

Introduction

A close NATO-Russia relationship may not mean agreement in each and every case. Yet we should be able to achieve a relationship where disagreement in one area does not hinder progress in another.

Lord George Robertson (1)

More than ten years has passed since the time when Russia came to the world scene as an independent actor of international relations. During this complicated, full of challenges and irreversible consequences period Russia has been trying to shape well-balanced foreign policy, based on national interests, pragmatism and economic effectiveness. Being the greatest Eurasian State, Russia is playing a key role on the continent, which is representing, according to Z. Brzezinski expression a “Chess-board on which the struggle for the global supremacy is continuing”. (2) Russian prestige and stable position in the world affairs will depend on the condition of how right it will build up her policy on the continent. In this context NATO’s – Russia relations consider to be one of the prioritize directions in the foreign policy of our state and international relations in general. From the point of the global changes in international relations, the problem of Russia and NATO is leading to the question which world is replacing the bipolar one: multipolar or unipolar? In the context of international relations globalization NATO-Russia cooperation could also give an answer to the question whether it is possible to elaborate a common approach of different forces to the resolution of ethnical-political and religious conflicts and to create accordingly an effective system of international security. While discussing the possibilities of NATO-Russia relationship it should always be kept in mind their specific character and understanding that it will be very difficult to find an optimum equal format of relations between the sovereign state from the one side and international organization from another.

For Russian diplomacy NATO phenomena in international affairs has both pluses and minuses. From one point of view it is easier for Russia to solve Euro-Atlantic security problems with the Alliance, which includes the leading European and American states, rather than with each state separately, as far as NATO has a strong mechanism of decision making and realization of the coordinated activity of all the members. But the asymmetry of the “weight categories” of Russia and NATO makes it difficult to build up relationship on the equal base. First of all on economic and military indexes NATO excels Russia multiply. Secondly, Russia does not have “veto” right in the NATO decision-makings in particular in the

questions of Alliance enlargement, even at the expense of the former USSR republics.

The following factors influence on the evolution of NATO-Russia relations in the post-bipolar period: global changes in international relations, especially such challenges as threat from the un-stable regimes, international terrorism, dynamics of NATO evolution, Russian home policy and elaboration of the national security concept.

The basic goal of the research is to follow and analyze the dynamics of NATO-Russia relationship, to reveal the basic factors, which influence on them, try to find out how to avoid their total dependence from regional conflicts (how it's happened in spring 1999) and build up a solid base for the true strategic partnership. It must be acknowledged that while building such relationship up, it's impossible to ignore the national interests of Russia and NATO member states, which sometimes are contradictory. But the devotion to the common aim to supply stability on the European continent and understanding that without transparent relations and elaboration of common strategy it's impossible to reach it should prevail. This does not mean that national interests should be sacrificed for the common aim of course, but all the efforts should be directed to the creation of such model of relations, which would not contradict sharply to the interests of both sides and stimulate them for closer partnership. The strategic lines of NATO and Russia must be oriented not toward considerations of expediency, but toward the long-range interests of international society.

Originally research should cover the time from the early 1990s, when the end of the Cold War was declared (February 1992) and so called "post-bipolar system" came to change the bipolar confrontation. The period of 1991-1995 could be considered in NATO-Russia's relations as time for *modus vivendi* search. But it is very important to stress that in that period Russian Federation did not consider its relations with NATO as an independent and dominant. They were perceived by the most of political elite only as one of the components of Russian Federation European policy. This could be explained by the fact that Russian and some politicians from the West anticipated that with the end of Cold War mechanisms of the bipolar withstanding in Europe and first of all military-political blocks would disappear. According to these perceptions NATO should cease its existence like a Warsaw Treaty Organization in 1991. As far as the basic goal of NATO was to supply a collective defense in case of the armed attack from any alien side (i.e. Soviet Union) and with the disintegration of the USSR the *raison d'etre* for NATO disappeared as well. Very soon these illusions changed to the more realistic approach, which meant the necessity of NATO evolution, but not disappearance. Although many in Russia viewed NATO's continued existence as a betrayal.

In the period of early 1990s Russia was treated by NATO no differently than her ex “younger brothers” from former Warsaw Pact and former Soviet republics through the membership in North Atlantic Cooperation Council (presently Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council) and Partnership for Peace Program.

