liberal values. Other writers have included in their definition characteristics such as stability, economic freedoms and government sovereignty over foreign and military affairs.²⁴ As well as widening the remit of what is meant by the term democracy, many writers have sought to emphasise that democratic peace equals liberal democracy or what might be termed constitutional liberalism.²⁵ This might be defined as a state that instantiates liberal ideas, where liberalism is the dominant ideology and citizens have leverage over foreign policy. This expanded and deepened understanding of the conditions around which democratic peace might encourage good neighbourly relations between Russia and Ukraine suggests that normative and institutional elements are both vital elements of any programme of military assistance to these states. Democracy without constitutional liberalism, i.e. the normative trappings rather than just the institutional trappings, is merely a process to determine who governs a state. To ensure good neighbourly relations between neighbours

²¹ Zeev Maoz, Bruce Russett, 'Normative and Structural Causes of Democratic Peace 1946-1986', **American Political Science Review**, 87/3 September 1993, pp.624-638.

²² John Owen, 'How Liberalism Produces the Democratic Peace' **International Security**, 19/2 (Fall 1994), pp.87-125.

²³ It is accepted in this piece that this is not the only factor that influences relations between Russia and Ukraine. However, examining this factor is important as democratic development plays an important role in security sector reform as well as foreign policy.

²⁴ Doyle, taken from Nils Petter Gleditsch, 'Democracy and Peace', **Journal of Peace Research**, 29/4 1992, pp.369-376.

external programmes have to encourage the liberal characteristic of a democratic state. This would include constitutional safeguards to protect individuals from the coercive power of the state and the creation of a state that protects and recognises the rights of its citizens.

The dyadic variant of the democratic peace theory claims that the foreign policy of democratic states will vary depending on the type of state they are interacting with. Many proponents of democratic peace theory argue that the foreign policy of democratic states will not be affected by whether they are interacting with democratic or non-democratic states. Instead, factors central to the democratic culture and decision making process will determine their foreign policy not the regime type of the 'other'. This is referred to in the literature as the monadic. The monadic suggests that it does not necessarily take two states to create peace, as democracies are more pacific. Proponents of this variant of the democratic peace theory argue that democratic states are less likely to use force in the international system and that this holds irrespective of the type of political system a potential enemy might or might not have.²⁶ This variant implies that relations between Russia and Ukraine could be improved if one or other of these states developed democratic institutions and norms and values and this improvement would occur irrespective of the transition process-taking place next door. The assumption behind both the dyadic and monadic explanations is that democratisation shapes and influences foreign policy and by extension relations between states.

Applying these democratic ideals to Russia and Ukraine is tricky as both states are newly independent with embryonic democratic structures and political culture. Mansfield and Snyder argue that states in the process of democratisation are more likely to engage in war as they are characterised by weak institutionalised democratic procedures and

²⁵ Fareed Zakaria, 'The Rise of Illiberal Democracy', **Foreign Affairs** 76/6 November/December 1997, pp.22-43. John Owen, 'How Liberalism Produces the Democratic Peace', op cit.

²⁶ R J Rummel, 'Democracies ARE Less Warlike Than Other Regimes' **European Journal of International Relations**, 1/4, December 1995, pp.457-479.

illiberal societies.²⁷ They maintain that in partial democracies elites mobilise public opinion with appeals to nationalism or ethnicity and engage in prestige strategies in foreign affairs to enhance their authority. This version of the democratic peace theory suggests that while partial democracy and the process of democratisation is likely to impinge negatively on relations between these two states there are two important ways in which external donors could help to mitigate its pernicious effects. First, external assistance might be provided to help create what is termed a 'responsible marketplace of ideas' in which myths propounded by the elite and privileged groups to substantiate their position and block reform are carefully scrutinised.²⁸ This might include support for the democratic oversight of the security sector within society at large and the democratic institutions. Support for a free press, the development and active support of civic society including NGO's and facilitating democratic oversight by state institutions would be important ways in which partially democratic states could begin to reap the benefits of the democratic peace. Second, the external environment in which partially democratic states operate will influence the transition process and by extension the possibility of good relations. A relatively benign external international and regional security environment where there is increased transparency, openness, dialogue and interoperability could play an important role in disenfranchising certain groups and empowering others in society. Drawing heavily on the work of the founding father of democratic peace theory – Immanuel Kant – this view suggests that there will be a positive spill over effect of the perpetual peace created by European institutions. This will positively shape the strategic environment in which Russia and Ukraine conduct relations. Kant lays out a three-stage plan for the development of perpetual peace between states.²⁹ Firstly, states must have a republican constitution, which protected the rights of individuals, have a representative government with a

²⁷ Edward D Mansfield and Jack Snyder, 'Democratisation and the Danger of War', **International Security**, 20/1 (Summer 1995), p.5-38.

²⁸ Ibid. p.37.

²⁹ For details see Michael W Doyle, 'Liberalism and World Politics', **American Political Science Review**, 80/4 December 1986, pp.1151-1169.

separation of powers, the rule of law and a market based economy.³⁰ The second stage, which is the spread of the pacific peace, will take place when states have learnt the hard lessons of war and peace and begin the process of moving towards some sort of a collective security agreement. The third stage – cosmopolitan law – cements the notion of peace and ensures that states will have moved on to a qualitatively new stage in their relations. NATO, an organisation that in many ways epitomises Kant’s ideals, has a pivotal role to play in facilitating the democratic transformation in Russia and Ukraine. By NATO encouraging key norms and values of democracy, freedom and the rule of law in these two states it is likely to shape and influence positively their foreign policy and further strengthen the prospects for good neighbourly relations. NATO’s engagement of these two states could lead to a positive spill over effect of Kant’s notion of perpetual peace. Security sector reform in partially democratic states will be easier if there is no direct security challenge from neighbours or old enemies. The military will play far less of a role in any debate about reform where there is no external security challenges. Similarly, civic society and the legislative branch are more likely to be empowered to act as a check and balance on security sector issues in a benign security environment. This spill over of peace from NATO, combined with the bilateral programmes of SSR discussed in the next section, will create a non-threatening security environment in which Russia and Ukraine can engage in democratic reform as well as co-operation with one another. This link between the external environment, security sector reform and democratisation more generally is discussed later.

3. Security sector reform

There has been a growing consensus amongst the international donor and academic community that a state’s security sector can be an important barrier to good governance and regional security.³¹ A state’s security sector is made up of two central pillars although the

³⁰ For details see Michael W Doyle, ‘Kant, liberal legacies, and Foreign Affairs’ and Kant, Liberal Legacies and Foreign Affairs, Part 2’, **Philosophy and Public Affairs**.

³¹ Natalie Mychajlyszyn, ‘Civil Military Relations in Post-Soviet Ukraine: Implications for Domestic and regional Stability’, **Armed Forces & Society**, 28/3 Spring 2002 pp.455-479. Damian Lilly, Robin

component parts may vary from country to country depending upon historical experience and development.³² The first pillar is composed of the organisations that have the authority to use, or the ability to call on the use, of force or the threat of force to protect the state and its people. This would include the armed forces, the police and paramilitary forces and the intelligence services. The second pillar of the security sector is made up of the civil structures in a society, elected, appointed or self-appointed, who are responsible for the management and oversight of these bodies. There is, however, disagreement as to how to successfully build and sustain these two pillars in post-communist societies. Some analysts have called for a two-tiered approach focusing on civil military relations and democratic control while others have included a third element – defence reform. There is also disagreement as to what constitutes the second pillar. As will be discussed, some writers argue that democratic control is little more than parliamentary oversight and does not extend to civil society. This paper will argue that a wide and deep understanding of this concept is required by donor countries in order to facilitate good neighbourly relations between Russia and Ukraine.

Most of the literature on the transformation of the defence establishments in newly independent states is based around two key elements – strengthening civil military relations and democratic control. Marybeth Ulrich advances the clearest and most sophisticated examination of these elements. She claims that there are two critical dimensions of the reform process – democratic political control and democratic professionalism.³³ Ulrich argues that certain key norms and values and institutional elements must be developed within the political and military establishments of recipient states if successful reform is to take place.³⁴ The first type is aimed at strengthening civil and democratic control of the security sector in three ways. First, institution building - programmes would be aimed at giving the

Luckham, Michael Von Tangen Page, 'A Goal Orientated Approach to Governance and Security Sector Reform', International Alert, London: September 2002 pp.6-8. Also see 'Towards a better practice framework in security sector reform. Broadening the debate', Occasional SSR Paper No.1 August 2002, Clingendael-International Alert-Saferworld.