It’s possible to speak about the beginning of “real” NATO-Russia relations since 1996, when Eugeny Primakov was appointed as a foreign minister of Russian Federation and took a course of more assertive and influential Russia’s foreign policy. This course logically led to the new level of NATO-Russian relationship, when in May 1997, NATO-Russia Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security was signed in Paris. It has demonstrated that Russia would have a voice in the Euro-Atlantic security institutions and influence on their decision-making process through the Permanent Joint Council, created according to the Founding Act. That’s why the chronological frames of the research will cover time from 1997 till the end of 2002, when on Prague summit in November seven applicant states from Central and Eastern Europe were invited to join the Alliance.

As far as the research is devoted to the problem of search of the optimum format of NATO-Russia’s relations to supply the stable security in the Euro-Atlantic region it would be important to make accents on the following aspects:

- One of the most important and arguable questions, which at some extent could be a stumbling block for NATO-Russia relationship is NATO enlargement issue. Although the sharp criticism of that process has been overcome in Russian political circles, Russian Federation reaction on it is still very alert.
- NATO-Russia crisis management policy. It is supposed to investigate the possible ways of elaboration of the common NATO-Russian “crisis management” mechanism, to analyze how to avoid such turning-points in NATO-Russian security relations like conflict in Kosovo, when both sides were on the verge turning to enemies.
- Combating international terrorism and non-proliferation of mass destruction weapons. This problem has become especially topical after the September 11 events, which confirmed that only mutual efforts could manage with such danger.

The research is based on the method of counter-factual argument and comparative analysis for analyzing of NATO and Russia’s political strategies with regard to each other and for discussing various future developments of NATO-Russian relations, under different conditions.

Notes:

1. Robertson G. Challenges for the next decade // Nato's Nations. 50th Anniversary SHAPE Allied Command Europe. Issue 1., 2001. P.9.
2. Brzezinski Z. The grand chessboard. American primacy and its geostrategic imperatives. – Moscow: “Mezhdunarodnie otnosheniya”, 1999. P.4.

Chapter 1. Historiography of the research.

Large scale of primary sources such as NATO and Russia's strategic concepts, documents, declarations, speeches of political leaders, official statements, political reviews, analytical reports, list of which is presented in the bibliography has been analyzed.

Western and Russian authors' monographs and articles from various periodicals, where the issues of NATO-Russian relations are covered have been attracted to the research. It has allowed coming to the conclusion that NATO's topic is quite popular among the contemporary researches both in Russia and abroad and the question of NATO-Russian's relations is quite arguable. It was very important to be introduced to the whole palette of views on them.

As regards Russian researches, the most relevant to this topic are presented by T. Yurjeva and A. Utkin. (1) While analyzing NATO-Russian's relationship's historical background (in the 1990es) T. Yurjeva comes to the conclusion that their relationship in that period shows the development of two different approaches toward the issues of international and regional security. If Russian Federation stands on the point of multipolar world and equal participation of the all subjects of international relations in the security problems decision, NATO has come to it's jubilee with clear line on uni-polar world building under it's leadership. This causes the basic complications in NATO-Russian's relations.

The most full analysis of NATO place in the new system of international relations and Russian position is presented in monographs and articles written by the director of the Historical Researches Centre of the Institute of the USA and Canada – A. Utkin. Examining the prospects of NATO activity, the author is giving various predictions concerning NATO's future. Deeply analyzing all factors he comes to the conclusion that NATO is a powerful transatlantic organization and it's future sustainability depends on its relations with EU.