³² The literature makes frequent reference to the OECD/DAC Report, 'Helping Prevent Violent Conflict. Orientations for External partners', Paris, 2001, pp.22-24. <http://www.oecd.org/dac>. Some writers who claim that the security sector also includes bodies responsible for guaranteeing the rule of law have added a third pillar. This would include the judiciary, the penal system, human rights ombudsmen and the international community.

democratically elected institutions both the capacity and expertise to exercise democratic control. The second is process building – encouraging a transparent and open budgetary process for the security sector. The third is access building – this would include encouraging and facilitating the development of normative skills by key actors able to influence the decision making process around foreign and security policy. There is some disagreement within the literature as to how wide this access needs to be within a recipient country. David Betz argues that effective control and management of the armed forces in Russia is through the appointment of a civilian defence minister and the creation of an integrated military-civilian defence department.³⁵ He claims that through the ballot box democracies delegate authority to politicians who then exercise control over the military.³⁶ Similarly, in examining the democratisation of the Czech and Russian military, Ulrich examines the role played by key governmental institutions and does not look at the role of civil society more generally in influencing this transition process.³⁷ These categorisations of access and decision-making are too narrow and need to be widened to include other important players in the political process such as the media, NGO's and independent groups. Any bilateral or multilateral programme, which failed to address the larger issues of civic culture and its symbiotic relationship with the security sector, would be unsuccessful. Many writers see a robust civil society as the basis for sustainable democracy in newly independent states. A civil society is made up of public interest organisations that lie outside the control of the state that seek to influence on behalf of the people. The development of civil society is seen therefore as essential to democracy as these groups can act as a check on governments. A country's civil society acts as an important and vital source of information, debate and accountability for the

³³ Marybeth Peterson Ulrich, **Democratizing Communist Militaries The Cases of the Czech and Russian Armed Forces**, University of Michigan Press 1999.

³⁴ Ibid. pp.2-3

³⁵ David Betz, 'No Place for a Civilian? Russian Defence Management from Yeltsin to Putin', **Armed Forces and Society**, 28/3 March 2002, p.481-505.

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ Ulrich, op. cit. She does however take a sophisticated view of the link between governmental institutions and democratic norms by looking at what she terms democratic deficits. pp. 70-72.

security sector.³⁸ In both Ukraine and Russia, where there are weak institutions and little expertise on security related issues within the parliament or government ministries, donors could provide support for the establishment of a legal basis for civil military relations. In addition they could educate government officials in civil military issues and target programmes at groups in civil society who offer a source of information on defence and security issues. This paper terms these types of programmes horizontal as they meet the wider requirements of good democratic governance within a state.³⁹

The second aspect of reform that is discussed in the literature is professionalisation of the security institutions, or what might be also termed the strengthening of civil military relations. This strand of reform aims at increasing technical competence and developing military training and doctrine so that the security sector can effectively and efficiently provide for the security of the state and its citizens. Two related aspect of this process are the qualitative and attitudinal elements that play a key role in facilitating democratic control and oversight of the security sector. This includes military to military contact. By working closely with Russian and Ukrainian military personnel, donors are able to actively demonstrate, within their own military, respect, acceptance, the belief in and the benefits of democratic and civilian control of defence and security. The idea is that contact through training will result in a positive spill over effect of these attitudes and beliefs. In an attempt to strengthen the horizontal element discussed above, an objective of much of the military training is also to encourage norms and values of democratic control and oversight and to encourage the military to accept the chain of civilian command. This paper characterises this type as vertical programmes.⁴⁰ These are military to military links and are aimed at the more traditional military professional end of the spectrum and would include issues like command and control and doctrine. Vertical programmes aimed at security sector reform link military professionalism with democracy through interaction and training. Ulrich outlines the link

³⁸ This point is also made by A Cottey, T Edmunds and A Forster, 'The Second Generation Problematic: Rethinking Democracy and Civil-Military Relations', **Armed Forces & Society**, 29/1 September 2002, pp.31-57.

between professionalism and democracy. She argues that the task for democracies is to develop an officer corps of democratic expert soldiers.⁴¹ By encouraging the inclusion of democratic norms into the military's institutional professional development, donor countries could encourage reform that supports democracy in post-communist states.⁴²

The third type of reform is an issue specific programme where there is a sizable overlap between the vertical and horizontal aspects discussed above.⁴³ These are bespoke programmes aimed at meeting the particular requirement of recipient states. There are two main types of programmes undertaken by the donor's discussed in this paper – demobilisation and military reform. As well as widening and deepening the reform process, there is a need to have a clear and agreed roadmap of transition if success is to be achieved. Without a sense of the end point of reform in Russia or Ukraine, assistance will have a limited impact. Chris Donnelly, a specialist advisor to the NATO General Secretary, suggests that defence reform is a very important and often overlooked aspect of transition.⁴⁴ He argues that defence reform contains both normative and institutional elements with technical restructuring and changes in attitude of the armed forces in post-communist states.⁴⁵ NATO has set up a programme aimed at encouraging defence reform in Ukraine. Given NATO's unique access and influence in Ukraine it has the ability to work at the strategic level shaping future force configurations and norms and values. As Russia and Ukraine are involved in a process of radical downsizing of their former Soviet militaries, the international donor community has set up programmes aimed at the demobilisation and reintegration of former military personnel into society. The objective is to facilitate defence reform in these states and to improve relations between society and the military.

³⁹ Rocky Martin, 'Development agencies and security-sector restructuring', **Conflict, Security, Development Journal**, 2/1 2002, pp.145-149.

⁴⁰ Ibid. p.148.

⁴¹ Ulrich, pp.22-23.

⁴² Ibid. pp.23-41.

⁴³ For a discussion of issue specific based programmes see Rocky Martin, op. cit. p.148.

⁴⁴ Chris Donnelly, 'Defence Transformation in the new democracies: A framework for tackling the problem', **NATO Review**, 45/1 January 1997, pp. 15-19.

⁴⁵ Ibid.

External military assistance to promote security sector reform is provided by the donor countries discussed in this piece along three key axes: horizontal; vertical; and issue based. The assumption made by each of the donors discussed in this paper is that these individual programmes are inter-related and mutually reinforcing and are an inseparable part of security sector reform and general democratisation in both states. The US has an extensive programme of military assistance to the former Soviet republics. Its aims are to provide military training and security cooperation activities that support US foreign policy and national security goals and these are run out of the Department of State and the Department of Defence.⁴⁶ The stated means of achieving these objectives are to encourage and assist efforts to develop professional, democratically controlled militaries and the promotion of the principles of democracy, respect for human rights and the rule of law. This suggests that the US is committed, in theory, to a wider and broader notion of SSR reform and one of the means of achieving this, in tandem with other programmes the US has, is foreign military assistance programmes.

UK security sector reform programmes are termed defence diplomacy and is one of the eight Defence Missions of the British Armed forces. The aim of defence diplomacy is to 'build and maintain trust and assist in the development of democratically accountable armed forces'.⁴⁷ It is seen as a key ingredient in promoting a stable and peaceful Europe, one of the British Government's foreign and security policy objectives. The Defence Diplomacy Mission consists of three Military Tasks: arms control; outreach; and other Defence Diplomacy Activities. The UK military assistance to Ukraine and Russia is part of the UK outreach programme. Outreach has clear normative and institutional elements: its aims are to build trust, promote interoperability and assist in the reform and restructuring the security sector.⁴⁸

⁴⁶ As taken from 'Foreign Military Training and DoD Engagement Activities of Interest: Joint Report to Congress', Released by the Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, March 2002. Part 11. Description of Programs, [http://www.fas.org/asmp/campaigns/training/FMTR2002/II_%20Description%20of%](http://www.fas.org/asmp/campaigns/training/FMTR2002/II_%20Description%20of%20). The aims of this programmes are safeguarding American security, building prosperity and promoting US values.

⁴⁷ 'Strategic Defence Review: Defence Diplomacy', MoD. http://www.mod.uk/issues/sdr/defence_diplomacy.htm. See also Stephen Pollard, 'My Job', **RUSI Journal** October 1998, pp.6.

Security sector reform is also at the heart of NATO's work in both Ukraine and Russia.⁴⁹ As will be discussed in the next section, the programmes to these states have both normative and institutional elements. The emphasis, particularly in Ukraine, is on security sector reform and restructuring as part of a larger process of democratisation taking place within Ukraine. All three programmes demonstrate a commitment to the successful transformation of the security sector and they have had some success. Their impact, however, has been limited by the nature of the programmes and structural impediments within Russia and Ukraine. These include the absence or slow pace of democratisation in both states and the lack of governmental commitment to SSR. Effective democratic control and oversight of the security sector in Russia and Ukraine has both normative and institutional elements neither of which can be separated from the democratic transition in each state. Both states need to be encouraged much more by the donor community to develop effective institutions of states and civil society that have the capability and knowledge to shape and influence security policy.

4. Military assistance programmes to Russia

This section examines the programmes of the US, the UK and NATO in Russia and Ukraine and considers the extent to which the three key areas of military assistance - democratic control, democratic professionalism and defence reform - have encouraged security sector reform. The US programme to Russia is exclusively horizontal and is made up of four separate and interlocking programmes. The stated aim of US military assistance is to further Russia's development as a democratic civil society ruled by law with respect for human rights.⁵⁰ The first of these programmes is International Military Education and Training (IMET). This programme provides training and education to those involved in the security sector and its objective is to encourage democratic control of the security sector. Depending

⁴⁹ This point was made by Lord Robertson, NATO Secretary General, 'Questions and Answers', ITAR-TASS Press Agency, 9 December 2002, as taken from <http://www.NATO.int/docu/speech/2002/s021209c.htm>

on what is requested by recipient states IMET consists of horizontal and/or vertical programmes. The Russian government, unlike the Ukrainian government, has political and historical problems engaging in vertical programmes and the majority of its interaction with its former Cold War adversary remains at the horizontal level. The IMET programme agreed between the US and Russia has resulted in the educating of 94 military and civilians involved in the security sector in issues around civil military relations and democratic control of the armed forces. This emphasis on horizontal links is also seen with the other two programmes to Russia; two academic centres, the Asia-pacific Centre and the Marshall Centre, educated 300 military personnel in issues around democratisation and civil military relations.

The UK programme to the Russian Federation is largely though not exclusively vertical, that is it is aimed at democratic professionalisation, and the UK offers a unique issue based initiative. The bilateral programme to Russia is based on six pillars, five of which emphasise interoperability and the training of Russian military forces: English Language Training; Staff Training; Navy; Ground Forces; Air Forces; and Cooperation on Counter-Terrorism.⁵¹ The main activities that support interoperability are English language training as well as seminars and exercises on issues like peace support operations and command and control issues. To further promote interoperability and modernisation, training is also conducted on a tri-service basis. For instance, the navy has twinning relationships with Russian ships, offers basic officer training, operational training, training at the UK maritime warfare centre as well as submarine rescue training to Russian forces. The army offers peace support training and the air force provides search and rescue training as well as aircraft visits. While these links are largely military to military and involve training rather than education they do play a vital role in allowing the UK to influence positively the democratic management of forces and encourage these values. To further reinforce this normative link the UK runs an extensive programme of seminars covering issues such as

⁵⁰ For details of programme see 'Foreign Military Training Report FY 1999 and 2000', Foreign Military Training and DoD Engagement Activities of Interest, Volume 1, Joint Report to Congress, March 1 2000.

⁵¹ Copy of '2002 Bilateral Programme to Russia – Second Draft' given to author by DCEE Outreach at UK MoD.

peacekeeping, defence budgeting and strategic planning. The UK also conducts high-level military visits to discuss with their Russian counterparts issues of civil-military relations and democratisation.

The horizontal pillar of staff training complements these vertical programmes of training and interoperability by encouraging democratic control of the Russian armed forces. Although the number of places offered is relatively small compared to the US programme, the UK offers staff training and a programme of seminars to Russian military personnel. This includes attendance at the Defence Academy of the UK where officers study issues such as democratic control of the military and defence management.⁵² Part of the UK outreach programme is the Russian Resettlement Programme. This was launched in 1995 and nearly 10,000 retired Russian officers have been retrained so far at eight centres around Russia and around 70% are estimated to have found long term employment following retraining.⁵³ This vertical programmes has both institutional and a normative element. Its aim is to help the restructuring process of the Russian military and increase links with those in Russia who seek military reform.⁵⁴ This programme has been so successful that the MoD is looking at extending and expanding it to two new centres.

NATO-Russian relations have entered a new phase with the setting up of the NATO-Russian Council (NRC) at the Rome Summit in May 2002.⁵⁵ The NRC is an attempt to build mutually cooperative relations with Russia in areas of common interest. NATO SSR will be implemented under the NRC and will be based on both the works programme agreed under the Permanent Joint Council and nine new areas outlined at the Rome Summit. The areas for cooperation are: terrorist challenges; crisis management; non-proliferation; arms control; theatre missile defence; search and rescue at sea; defence reform; civil emergencies and new threats. These programmes are more of a means to an end than an end in and of themselves. NATO SSR to Russia is aimed more at improving relations between these two

⁵² Author's own knowledge of junior and senior officer courses as member of the Defence Academy.

⁵³ Paper No.1 defence Diplomacy, MoD <http://www.mod.uk/issues.cooperation/diplomacy.htm>

⁵⁴ Stephen Pollard, op cit, p.3.

former adversaries and promoting security across the European geopolitical space than about concrete issues such as interoperability and defence reform. NATO also lacks the leverage that it has over Ukraine. Russia's lack of interest in joining NATO means that NATO is not able to influence the shape and pace of the transition to the same extent as it can in Ukraine. In Ukraine, NATO is the key focal point for SSR and SSR is coordinated under the NATO umbrella to achieve reform. NATO programmes to Russia are modest by comparison and are largely aimed at improving relations and ameliorating mistrust and suspicion at all levels of society. Chris Donnelly makes this point when he suggests that the main impediment to co-operation between NATO and Russia is the lack of trust the latter has in the former.⁵⁶ Part of NATO's SSR to Russia is the funding of regional training centres for discharged military personnel.⁵⁷ In May 2003 Russia and NATO signed an agreement to cooperate in submarine crew and rescue.⁵⁸ This will result in increased interoperability between NATO and Russian forces as they standardise rescue procedures and conduct joint exercises. While this programme is largely horizontal – military to military – it contains a normative element. Increased interaction between NATO and Russian forces will help inculcate western norms and values about civil military relations. Russia and NATO have also held joint crisis response exercises to coordinate disaster relief efforts.⁵⁹

These three separate programmes to Russia have had some notable success in meeting the first two requirements of SSR – democratic control of the armed forces and democratic professionalisation. Both the UK and the US have programmes with clear normative elements at both the horizontal and vertical levels. These are aimed at inculcating key democratic and liberal values amongst military and influential civilians in Russia at both the governmental and military levels. These programmes are also

⁵⁵ For details see, 'NATO-Russian Relations: A New Quality', NATO Basic Texts, 28 May 2002. <http://www.NATO.int/docu/basicxt/b020528e.htm>

⁵⁶ 'Special advisor to NATO Secretary General Donnelly on NATO-Russian Relations' op cit.

⁵⁷ 'Assisting discharged military personnel in Russia', NATO Update, 22 April 2003. [Http://www.NATO.int/docu/update/2003/04-april/e0422a/htm](http://www.NATO.int/docu/update/2003/04-april/e0422a/htm)

⁵⁸ NATO and Russia sign submarine rescue agreement, NATO Update, 8 Feb 2003, <http://www.NATO.int/docu/update/2003/02-february/e0208a.htm>

⁵⁹ NATO, Russia hold first joint crisis response exercise', September 25 2002, http://www.usembassy.it/file2002_09/alia/a2092602.htm

important in generally improving relations between former adversaries and thereby creating a benign external security environment for Russia to develop its policy towards its neighbours. The programmes run under the NATO auspices also play an important role in ameliorating mistrust and suspicion. In Russia, NATO also acts as a force multiplier – ensuring a stable and secure external environment that allows Moscow to engage in military cooperation and dialogue with former adversaries. NATO has adapted its functions and membership and transformed itself from a purely military organisation to a security organisation that positively shapes the security environment Russia faces. This was seen at the Prague summit in November where seven former communist countries were invited to join. The enlargement of NATO combined with the setting up of the NATO-Russian Council has radically transformed the security architecture of Europe after the attack on the US World Trade Centre creating a more benign security environment for states that lie on the periphery. The NATO Secretary General Lord George Robinson highlighted the spread of peace up to Russia's borders when he stated that NATO will 'welcome new members, take on new missions, modernise our military capabilities and strengthen our relations with friends and partners throughout the Euro-Atlantic area.'⁶⁰

The next section examines how military programmes could draw on the high levels of trust and the benign security environment to encourage SSR. There are a number of key ways in which these programmes could be improved so as to also have a positive impact on SSR in Russia: having a clearer roadmap; by widening and deepening; and constructing an analytical framework for assessing success including monitoring of personnel involved. The security sector has been defined widely in this paper to include the totality of the institutions and bodies in the security sphere. This would include the regular armed forces, paramilitary and irregular armed forces, police and other law-enforcement agencies, the judiciary and the wider community including parliament, civil society and the media. It is only by including in particular the media and civil society in any expanded definition that assistance programmes can encourage what is termed in the democratic peace theory 'a responsible marketplace of

⁶⁰ 'NATO: European, Alliance Leaders React to Expansion', RFE/RL 21 November 2002.

ideas'. This idea developed by Mansfield and Snyder, and discussed earlier, would ensure that where military assistance programmes targeted civil society and the media they helped partially democratic states to disseminate information and to block elite control of the foreign policy and security agenda. For military assistance programmes to be more successful in Russia, they also need to target what have been termed 'grey area' forces.⁶¹ Ekaterina Stepanova argues that the grey area forces- the Ministry of the Interior, Ministry of Emergencies and Federal Security Service – all play a central role in Russia's post-conflict situations.⁶² Ministry of Interior forces in Russia alone are made up of 220,000 well-equipped men. Broadening out military assistance programmes of inculcating democratic norms and values as well as democratic professionalism to include these non-regular forces would ensure that they make a much better contribution to security sector reform.

A further way in which the programmes might be improved is to look at better ways of assessing their impact. As externally funded programmes are a process, not an event, often dealing with intangibles such as encouraging democratic norms and values, they are difficult to measure and it is almost impossible to prove a causal link between these norms and values and an observable change in behaviour or policy.⁶³ This process of assessing the impact of military programmes in Russia is obscured by the lack of detailed record taking of which officer/civilian was trained and a follow up on where they were promoted to and what impact they had on policy or shaping the debate. Without this detailed information it is difficult to determine the impact of training and education on SSR.

Internal barriers to effective programmes in Russia

The impact of the military assistance programmes is limited by three main factors: the failure of the Russian Federation to implement a coherent and workable reform package; the centralisation of power in Russia under Yeltsin and the lack of democratic

⁶¹ Ekaterina Stepanova, 'The Use of Russia's 'Grey Area' Forces in Post-Conflict Environments', CMR Network, January 2002.