Russian specialists in the sphere of international relations, who examine this problem, could be divided on three categories:

- "NATO advocates", those who consider that NATO's enlargement is a positive, inevitable process and Russia should accept NATO as an enlarging friend, but not as an expanding adversary. (2) Such authors as D. Trenin, V. Makarenko, T. Parkhalina, T. Shakleina stand on the point that it is necessary to move away from the "Cold war" times and perceive NATO not as an enemy, but as an organization, which guarantees stability on the continent. (3) Director of the analytic-consultative Center "Stradyz" V.Makarenko argues that NATO is not threatening Russian national interests. He is taking general formula of

national interests, which is “sovereignty – territorial integrity – economic prosperity” and confirms that NATO enlargement or even Russia’s entrance to NATO will not break one of these components. (4) T. Shakleina is completely sure that in the future Russia has good chances to become NATO’s member. (5)

- “Pragmatics”, who acknowledge that NATO enlargement will not add security to the Russian borders, but more likely will lead to the new dividing lines. Nevertheless they consider that in order to neutralize the threat of Russia’s isolation, RF has no choice but to cooperate with NATO. (6) Moreover such authors as director of the Institute of globalization problems – M. Delyagin, director of the European Cooperation Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs – B. Kazantsev and editor in chief of the “Independent group of editors” – Vtreyakov think that RF should not worry about new NATO strategy and it’s advancement to the Russian borders, because this gives our political leaders good chances for the bargaining. (7) Researcher Y. Davidov argues that Russia does not possess resources to withstand the enlargement process. He suggests Moscow to find a way out from such situation by initiating a dialogue with NATO, developing strong peacekeeping base and single approach towards management with various ethnic-political conflicts. (8) Such politicians and journalists as V. Kremenyuk, A. Goltz and L. Velekhov closely connect Russian economic situation and necessity in Western investments and credits with the RF political line towards NATO as an influential Western institution. (9) Being a realistic politician Y. Primakov acknowledges that it is possible to develop good relations with NATO, but he notes that “in politics intentions change; but potentials are constant. I do not believe that NATO will attack us. But hypothetically the situation may arise when we’ll have to act against NATO’s interests”. (10)
- “NATO adversaries”, who express their negative attitude towards NATO openly and don’t believe in any positive developments of relations with Russia. V. Shtol – editor in chief of the journal “Observer” writes that “it is obvious that what NATO has done in Yugoslavia is just a repetition... USA and their allies are creating the belt of enemy states around Russia. (11) V. Terekhov accuses NATO in the shattering of international relations system created on the base of the UN Charter. (12) A. Galiev also expresses negative views on the Alliance. (13) S. Strelyaev goes so far to compare NATO with an experienced criminal, who is encircling himself by the unstable youth (new members from Central and Eastern Europe), attracting her by the temporary benefits. (14)

Summarizing all the above written it is possible to conclude that the issue of NATO-Russia’s relations is an attractive topic for the research. There

are few works in the Russian historiography, where the problem of NATO activity and enlargement in particular is considered like a positive factor for Russian Federation. Basically among the circles of specialists and decision-makings circles the attitudes towards this issue remain relatively negative, but with clear understanding that if Russia does not have potential to oppose NATO it should cooperate with the Alliance, deriving maximum benefits from it.

The issue of future NATO activities remains a topic of heated debate in the West. As regards NATO-Russia's relationship they are being considered only as a component of the whole problem. In comparison with Russian historiography, not so much attention is paying to this issue in the West, although it is possible to classify the authors according to their attitude to this problem.

- The most part of the researchers believes that NATO remains relevant after the "Cold war". (15) NATO must be inclusive not exclusive, whether through enlargement or the avenues (PfP or EAPC). NATO has the ability to stabilize and secure peace on the continent. (16) Undoubtedly the Alliance should be transformed and reject from the "Cold war" style of behavior. J. Nye for example, suggests the idea that NATO should transform the nature of security in Europe using a mechanism of "soft power". Nye defines it as "the ability to attract through cultural and ideological appeal, to influence the policies of other states in ways that are consistent with it's own interests, simply by virtue of the values for which it stands". (17) Continuing the thoughts about Alliance transformation S. Croft and J. Goodby make an accent on the point that political function of NATO should prevail on it's military one. (18) According to their opinion this would help to avoid exacerbating of relations with Russian Federation because of enlargement. H. Waterman and D. Zagorcheva prove that NATO guarantees stability on the continent, in which RF is interested. (19) Such authors as J. Goldgeier, V. Havel, A. Karkoszka, W. Matser connect deep hopes with the development of NATO-Russia's partnership. They mark that Russia's present cooperation with NATO has the potential to develop into a long-term relationship to the benefit of both sides. (20)
- Second group presents mainly «hegemonic» views on the issue and stresses that NATO should be transformed and strengthens its positions over the Euro-Atlantic region. This is possible only if the US would keep their presence in Europe. (21) Analyzing Partnership for Peace program, H. Kissinger marks that "only American presence in Europe, based on NATO could guarantee stability on the continent". (22) T. Sandler and R. Hartley warn that NATO must be careful with RF and enlargement. They don't believe in Russian democratic reforms, making

- an accent on Russian instability and consider it like a possible threat to the West. (23) G. Williams and B. Jones analyzing NATO prospects for the future state that NATO is about to enter a 20 year crisis from which it is likely to emerge greatly strengthened and with a renewed mandate for the next 50 years. They also predict that in 20 years China and Russia, undisciplined by benign social forces are the countries most likely to begin war, that's why NATO must pay more attention to this states. (24) Finally they come to the conclusion that that although the threat from Russia is heavily discounted in case of its renaissance, Europe could suffer from its hegemonic ambitions. Such specialists as J. Sperling and E. Kirchener consider that this situation proves NATO viability even after dissolution of the Soviet Union and gives it role as the most credible and foremost defense organization in Europe. (25)
- Third group could be called like "NATO opponents", it is not to big like two previous ones. Its representatives – T. Carpenter, B. Conry, J. Mearsheimer believe that Soviet threat was a linchpin of the Alliance and it is unlikely that NATO would outlive the "Cold war". (26) Another realistic critic of NATO M. Mandelbaum declares that Alliance demonstrated its decline during Kosovo campaign. According to his opinion this war served only to jeopardize two important interests: namely US relations with Russia and China, both of which vehemently opposed the war. (27) More soft NATO critics – D.Reiter and A. Kydd give arguments about useless of enlargement. D. Reiter writes that future NATO enlargement has very real costs to both old and new members and moreover the deterioration of relations with Russia. (28) A. Kydd is sure that all good relations with Russia and the West will be greatly inflated if NATO continues its expansion to the territory of the former Soviet Union. (29)

As a result it should be marked that the topic of NATO-Russia's relationship is acute and the most part of Western researchers acknowledge that the stability and peace in the Euro-Atlantic region depend on them to much extent. But the complex research on this topic, which would cover the whole spectrum of challenges and cooperation still does not exist neither in Russia nor in the West. The most part of Western publications examines this issue fragmentally, only in the context of the global security study. The diversity of views on NATO-Russia's relations and their prospects gives a possibility to compare and analyze them to elaborate a balanced objective approach toward this problem. Concluding this part I would like to express a deep gratitude to the NATO – EAPC Fellowship. It gives me possibility to conduct a research in NATO library in Brussels and Library of the Institute of the European University in Florence and to be able finally to be introduced to the whole palette of views on the issue of NATO-Russia's relationship, to purchase some books of Western authors

related to this topic. All the collected material will be used in the development of the special course on the Euro-Atlantic Security problems for the students of the faculty of History of the Ural State University.

Notes:

1. Yuryeva T. Russia and NATO// Vnesnyaya politika Rossiyskoy Federatsii 1992-1999 – Moscow:ROSSPEN, 2000; Utkin A. Amerikanskaya strategiya dlya XXI veka – Moscow: Logos,2000; Utkin A. Mirovoy poryadok XXI veka – Moscow:Algoritm, 2001.
2. Trenin d. Silence of the Bear// NATO Review. Spring 2002. www.nato.int/docu/review/2002/issue1/art3html
3. Parkhalina T. Russia and NATO: one year later//Observer #8 (127), 2000. P.42.
4. Makarenko V. Kto soyuzniki Rossii? Mentalnost, geopolitika, paradoxi politiki bezopastnosti Rossii – Moscow:Stradiz, 2000. P.29.
5. Shakleina T. Concept of the new Atlantic society and Russia's security // USA: Economica, Politika, Ideologiya. #2, 1997. P.32.
6. Kobrinskaya I. Russia: facing the facts // Enlarging NATO. The National debates. Mattox G., Rachwald A. (ed-s) – London: Lynne Reinner Publishers, 2001. P.178.
7. Delyagin M. If Russia has forces to manage with the US new pragmatism? // Mezhdunarodnaya zhizn. #3, 2001. P.13; Kazantsev B. The consequences of NATO enlargement // Mezhdunarodnaya zhizn. #11-12, 1997; Tretyakov V. Pragmatism of V. Putin's Foreign Policy // Mezhdunarodnaya zhizn. #5, 2002.
8. Davidov Y. Enlargement of the Atlantic world sphere of responsibility // USA – Canada: Ekonomika, Politika, Kultura. #3, 2000. P.30.
9. Kremenyuk V. Russia and NATO: Sworn friends // Observer #8 (127), 2000; Goltz A. Repeated marriage // Itogi. 22 February 2000; Goltz A. To NATO because of need: Vladimir Putin would like to change guarantees of security on the financial support of the West // Itogi. 14 March 2000.
10. Primakov Y. Russia, the West and NATO // Obschaya gazeta. #37, 21-27 September, 1996; Primakov Y. Russianad international relations in the conditions of globalization // Mezhdunarodnaya zhizn. #3, 2001.
11. Shtol V. Russia and NATO: On the verge of the ages // Observer. #8 (127), 2000. P.40.
12. Terekhov V. Germany – fifty years on // Mezhdunarodnaya zhizn. #10, 1999. P.37.
13. Galiev A. Against NATO // Expert. #12, 1997.
14. Strelyaev S. Russia and NATO: what is further? // Observer. #8 (127), 2000. P.48.
15. Duffield J. NATO's function after the Cold war // Political Science Quarterly. Vol.109, #5 (winter 1994-1995). P.767.
16. Mattox G. A. New realities. New challenges // Enlarging NATO. The National debates. Mattox G.A., Rachwald A.R. (ed-s) – London: Lynne Reinner Publishers, 2001. P. 255.
17. Nye J. Redefining NATO's mission in the information age // NATO Review. Vol. 47, #4 (winter 1999). P.12.
18. Croft S. Guaranteeing Europe's security? Enlarging NATO again // International Affairs. Vol. 78, #1. January 2002; Goodby J.E. Europe undivided. The new logic of peace in the U.S. – Russian relations – Moscow: Mezhdunarodniye otnosheniya, 2000.

19. Waterman H., Zagorcheva D. Correspondence. NATO and democracy // *International Security*. Vol. 26, #3 (winter 2001/2002).
20. Goldgeier J. Not when but who // *NATO Review*. Spring 2002; Havel V. Prague predictions // *NATO Review*. Spring 2002; Matser W. Towards a new strategic partnership // *NATO Review*. Winter 2001/2002; Karkoszka A. Following the footsteps // *NATO Review*. Spring 2002.
21. Yost D.S. Transatlantic relations and peace in Europe // *International Affairs*. Vol. 78, #2. April 2002. P.295.
22. Kissinger H. Be realists // *USA: Ekonomika, Politika, Ideologiya*. #7, 1994. P.85.
23. Sandler T., Hartley K. The political economy of NATO. Past, present and into the 21st century. – Cambridge University Press, 1999. P. 260.
24. Williams G.L. Jones B.J. NATO and the Transatlantic Alliance in the 21st century. The twenty-year crisis. – Antony Rave Ltd, Chippenham. Wiltshire, 2001. P.212.
25. Sperling J., Kirchner E. Recasting the European order: security architectures and economic cooperation. – Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997; Sperling J. (ed.) Europe in change. Two tiers or two speeds? The European security order and the enlargement of the European Union and NATO - Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999. P.7.
26. Carpenter T.G., Conry B. (ed-s) NATO enlargement: illusions and reality – Washington, D.C.: Cato Institute, 1998.
27. Mandelbaum M. A perfect failure: NATO's war against Yugoslavia // *Foreign Affairs*. Vol. 78, #5 (September/October 1999). P.5; Mandelbaum M. The dawn of peace in Europe – N.Y.: Twentieth Century Fund Press, 1996.
28. Reiter D. Why NATO enlargement does not spread democracy // *International Security*. Vol. 25, #4 (spring 2001). P.67.
29. Kydd A. Trust building, trust breaking: the dilemma of NATO enlargement // *International Organization*. Vol. 55, #4 (autumn 2001). P.821.