⁶² Ibid.

oversight and control over defence and security issues; and the lack of progress towards democracy which has hampered the development of an effective civil society able to act as a check, balance and source of alternative information on these issues.

The absence of a coherent and workable reform package limits the impact of the military assistance programmes of the US, the UK and NATO. President Putin in his 2003 annual address to Parliament declared that the modernisation of the armed forces would be a prime national objective.⁶⁴ The blueprint for achieving this was unveiled in April 2003 and represents an extremely conservative attempt to reconcile the need for reform with the entrenched opposition to reform within key elements of the security sector. Stephen Blank argues that 'Russia's multiple military organisations have obstructed all efforts to create a professional, democratically accountable or technologically capable army adapted to today's real threats.'⁶⁵ The Russian military has consistently proven unable to move away from viewing relations with its neighbours and the West in particular through a cold war prism and has blocked reform aimed at changing force size or priority.⁶⁶ It has consistently watered down any proposals aimed at moving towards a smaller professional standing army, as this would prove unable to defend the long land borders of the Russian Federation. The reform package envisages keeping a conscript army indefinitely but cutting by half the time served, creating a corps of professional sergeants and the formation of 91 units staffed by professional soldiers by the end of 2007.⁶⁷ In addition, the Defence Minister announced a few months earlier the airborne 76th division based in Pskov would be the first formation of this new model army to be staffed by contract soldiers.⁶⁸ This reform package has been heavily criticised for the lack of strategic vision and direction, the absence of institutions and insufficient funding.

⁶³ For a discussion of this issue see, Anthony Forster, 'Evaluating Defence Diplomacy: A New Framework for Analysis', Civil-Military Relations in Central and Eastern Europe Internet Resource Centre. December 2000

⁶⁴ P Felgenhauer, 'The Military Reform Card', **Moscow Times**, 22 May 2003.

⁶⁵ Stephen Blank, 'This time we really mean it: Russian military reform', **Russia and Eurasia Review**, Volume 2/1, Jamestown Foundation, 7 January 2003.

⁶⁶ Isabelle Facon, 'The Reform of the Russian Army Issues & Obstacles', Conflict Studies Research Centre, July 2002.

⁶⁷ Alexander Golts, 'Military Reform is going Nowhere Again' **Moscow Times**, 7 May 2003.

In order to optimise the impact of the military assistance programmes to Russia, the US, the UK and NATO need to encourage Russia to adopt a workable and appropriately funded roadmap. Engaging in military assistance in the absence of clear strategic guidance and a clear vision of what is to be achieved by when and how this will be funded will limit the impact of programmes aimed at democratic control and democratic professionalism. The new Russian national security concept that provides guidance on the types of threats and hence links the strategic level with force structures, platforms and battle plans is yet to be published. Without this strategic vision the defence reforms in Russia are unlikely to produce the forces needed to defend Russia and advance her interests in the twenty first century. Although this is a highly sensitive issue, work needs to be done, though the auspices of the NATO Joint Council, on encouraging Russia to engage in a strategic defence review. Chris Donnelly has recently outlined the need for co-operation with Russia to be expanded to include the issue of military reform.⁶⁹

The current incremental reform package has also been criticised for lacking the institutions and structures to implement key aspects effectively and it is here that military assistance programmes can be most effective. The decision to create a body of NCO's, to be assigned to both contract and conscript units, has been largely welcomed and is seen as an essential component of establishing proper chains of command and enhancing professionalism, raising morale and ending conscription problems within the Russian armed forces. However, the Defence Ministry has made no provisions for building training facilities or setting up new training programmes for the sergeants.⁷⁰ The UK has an established programme that aims to train junior officers and Senior Non-Commissioned Officers to develop and conduct NCO training courses. The British Military Advisory and Training Team provides training assistance to transition states in Central and Eastern Europe to facilitate the development of appropriate and democratically accountable forces. This programme

⁶⁸ P Felgenhauer, 'The Military's Festive Fracas', **Moscow Times**, 19 December 2002.

⁶⁹ 'Special advisor to NATO Secretary General Chris Donnelly on NATO-Russian Cooperation', **Vremya Novosti**/WPS: Defense & Security, 3 June 2003 as reported in NATO Enlargement Daily Brief, Friday 6 June 2003.

needs to be extended to Russia to encourage the setting up of training programmes for its NCO's.

The third problem with this proposed package of military reform is that while the budget is set to increase in 2003, no provisions have been made to improve the conditions of service for personnel, which will undermine recruitment and retention. The Russian army is made up of just over a million personnel with contract soldiers making up a mere tenth of that number. Due to the poor conditions of service, with low pay and lack of housing, the number of contract soldiers has fallen by a fifth during the last two years.⁷¹ The Pskov Division, which has struggled to fill one regiment, has highlighted the difficulty of recruiting contract soldiers.⁷²

Deepening these programmes could also increase the impact of the military assistance programmes to Russia. This would also increase the link between assistance and SSR and would necessitate a comprehensive programme of targeting both normatively and institutionally the other elements of Russian society responsible for security oversight, lawmaking and ensuring accountability. This would include targeting horizontal programmes of encouraging democratic control of the military at the parliament, political parties and NGO's that make up civil society. By taking the lessons learnt so far and targeting these sections of the security sector community the military assistance programmes could reap additional benefits. As was discussed above a necessary but by no means sufficient element of democratic civil military relations is parliamentary oversight. Hans Born describes parliamentary oversight of the security sector as the visible tip of a large civic society iceberg.⁷³ He claims that a key weakness of foreign military assistance programmes is that they target aid at the top of the iceberg rather than seeing parliamentary oversight as part of

⁷⁰ Alexander Golt, opt cit,

⁷¹ Viktor Myasnikov, 'Where can Russian find contract servicemen? The military reforms may be stalled by a shortage of personnel', **Vremya MN** 30 January 2003, taken from WPS Monitoring Agency.

⁷² 'Defence Ministry: Without rudder and without sail. The Military Department has lost control of both the rank and file and the generals', **Nezavisimoye Voyennoye Obozreniye**, 20 December 2002, Via BBC Monitoring Service.

⁷³ Hans Born, 'Representative Democracy and the Role of Parliaments: An Inventory of Democracy Assistance Programmes', <http://216.239.39.100/search?q=cache:8vsrnDWFJmAJ:www.isn.ethz.ch/5isf/5/Paper>

an embedded civil society. In a liberal democratic state the legislative branch has three roles: monitoring the work of government; representing the interests of the people and the state; and law making.⁷⁴ The Russian Duma has a degree of influence in three areas: the defence budget; declarations of war; and legislation on defence issues.⁷⁵ In all three areas there are institutional and normative limits on the ability of the legislative branch to fulfil its oversight functions.

The Duma is hampered by a lack of institutional and constitutional power and a military culture that refuses to accept that civilians have a legitimate role to play in defence matters. Power over security and defence issues is firmly in the hands of the President and his administration. President Putin exerts considerable influence over security issues because of the constitutional and institutional trappings he inherited from Yeltsin, a compliant and pro-Kremlin dominated parliament, the perception by the military that he is 'one of them' and very high public support ratings. Strongly influenced by the military, Putin has, however, moved to strengthen his control over military issues in two ways: by creating seven federal districts in 2000 five of which were headed by police and military generals; and engaging in defence reform.⁷⁶ The representatives of the federal districts are responsible for monitoring regional force structures including those in the power ministries. There are about a dozen of these governmental bodies all of which carry weapons or wear military uniforms and make up the security sector in the Russian Federation. More generally the consolidation of vertical power by Putin has given the President much greater influence over the direction of Russian foreign policy. Putin sees foreign policy as a private affair to be decided by him alone or with a handpicked group of individuals.⁷⁷ This approach to foreign policy decision-making has been severely criticised by Liberal Duma Deputy, Vladimir Ryzhkov, who said that Russia's foreign policy did not

⁷⁴ Ibid.

⁷⁵ J H Brusstar and A A Belkin, 'Civilian Control is a Russian Myth', A special report on A military in Charge of Itself, <http://www.defencejournal.com/march98/militaryincharge1.htm>.

⁷⁶ Brian D Taylor, 'Strong men, Weak State Power Ministry Officials and the Federal District', Ponars Policy Memo 284 October 2002.

⁷⁷ For discussion of this issue see Gregory Feifer, 'Putin's Foreign Policy a Private Affair', **The Moscow Times**, April 2, 2002.

reflect the will of the people and was caught between the old Soviet command system and a more democratic future.⁷⁸

In the late 1990s there was an attempt by the Duma defence committee to develop a draft law on civilian control of the military giving parliament a greater role in security issues.⁷⁹ This bill was an attempt to legally regulate control over the military by civilian society.⁸⁰ Due to the political changes to the composition of the Duma in the 1999 elections and lack of parliamentary commitment to oversight this bill has not been developed. The Duma also has no oversight capacity over the government or its departments of state or defence and does not confirm the appointment of the Minister of Defence. The Russian imperial and Soviet State has no history of democratic control of its armed forces. During the Soviet era the military was under political control but this is not the same as civilian or democratic oversight. The military in Russia has developed a culture of secrecy, lack of respect for non-military experts, and military participation and control over issues of security and defence.