Chapter 2. NATO enlargement and position of the Russian Federation.

One of the most serious problems, which is disturbing Russian political elite and from time to time becomes a serious source of tensions with the West. For NATO this process was quite logical: it was reasonable to expect that once the Warsaw Pact had collapsed and NATO survived, further discussion regarding enlargement would be on the agenda. First of all it is important to stress that the problem of NATO enlargement should not be taken only as territorial expansion, although this question is one of the sharpest. The enlargement process should be interpreted as static one (territorial) and dynamic (at the expense of the sphere of responsibility enlargement). In the Alliance's Strategic Concept, approved in the meeting of North Atlantic Council in Washington (23-24 April 1999) it was stressed several times that NATO is ready to use its force and influence beyond the sphere of NATO's responsibility. In 31 Article of the Concept it is written that "in pursuit of its policy of preserving peace, preventing war and enhancing security and stability and as set out in the fundamental security tasks, NATO will seek, in cooperation with other organizations to prevent conflict, or, should a crisis arise, to contribute to its effective management, consistent with international law, including through the possibility of conducting non-article 5 crisis response operations". (1)

Actually NATO claims to be the only one organization, able to respond adequately to any un-expectable situation and manage the crisis. Especially after the crisis around Kosovo in 1999 it was stressed in NATO political and military circles that NATO was the only one effective organization, which took the mission of its management. In the meantime UN and OSCE could not suggest any measures to solve this complicated problem. So it is quite logical that the terminology in official NATO documents has been changed aftermath. Instead of the definitions "Atlantic world", "Atlantism" the terms "Euro-Atlantic world" and "Euroatlantism" have begun to be used more frequently. If former definitions meant only the territory of NATO members plus North Atlantic and Mediterranean region, the new one is more vague. In the Washington summit this territory was identified like a "common space from Vancouver to Vladivostok" for which NATO is responsible. (2) Of course NATO acknowledges the UN Security Council's primary responsibility in the matter of security and stability guaranteeing in the Euro-Atlantic region and confirms that will act according to the UN regulations. (3)

The enlargement of the NATO sphere of responsibility is also realizing through the development of partnership, cooperation and dialogue in the frameworks of the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, Mediterranean Dialogue, through the Partnership for Peace program, interaction with

Western European Union. Such NATO activity demonstrates that the providing of security for this or that state is more effectively in the frameworks of strong international, but not national organization and today NATO could be considered as the most powerful one.

Undoubtedly, the effective provision of security in Euro-Atlantic region is impossible without Russia's participation. NATO General Secretary George Robertson has stressed this idea several times, accenting that "relationship of mutual understanding and cooperation with Russia are very important for the whole Europe". (5)

While analyzing Russian reaction on the enlargement process, the historical experience should be taken into consideration. The change of paradigms could not happen in one hour. For more than 40 years NATO and Russia were adversaries. Left her satellites civilizedly, withdrawn her troops from Europe and signed arms control treaties, Russia have gotten a possibility to set up cooperative relations with her ex-enemies. Nevertheless the feeling of mutual suspicion will continue to influence Russia's-NATO relationship for long time. Especially in the mid of 1990es the idea of NATO enlargement was interpreted by Russian political circles as an attack on RF national interests. Firstly Russian imperial ambitions were too strong at that time and secondly the lack of understanding of the reasons of keeping the organization, created for the defense from the state, which ceased its existence. By the mid of 1990es NATO had not elaborated yet the strategy of behavior with Russia and methods of her conviction in NATO's non-aggressive intentions.

Moreover the mid of 1990es were marked by the crisis of trust to Russia. The events of autumn 1993 and war in Chechnya 1994-96 have demonstrated to the West that Russia is far from stability. Western political leaders came to the conclusion that Russia had declined from the way of democratic institutions development and market reforms and regime of President B.Yeltsin personal power had become strengthened. (6) In connection with these NATO's role and scheme of Security in Europe began to change and the issue of development of the restrictive measures of Russia's role was put on the agenda.