The ability to influence, shape and debate the defence budget is severely constrained by Russia's military culture which gives rise to institutional barriers. These are compounded by the lack of an effective mechanism of supervision within the Duma. The culture of secrecy and military control around issues of defence denies the Russian parliament a role in checking defence spending and priorities. By the late 1990s the issue of secrecy had emerged as a significant barrier to parliamentary oversight. Between 1998-2000 the defence budget was presented to parliament with only three, very general, non-classified lines dealing with maintenance of the armed forces, mobilisation and nuclear programmes.⁸¹ There is some suggestion that 2003 might mark the year of greater transparency in the military budget. With the proposed increase of more than twenty percent in the defence budget, the Deputy Prime Minister Alexei Kudrin promised to make more than half of the budgets spending articles available to the State Duma during the second and

⁷⁸ Ibid.

⁷⁹ For details of draft law see Yuri A Ivanov, 'Legal, Political and Budgetary Aspects of Civilian Control of the Military in Russia', in D Betz, **Army and State in Postcommunist Europe**, Frank Cass 2001.

⁸⁰ Ibid., p.14

third reading.⁸² However, the power of the Duma as a body of information about defence is still severely limited, as there is no open debate on defence issues within the parliament. This ensures that there is little public information or civil society involvement in the shaping and debate on defence and security issues in the Russian Federation. In September 2002, following the crash of a transport helicopter, the Defence Minister Sergei Ivanov was invited to present a report to the Duma on the state of the Russian armed forces. Forty-seven deputies of the Duma wanted the hearing to be open but the Duma council turned down this request.⁸³ David Betz outlines an additional way in which military culture prohibits effective parliamentary oversight.⁸⁴ He argues that parliamentarians are unwilling to secure the security clearance necessary to effectively scrutinize the budget.⁸⁵ The explicit link between security clearance and the possible constraints imposed on individual parliamentarians has a strong deterrent effect on anyone interested in public scrutiny of the defence budget as well as ensuring that the military, through its 'soldier-politicians', continues to exercise control.

The Duma's lack of any real lawmaking capacity on military issues suggests not only that little real progress has been made in institutionalising democratic control and oversight but that parliament is not performing effectively its roles of representing and protecting civil society. The recent passage by Putin of the bill on alternative military service in the version that was originally proposed by the General Staff, despite appeals for amendment from opposition parties, suggests that the Russian parliament has very little real influence over military matters. The Russian constitution enshrines the right to alternative community service (AGS) on religious and pacifist grounds. In early 2002 the submission of a draft bill on AGS by the General Staff along with three others gave the military considerable influence

⁸¹ For details and a discussion see Alexi Arbatov, 'Why Keep Secret Military budget?' **Moscow News** September 25-October 1 2002.

⁸² Alexander Sokolowski, 'Grounds for Optimism', **Moscow Times**, October 21 2002.

⁸³ Vadim Soloviov, 'An extremely neglected security issue building a new army is easier than reforming the old one', **Nezavisimaya Gazeta**, September 12 2002 as reported in CDI Russia Weekly, <http://www.cdi.org/rissoa/222-5-pr.cfm>.

⁸⁴ David Betz, 'No Place for a Civilian?: Russian Defense Management from Yeltsin to Putin', **Armed Forces & Society**, 28/3 March 2002, p.481-505.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*

over the debate and the final version.⁸⁶ The government and military backed bill was passed in June 2002 and has been criticised as ‘a victory for the military lobby’.⁸⁷ In the bill, draftees have to prove their beliefs to a special committee in order to qualify for alternative service: it will be up to the military to decide where to send conscripts. It is not clear how this new law will work in practise, but it does highlight the disproportionate influence of the military, not the parliament, on lawmaking in defence issues in the Russian Federation.

Military assistance programmes can play a vital role in encouraging democratic control and democratic professionalism in Russia, and such programmes would target one of the key barriers to SSR – military culture. The programmes to Russia all contain an important normative element of supporting the development of the norms of democratic control over defence and security issues in both civilians and military personnel. Vertical programmes of military interoperability and training also have this normative element that aims to instil by association and interaction the values of democratic control. These programmes could be optimised by changing gradually Russia’s military culture so that the military begin to accept civilian and democratic control and accountability. Targeting education programmes at the Russian parliament and the soldier politicians could be a way of encouraging greater democratic control.

Professional democratic military training and education is an additional essential component of security sector reform and one in which military assistance programmes have played a key role. However, these need to be refocused to meet the exact requirements of the Russian military so as to maximise their impact. In Russia, there is a clear need for reform of military training and without this the effect of the vertical military assistance programmes outlined above will be limited. Military training in Russia is hampered by a lack of criteria to assess the quality of training, the absence of a clear link between mission, weapon system and training, growing disunity in training specialists across the power

⁸⁶ Mikhail Zherbyatev, ‘Alternative Community Service in Russia: The results of ten years of debate’, Prism, 8/2 February 28 2002, The Jamestown Foundation.

⁸⁷ Alexander Barannikov as quoted by Oksana Yablokova, ‘Alternative Service Bill Approved’, **The Moscow Times**, June 20 2002.

ministries and lack of appropriate funding. Valery Mironov claims that not only is there no criteria to assess military training or even estimate training costs of military personnel, but there is also no mechanism by which the efficiency of troop's activities at the tactical and operational level is fed back into, and leads to an adjustment in, military training.⁸⁸ This problem is further compounded by the lack of a federal body responsible for military training in Russia. In 1998 there were 125 military colleges and academies where 150,000 officers from Russia, the CIS and other countries trained. These are made up of colleges and academies run by the Defence Ministry which train military specialist for the Armed forces and 15 other ministries and government agencies. The remaining schools belong to the other law enforcement agencies that constitute the security sector. This leads to parochialism and competition for scarce resources and diminishes the prospects for increased transparency and accountability both to the public purse and to civil society. As part of the remit of widening programmes to include the 'grey sector' of Russian forces, military assistance programmes need to work with the Russians to develop a revised plan of training that covers all security forces and links training with military reform and doctrine.

The influence of the military assistance programmes discussed above will be hampered, however, by the lack of a civil society and the lack of the development of liberal norms and values within Russia. The Russian Constitution upholds international standards of human and civil rights. In 1998 these rights were further extended with the ratification of the European Convention on Human Rights, which allows Russian citizens to file appeals with the European Court in Strasbourg. However, lengthy periods of detention, arbitrary arrest, the systematic use of 'hazing' against military recruits, the use of torture and murder as well as discrimination against women and ethnic and religious minorities all remain serious problems in the Russian Federation. Civil liberties have declined in the Russian Federation, particularly in Chechnya, as detention, extortion and the use of torture have been used systematically by the Russian military to subdue the population. While

⁸⁸ Valery Mironov, 'Reform of the Military training system in Russia', **Military Parade**, January-February 1998.

Russia has a nominally free press, the government exerts considerable pressure on journalists and media organisations not to criticise or challenge policy. Television stations that take an independent line of the Kremlin have been subject to strong legal pressures such as criminal or tax investigations that have made it difficult for them to operate as independent stations. Ensuring press freedom is even more difficult in Russia's regions where media outlets are heavily dependent on authorities for financial subsidies and are particularly vulnerable to harassment and intimidation. Reporters Without Borders are highly critical of Putin's regressive steps aimed at controlling the media in Russia. In its annual report 2002 it lists a catalogue of media takeovers by government backed energy companies, the systematic crack down on the media after 9/11 and the use of terror tactics including violence and murder against journalists that do not conform to the Kremlin's line on Chechnya.⁸⁹

While the lack of progress made by Russia in the development of a civil society and the institutional trappings of democracy hampers the effectiveness of military assistance programmes, the process of deepening access could go some way to ameliorating these problems. It is clear that military assistance programmes alone cannot build an effective civic culture in Russia, but what they can do is identify, and if appropriate support, particular groups within Russia who have democratic credentials and an interest in military and defence issues. The teams involved in military assistance programmes develop privileged and unprecedented access to senior Russian civilian and military personnel. This access can be extended and expanded to include interested groups within Russian society. Military assistance could also provide impartial and apolitical specialist information to key groups that make up the security sector to overcome an entrenched culture of secrecy.

⁸⁹ Reporters without borders, 'Russia – Annual report 2002', http://www.rsf.org.article.php3?id_article=1799.

5. Military assistance programmes to Ukraine

The US military assistance budget to Ukraine has been larger than the Russian and has a larger vertical component. This reflects Ukraine's commitment to military reform and restructuring and US goals of encouraging an independent, democratic, non-nuclear, market-orientated Ukraine that is increasingly integrated into the security architecture of Europe. The majority of the IMET programme is vertical - aimed at improving Ukrainian military readiness in a broad range of functional areas. This included English Language training, supply officer training, defence resource management, military engineering, military police instruction and military air traffic control training.⁹⁰ These vertical links were further reinforced by the Foreign Military Financing (FMF) programme which allows recipient states to finance the acquisition of US defence articles, services and training through grants and loans with the aim of fostering regional security. Ukraine has purchased US military training using FMF grant funds to advance its NATO interoperability and Partnership for Peace participation. The IMET programme also included a horizontal element. The US funded programmes in Ukraine on civil military relations, the creation and maintenance of effective military justice and the development of military codes of ethics. Further reinforcing these horizontal elements, and indicating the priority the US and Ukraine attach to democratisation and improving civil military relations, the US DoD funded 40 Ukrainian students to study these issues at the George C. Marshall Centre for Security Studies.

The UK programme of outreach to Ukraine is larger and more extensive than that to Russia, containing both a vertical and horizontal component. As part of the attempt to increase interoperability the UK has an extensive programme of language training for junior and middle ranking officers involved in PSO and PfP. The British Council, based in Kiev, and operating in 12 other sites, has taught English to over 1000 Ukrainian Officers during 2002.⁹¹ The UK also provides considerable in country training in the form of 'train the trainer' programmes. This is an effective way of reaching a larger number of military personnel in

⁹⁰ Ibid, Part III. Foreign Policy Papers – Newly Independent States – Ukraine.

Ukraine and accelerating the process of interoperability. A large part of the outreach to Ukraine is the provision of training for Peace Support interoperability. This includes reciprocal visits, exercises conducted in the spirit of PfP and exchanges. In November 2002 a British destroyer visited Odessa and conducted naval training with the Ukrainians. In September 2002 exercise Cossack Express took place in Yavoriv training area in Ukraine. This was a combined Ukrainian-British army exercise designed to increase military to military contacts and enhance interoperability. In the same month the UK participated in a trilateral peacekeeping exercise with Polish and Ukrainian forces. The UK also has extensive high-level political and military visits to Ukraine. In September 2002 the UK Defence Minister visited his counterpart and the Ukrainian President. At a more operational level the RAF and the Navy both scheduled visit to Ukraine in 2002 to increase interoperability and understanding. The UK also has a sizable vertical professional training programme to Ukraine. This includes staff training at military colleges in the UK. NCO training by the British Military Advisory and Training Team (BMATT) is also part of professional military training where UK teams 'train the trainers' to enable them to develop democratically accountable armed forces. In January and February 2003 BMATT conducted and supervised training of Ukrainian Peacekeeping Troops in Yavoriv and Zhitomyr in Ukraine.⁹² Officer training was also conducted in the UK at the three single service colleges.⁹³ In the same way as the UK set up a bespoke SSR programme to Russia, it has plans to extend this to Ukraine. In 2003 the British Embassy in Ukraine established plans to set up a Ukrainian resettlement programme where military officers made redundant through restructuring can prepare for civilian life.

NATO's relationship with Ukraine is very different to Russia and this is reflected in the type as well as the breadth of SSR programmes conducted in this country. In 2001 the Ukrainian government declared its intention of seeking full integration into Euro-Atlantic

⁹¹ Details taken from British Ukrainian Bilateral Military Links, Britain in Ukraine web site, <http://www.britemb-ukraine.net/defence>.

⁹² Taken from British Ukrainian Bilateral Military Links, Britain in Ukraine web site, <http://www.britemb-ukraine.net/defence>.

structures and this has subsequently given NATO a greater ability to influence and shape Ukraine's transition both in the security sector and more importantly its democratic transition. It is the ability to link Ukraine's desire for membership to internal political and social change across all of Ukrainian society gives NATO its unique position as a provider of SSR to Ukraine.⁹⁴ Bilateral providers of SSR have far less ability to influence and shape Ukraine's democratic transition. As was argued earlier, successful security sector reform is a vital and inseparable component of the larger process of democratisation and any attempt to do one without the other is likely to result in the failure of both.

The signing of the Charter on a Distinctive Partnership between Ukraine and NATO in 1997 paved the way for the alliance to play a positive role in facilitating reform in this newly independent state. SSR is conducted through the Ukraine-NATO Commission, meetings under the 19+1 formula, joint working groups, reciprocal high-level visits, expert exchanges, and a crisis consultative mechanism. The NATO-Ukraine Commission (NUC) of Ministers in 2001 set out a 12 point action plan supporting three key decisions to synergise NATO's programmes to Ukraine.⁹⁵ These are: to extend the focus of the Joint Working Group on Defence Reform to include broader security sector reforms, to use the PfP Planning and Review Process as a tool to support Ukraine's State Plan for Reform of the armed forces and to strengthen support of bi-lateral cooperation for defence reform. The JWGDR, working under the NUC, is the key focal point for NATO-Ukraine defence and security cooperation. Using the Planning and Review Process (PARP), the JWGDR aims are two fold - to increase the interoperability of Ukrainian forces, and to set the priorities for Ukrainian defence reform. The PARP has been used to develop a State Plan for Reform of the Armed Forces. During 2001 this has meant that Ukraine and NATO have worked closely on the development of National Defence Reform Objectives. In a clear sign of NATO playing a far wider role in Ukraine's transition both in the security sector and more generally

⁹³ Details taken from DRAFT 2002 Bilateral Programme –Ukraine, DCEE Dated 5 October 2001.

⁹⁴ For a discussion of Ukraine's decision to join NATO see, Oleg Varfolomeyev, 'Ukraine Turns to NATO', Transitions Online, 14 June 2002.

⁹⁵ NATO-Ukraine Cooperation on defence reform, <http://www.ukraine.be/NATO/defence.html>

in its democratic transition an action plan was created at the Prague Summit in November 2002, as part of the agreement by the NUC to deepen and broaden the NATO-Ukraine relationship.⁹⁶ The action plan is divided into five sections the last of which outlines how the plan will be implemented. Highlighting the crucial link between security sector reform and democratisation the first section deals, in considerable detail, with institution building and the rights of Ukrainian citizens. The second section deals with security sector reform and details objectives that include enhancing interoperability with NATO forces. Section three and four detail with information protection and legal issues.

This plan is not without its critics and it remains to be seen whether Ukraine has the will or capacity to implement such an ambitious programme of reform across all sections of Ukrainian society.⁹⁷ However, it is clear that bilateral military assistance programmes to Ukraine by members of NATO are increasingly coordinated to support the NATO-Ukraine Action Plan.⁹⁸ This coordination will reduce the duplication in many of the programmes of NATO member states to Ukraine and will give NATO increased leverage in other areas of reform. The proposed NATO Individual Partnership Programme to Ukraine for 2003 is largely vertical though it does contain some horizontal areas of cooperation.⁹⁹ To support interoperability there is an extensive programme of English Language training, military exercises and related training activities. As well as more specialist training in air defence, peacekeeping, and command and control. The two areas of cooperation with normative and horizontal elements are Democratic Control of Forces and Defence Structures (DCF) and Military Education Training and Doctrine (TRD).¹⁰⁰ The first of these areas of co-operation contains only one programme, suggesting a lack of commitment on behalf of the Ukrainians to dealing with difficult issues of transition. The second of these areas of normative

⁹⁶ For details see, 'NATO-Ukraine Action Plan' NATO Basic Texts, Prague 22 November 2002, <http://www.nato.int/docu/basiczt/b02122a.htm>.

⁹⁷ For an insightful criticism of the Action plan see, Anatoliy Grytsenko, 'What did the Ukrainian authorities promise NATO', **Zerkalo Nedeli**, No.3 (428) 25 June 2003. http://www.uceps.com.ua/eng.all.publications/publicat_1161_eng.shtml.

⁹⁸ Private Interviews with Defence Attaches in Kiev conducted by the author.

⁹⁹ Copy of IPP received from NATO-Ukraine Liaison in Kiev.

¹⁰⁰ All of these programmes are already established and PfP partners select from a Partnership Work Programme, which they want to participate in. Ukraine's IPP contains all but three of the areas of

cooperation contains a larger selection of programmes but these tend to be more about military training, i.e. interoperability, than military education and reform.

These coordinated military assistance programmes to Ukraine have been fairly successful in increasing the prospects for military reform and democratic control of the armed forces in Ukraine. They are hampered however by the failure to take a deeper approach and to target military programmes at other sectors of the security community.

Internal barriers to effective SSR programmes in Ukraine

Like Russia, Ukraine has three internal barriers that hamper the ability of the external military assistance programmes to engage in the transformation of the SSR: a lack of progress and commitment to military reform; a lack of democratic oversight of SSR; and little progress has been made in the development of an effective civil defence and security society.

As was outlined earlier Ukraine has embarked upon military reform under NATO's umbrella. This gives greater coordination to externally funded SSR programmes as the UK and the US tailor their programmes to meet the agreed NATO-Ukraine reform targets. Although considerable progress has been made this is hampered by the lack of overall commitment by Ukraine to the reform process and the dire state of the economy. Ukraine's inability to shake off its Soviet legacy also hampers the prospects for reform. There is a lack of transparency in decision-making by the President and his administration, an unwillingness to delegate, and a lack of balance between responsibility and authority. The effectiveness of the three externally funded programmes to Ukraine outlined earlier are hampered by the lack of democratic civilian control over the military. Although democratic control is more than civilian control the lack of the latter in Ukraine indicates the lack of commitment of the executive to the former. Since independence Ukraine has had only one civilian defence minister and the current defence minister, Vladimir Shkidchenko is an Army General with

cooperation. These are, small arms and light weapons, meteorological support and Military infrastructure.

considerable military experience.¹⁰¹ Andriy Bychenko, a Ukrainian defence analyst, claims that a civilian appointment in Ukraine would indicate that society and parliament controls the defence establishment not the military.¹⁰² For President Kuchma however, the appointment of a loyal military General ensures he continues to exercise executive control over defence issues.

Despite carefully working out a programme of reform with NATO, Ukraine's defence budget has been steadily declining in real terms and is inadequate to maintain, let alone expand, to meet the costly reform process.¹⁰³ The State Programme of Armed Forces Reform and Development plan was published in June 2000 and offers a revised timeline of 2015 for defence reform. It outlines a three-stage process with the aim of moving to a professional, mobile, well-equipped and trained military by 2015. However there is an imbalance between the ambitious plans and the resources available to fund them. For instance, the cost of moving to a professional standing army is likely to be sizable. An effective policy of recruiting and retaining high quality personnel is predicated on a substantial improvement in the current poor living standards and conditions of the armed forces.¹⁰⁴ Because much of Ukraine's military equipment will reach the limits of its usefulness by 2005, Ukraine will have to make some hard choices about the balance between equipment and personnel.¹⁰⁵ Over half of the armaments in the Ukrainian army require replacement or upgrades and about seventy percent require complete overhaul.¹⁰⁶ The situation in the air force is particularly acute with less than fifty percent of aircraft and sixteen percent of helicopters operating.¹⁰⁷

Despite early positive signs that the Ukrainian parliament, the Verkhovna Rada, was likely to shape Ukraine's civil military relations and transformation this has not proven to be

¹⁰¹ Alexander Gorobets, 'Kuchma likes generals: New defence minister of Ukraine is a military man as well', **Pravda Ru Kiev**, 13 November 2001

¹⁰² Andriy Bychenko, 'Civilian Control over the military in the context of parliamentary elections', **National Security and Defence**, No.1 (25) February 2002.

¹⁰³ Parchomenko, op cit.

¹⁰⁴ For a discussion of the many problems with the Ukrainian armed forces see, W Parchomenko, op cit.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid. p.68.

the case. In the early years of independence the Rada played a pivotal role in the establishing of an independent Ukrainian military. In 1991 the Rada passed the Declaration of Independence that included a resolution creating the Ukrainian Defence Ministry, the Armed Forces of Ukraine and National Guard and subordinating all troops on former Soviet troops to the parliament. Since then its role has diminished sharply and it has become increasingly marginalized, exerting little influence over military or defence issues. Constitutionally, the Ukrainian Rada plays a larger role in security issues than the Russian parliament although its powers are limited compared to the President.¹⁰⁸ Its main areas of responsibility are approving the defence budget, adopting laws on defence and security and implementing them, determining the principles of foreign policy and declaring war. The role of the Rada is constrained by its lack of access to detailed information and resistance from the executive to effective parliamentary oversight.

The lack of openness and transparency by the government in defence issues severely hampers the ability of the Rada to oversee or to formulate policy in this area. A good example is the failure of the Ukrainian government to publish information about the activity and state of the security sectors or the direction of Ukraine's foreign policy. Bychenko, a Ukrainian defence analyst, suggests that to remedy this information deficit and improve democratic control over defence the government needs to begin publication of key defence reports on a periodic basis.¹⁰⁹ He includes in his list a White paper on the defence policy of Ukraine and annual reports on defence and law enforcement budget performances.¹¹⁰ The Rada's influence over foreign policy is also constrained by the tendency of the President to implement policy by decree, thereby bypassing parliament. Natalie Mychajlyszyn argues that 'the president has at times issued decrees, taken initiatives, and set policies, including Ukraine's participation in NATO's partnership for Peace

¹⁰⁶ 'Ukraine Adopts Systemic Approach to Defense Reform', Interview with the head of the Ukrainian State Commission for the Defense Industry Complex Volodymyr Horbuilin, as reported by the Centre for Analysis of Strategies and Technologies, **Eskport Vooruzheniy Journal**, Jan-Feb 2002.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid.

¹⁰⁸ For a discussion of this division see Grigoriy Perepelitsa, 'Development of Civil-Military Relations in Ukraine', **Democratic Control of the Military in Postcommunist Europe**, op cit, pp233-247.

¹⁰⁹ Bychenko, op cit.

(PfP) and the diversion of funds from the AFU (Armed Forces of Ukraine) to Special Forces that have had strong opponents in the Verkhovna Rada.¹¹¹ The President also attempts to bypass parliament over the issue of arms exports. Activity in this sphere is governed by presidential decrees and government resolutions and the executive branch holds an exclusive right to determine what information is published and when effectively denying any parliamentary or public oversight.¹¹²

The success of the external programmes is also hampered by the lack of progress Ukraine has made in developing a civic culture able to act as a check and balance on SSR. This is made up of many elements but two of the most important are the development of NGO's and the role of the media. Ukraine, unlike Russia, has made considerable progress in the development of civil society. The number of NGO's has grown significantly and by the end of 2001 there were approximately 35,000 in Ukraine.¹¹³ The development of a robust civil society is seen as the basis for sustainable democracy in newly independent states. NGO's in particular can serve as important instruments for increasing public awareness about issues and advocacy. They also play an invaluable role in holding governments accountable for their decisions. This is crucial in military issues as the military reflects and is shaped by society. NGO activity in Ukraine is largely focused around public health, social welfare, social/political, advocacy or cultural/art organisation with citizens still reluctant to participate generally and very few NGO's focusing on defence or security issues.¹¹⁴ While there are almost fifty nongovernmental research centres in Ukraine only about a dozen are active in the defence sphere and their impact is extremely limited due to the lack of transparency and openness of government. The role of society, interest groups, the media,

¹¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹¹ Natalie Mychajlyszyn, 'Civil-Military Relation in Post-Soviet Ukraine: Implications for Domestic and Regional Stability', **Armed Forces and Society**, 28/3 spring 2002, pp.455-479, 462.

¹¹² See Leonid Polyakov, 'Managing the Challenge of illegal Arms Transfers', Conflict Studies Research Centre, May 2003.

¹¹³ Cited in Adrian Karatnycky and Amanda Schnetzer (eds.) **Nations in transit 2002. Civil Society, Democracy and Markets in East Central Europe and the Newly Independent states**, New Brunswick, 2002, pp.401-405.

¹¹⁴ V Naniwska, 'NGO Development in Ukraine' International Centre for Policy Studies, Kyiv, July 2001.

NGO's, think tanks and political parties, in influencing and shaping the debate around defence issues in Ukraine remains extremely weak.¹¹⁵

Democratic accountability is also hampered by the severe restrictions on the freedom of the press. A report on Ukraine by Human Rights Watch argues that press freedoms have been seriously curtailed in Ukraine during the last few years.¹¹⁶ In the same way that fear and intimidation of journalist promotes self-censorship in Russia these tactics also result in the same outcome in Ukraine. Journalist operate in a climate of fear where criticising the regime can result in being beaten to death, imprisoned, or fined. Officially there are no restrictions on the press in Ukraine. Unofficially, the Kuchma government uses what are termed 'temniki' which are texts in which editors are told what the presidential administration want to see covered and how news items should be presented.¹¹⁷ The New York-based organization Human Rights Watch described these directives as 'subtle but effective censorship'.¹¹⁸

The current President, Leonid Kuchma has come to be seen as one of the main obstacles to democratic progress in Ukraine. He has thwarted the formal political structures of democracy while undermining the liberal nature of Ukrainian society. The President remains the key political actor within the political system in Ukraine with the power to dismiss government members and veto legislation. Kuchma has demonstrated clear authoritarian trends, most notably with the attempt to strengthen further the power of the President of Ukraine with the Referendum in April 2000. As part of this concentration of power Kuchma has also surrounded himself with tough and powerful cadre who owe their primary loyalty to the president and not to the people. In addition, Kuchma has forced the resignation of the National Bank Governor Volodymyr Stelmakh and replaced him with

¹¹⁵ Stacy R Closson, 'Civil-Military Relations in a Sovereign Ukraine; Contributing or Detracting from the Security of a New Nation?' in J Moroney, T Kuzio and M Molchanov, **Ukrainian Foreign and Security Policy**, Praeger, 2002, pp.113-131.

¹¹⁶ 'Negotiating the News: Informal State Censorship of Ukrainian Television', Human Rights Watch, 15/2, March 2003.

¹¹⁷ For a discussion of this see the speech by Andriy Shevchnko on public hearing and the media and censorship in Verkhovna Rada in Kiev on December 4th 2002, as reproduced in **The Ukraine List**, UKL 189.

¹¹⁸ Taken from Maryann Bird, 'No News is Bad News', **Time Europe**, December 23, Vol 160 No.26.

Serhy Tygypko. This appointment dealt a heavy blow to the opposition, as the bank has a range of powers not least of which is the potential to harass pro-opposition financial institutions.

Allegations against the president that he was involved in the murder of a journalist, that he misused the 'administrative resource' in an attempt to secure support and control of the Rada and broke UN sanctions by selling arms to Iraq have all damaged Kuchma and ultimately Ukraine's democratic credentials. Further damaging Kuchma's reputation and ultimately Ukraine's transition towards democracy has been the allegations on the tapes made by Kuchma's bodyguard, Major Mykola Melnychenko, that the president approved the sale of four sophisticated radar systems to Iraq through an unidentified Jordanian middleman. An investigation in late 2002 by a team of British experts and US did little to improve Kuchma's domestic and international standing when it concluded that the illegal transfer of arms 'remains a credible possibility'.¹¹⁹

Ukraine's journey along the long road towards democracy has been bumpy and appears to have hit a sizeable roadblock with Kuchma's consolidation of power and his international and domestic isolation. Ukraine has the formal institutional trappings of democracy but under the weight of a strong autocratic leader, these have failed to become an effective check and balance on the power of the executive. Subsequently, the legislative branch and by extension the electorate, exert very little influence over the shape and direction of foreign policy. The various, pro-reform parties which achieved such notable success in the elections in March 2002 to the Rada have been unable to translate this victory into an effective check or means of exerting influence on SSR.¹²⁰

¹¹⁹ 'Report of the experts team visit to Ukraine', October 13-20 2002 as published in **The Ukraine List** (UKL) 188, 2 December 2002.

¹²⁰ For a discussion of this point see Valeriy Chaly, Mikhail Pahkov, 'Foreign Policy for Domestic use', **Zerkalo Nedeli**, 45/420 23 November 2002

6. Military assistance programmes and relations between Russia and Ukraine

Drawing on the ideas developed in section two from the democratic peace theory literature this section argues that the progress made so far, as well as the proposals for improvement discussed above, will play a role in improving and strengthening relations between Russia and Ukraine. Combining the monadic aspects of democratic peace theory, outlined in section two with the idea of the democratic spill over of Kant's perpetual peace suggests that military assistance programmes have played a role in improving relations in two key ways: in creating a peaceful environment in which Russia no longer feels threatened as is able to normalise relations with former Soviet neighbours; and in continuing to encourage SSR and to link this to democratisation in both Ukraine and Russia.

The changing strategic environment in which they operate directly affects relations between Russia and Ukraine. Domestic political developments in both these states do not take place in a vacuum and are shaped by, as well as shape, foreign policy. The terrorist attack on the world trade centre in the US created the potential for a strategic realignment between East and West.¹²¹ Despite the Russian opposition to war in Iraq, there has been a steady improvement in relations between Russia and the US. Even prior to 9/11 Russia's relations with the West had been recovering from the low point of 1999 following NATO's air campaign in Kosovo. President Putin has pursued a pragmatic foreign policy aimed at advancing Russia's economic and political interests. This includes active engagement with the West to attract foreign investments and to ensure favourable external conditions for facilitating a market orientated economy in Russia.

The Russian Federation has been extremely supportive of US attempts to form an anti-terrorist coalition and Putin took a gamble in further supporting the US-led attack against the Taliban in Afghanistan.¹²² Putin provided diplomatic and military support to this campaign. He shared intelligence on Taliban and al-Qaeda training camps, opened

¹²¹ For a discussion of this see Oksana Antonenko, 'Putin's Gamble', *Survival* 43/4 Winter 2001-2, pp.49-60.

Russian airspace, supplied the Northern Alliance with military equipment including tanks and APCs and did not oppose Central Asian states offering logistical support to the US military. In the diplomatic sphere Putin supported UN Security Council Resolution 1373, which endorsed US military action against the Taliban. This clear rapprochement between Russia and the US has had a positive spill over effect in also improving relations between Russia and NATO. Russia did not oppose the recent round of enlargement and has consolidated its role and key position by active participation in the NATO-Russian Council.¹²³ This thaw in relations and greater co-operation with the West has allowed greater access and a larger role for military assistance programmes. Both the NATO and the UK programmes to Russia have been enlarged and expanded. This reflects a greater willingness to co-operate and gives these programmes more ability to influence SSR and to further encourage openness and transparency between former adversaries. Military assistance programmes therefore provide a concrete way of demonstrating better relations and by increasing interaction further reinforce and accelerate this trend. Closer co-operation with the US and NATO will also allow Russia to view relations with neighbours through a new non-Cold War prism. A strategic realignment between Russia and the West will gradually affect how Russia views Ukraine, although this will be continue to be influenced by their shared past. In a sign of how improving relations between East and West is affecting relations between Russia and Ukraine, Russia did not oppose Ukraine's decision to join NATO in the future.

The second way in which military assistance programmes can promote good relations is by encouraging Ukraine's SSR and its development into a mature democratic state. The monadic variant claims that the more democratic an individual state is, irrespective of its proposed partner, the more peaceful will be its foreign policy and the better will be relations. This suggests that if NATO can promote democratisation in Ukraine then this will create a stable peaceful state to Russia's west and encourage

¹²² Ibid.

Ukraine to pursue co-operation rather than conflict with its larger neighbour. As was outlined in the first part of this paper, relations between these two states have normalised during the last few years. This can be partially explained by the progress Ukraine has made in SSR and democratisation. Paradoxically, part of the explanation can also be traced to declining western interest in Ukraine. While the military assistance programmes to Ukraine have continued, relations between the US and Ukraine, in particular, have declined rapidly.¹²⁴ Ukraine has been heavily criticised by the US for its alleged sale of four sophisticated radar systems to Iraq as well as being a haven for terrorist money laundering.¹²⁵ Ukraine has also been accused of the sale of pontoon bridges to Iraq. The subsequent demotion of Ukraine combined with the allegations made against Ukraine's president, have pushed Ukraine firmly to the periphery of Europe.¹²⁶ The decision by Ukraine to send a NBC battalion to Iraq and the proposal to send 1,800 troops to the Polish sector in post-conflict Iraq has led to a slight improvement in relations with the US.¹²⁷ It is clear however, that for Ukraine to consolidate and improve relations with the West and Russia it is necessary for it to focus on the issue of democratisation. Military assistance programmes therefore have a vital role to play in facilitating SSR in Ukraine. Given that there is considerable domestic support for closer cooperation with Russia, Ukraine's increased democratisation, is likely to increase rather than decrease this trend in the future. In early 2002 the Sociological Services of the Razumkov Centre conducted a poll, which examined public opinion of Ukraine's foreign policy orientation and priorities and found that over 60% of those surveyed thought that Ukraine should deepen co-operation with Russia.¹²⁸ A similar survey of political parties and blocs who were

¹²³ Michael Binyon, 'Kremlin enjoys the fruits of its foreign policy', World News, The Times Online, <http://www.timesonline.cl.uk/article/0,,3-487271,00.html>

¹²⁴ Oleksandr Pavliuk, 'An Unfulfilling Partnership: Ukraine and the West, 1991-2001' **European Security**, 11/1 (Spring 2002) pp.81-101.

¹²⁵ 'Ukraine under pressure over Iraq', BBC News 26 September 2002, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/europe/2283620.stm>

¹²⁶ For a discussion see Taras Kuzio, 'Nato membership for Ukraine not likely before 2012', RFE/RL Newline, 21 February 2003.

¹²⁷ 'Polish-Led Iraqi force has been formed'. Defense Ministry AFP, 6 June 2003, as reported in NATO Enlargement Daily Brief, Friday, 06 June 2003.

¹²⁸ 'Ukraine's foreign policy: The positions and assessment of citizens', **National Security & Defence**, 2/26, March 2002.

participating in the elections to the Rada found that the majority of political forces emphasise the need to deepen relations with the Russian Federation.¹²⁹ These findings indicate that there is considerable support within Ukrainian society for greater co-operation, albeit as an equal, with the Russian Federation. If Ukraine continues along the democratic path and public opinion and the legislature play an increasing role in shaping foreign policy then it is clear that relations will continue to develop positively with Moscow. Similarly, if a pro-reform candidate wins the presidential election in 2004 then relations are likely to continue to mature.

The dyadic discussed in section two also suggests that the expansion and deepening of military assistance programmes to Russia will also facilitate good neighbourly relations with Ukraine. The improving relations between east and west allow the bilateral and multilateral donor's to build on the benign security environment and the progress made so far and targets their military assistance at a wider and deeper audience. This would encourage SSR and democratisation in Russia. If Russia and Ukraine both made progress towards democratisation then the democratic peace theory dyadic suggests that relations could improve further. Democratic peace theory claims that there are structural and normative barriers to conflict. The structural barriers are predicated on a consolidated democracy where leaders are constrained in their foreign policy decisions by the need for approval by the cabinet, legislature and the electorate. These institutional constraints would result in cautious foreign policy behaviour by both Russia and Ukraine towards one another. According to the normative school, democratic political culture also encourages co-operation rather than conflict. Democratic decision makers expect the leaders of other democracies to follow the norms of compromise in their foreign policy and therefore not radically shift direction. This is particularly true in Ukraine where a majority of the public support closer co-operation with Russia.

¹²⁹ 'Foreign Policy: Positions of the leaders of parties and blocs', **National Security & Defence**, 2/26 March 2002.

Conclusion

This paper has argued that foreign military assistance programmes have had some success, albeit in different ways, and this will have a positive effect on relations between Russia and Ukraine. The programmes to Russia have played an important role in ameliorating historical mistrust and suspicion by improving dialogue and contact with its former Cold War adversaries. This has helped create a benign security environment in which Russia can normalise relations with neighbours. The military programmes to Ukraine have developed the momentum necessary for reform and an agreed roadmap. This has opened up the possibility of a move from partial to consolidated democracy in Ukraine in the future. Increased democratisation in Ukraine will create the necessary environment for good relations between these two states.

In order to optimise this success, however, the larger issue of democratisation taking place within these recipient states has to be addressed. Successful SSR in Russia and Ukraine is conditional on encouraging and facilitating democratisation through the further widening and deepening of these programmes. Democratisation in both Ukraine and Russia will strengthen the prospects for good neighbourly relations.