Such NATO decisions as confirmation of the "open doors" for new members, declared on Brussels NATO Summit in 1994 (immediately following this President Clinton promised in Warsaw that it was no longer a question of if NATO would expand, it was just a question of when) (7); Study on NATO Enlargement, issued by the Heads of State and Government, participating in the Meeting of the North Atlantic Council, 3 September 1995, have demonstrated to Russia the desire to spread NATO's military and political expansion on the territories of the former USSR traditional influence. (8)

Russian political circles were irritated especially by NATO's territorial expansion. From the one side, enlarging its sphere of security by means of new members – ex Warsaw Treaty participants involvement, NATO was realizing the aim of making Europe “whole and stable”. From another side it was a risk to prick up Moscow by causing a fear and thoughts about the diminution of Russia's role in the habitual region of domination. The issue of the former Warsaw Pact members entry to NATO was arisen in 1993, during President Yeltsin visit to Poland, Czech Republic and Slovakia. At that time President expressed the ideas, which sounded like an acknowledgement that entry of these states to the Alliance would not conflict with Russia's interests. Very soon this view was disavowed by the Russian side through the different channels and official statement of the President to the Western political leaders. (9)

Since 1993 the issue of the consequences of NATO enlargement for Russia has gotten an impulse for heated discussions. Russian political elite on the issue of NATO enlargement has introduced different points of view. For example, in autumn 1996 I. Ribkin – the secretary of the Security Council expressed the view about the possibility of RF entry to NATO's political structures. His deputy B. Berezovsky introduced the same idea. Russian State Duma's representatives have taken the opposite side, which further became an official Duma's position. On October 25, 1996 they adopted an appeal “In connection with NATO Enlargement Plans”, where the possibility of Russia's entry to the Alliance was not considered at all. The basic accent in this appeal was done on the danger of NATO enlargement plans for Russia. In the beginning of 1997 some Duma's delegates formed the “AntiNATO” association. One of the main goals of this association was to consolidate Duma's delegates around the idea of opposition to NATO and adoption of laws necessary for the state security interests defense. (10) But despite of this, Russian state official position was concentrated on the idea of the continuation of dialogue with NATO.

In December 1996 the Meeting of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of NATO member states began to elaborate recommendations for the new members' admission. Russia's attitude towards these measures was very negative. RF has seen a shadow of the new dividing lines in Europe in them. To avoid such misunderstanding with Moscow and to prevent its sharp opposition to the enlargement process, Ministers of Foreign Affairs developed a strategy of the “extending and expansion” of relations with Russia. Further four months of intensive talks between NATO Secretary General H. Solana and Russian Foreign Minister Y. Primakov have led to the development of the text of “Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security between NATO and the Russian Federation” which was signed in Paris on 27 May 1997. NATO has demonstrated by this step that it did not intend to exclude Russia from the new world order

formation. The creation of the Permanent Joint Council of Russia and NATO has supplied a possibility to the RF to participate in some discussions, which are of mutual interest for both sides. Thus NATO has succeeded to soften a sharp critics from Russian Federation as regards ex USSR satellites entry to NATO.

Nevertheless after the Madrid Summit in July 1997, where the principle of “open doors” was confirmed and the decision of Czech Republic, Poland and Hungary entry to NATO was declared, Russia commented this step like a serious strategic mistake of the West in the relations with Russia, in the building of new Europe and the whole system of international relations. Deputy Director of the European cooperation of the Russia’s Ministry of Foreign Affairs B. Kazantsev marked after the Summit that the realization of enlargement plans is dangerous because future European security system could be brought to the NATO-centric scheme, where the OSCE role would be reduced and Russia would be ousted to the periphery of the main processes of the development, interaction and cooperation in Europe. (11)

This situation had several estimations. Some analysts from the West, for example H.Kissinger consider that Moscow has gotten too much for the tolerant attitude to the Alliance’s initiative. According to his opinion, Russia’s inclusion to the discussions with NATO and possibility to influence on the decision-makings to some extent would bring negative consequences for the Alliance. H. Kissinger is the most consequent critic of the Russia’s inclusion to NATO structures. While analyzing Partnership for Peace program, one of which aims was to attract Russia to NATO activity he marks that “Russia and USA both are interested in stable Europe. This could be reached only by the American presence in Europe, based on NATO. Stability in Europe demands the confirmation of the centralized principle of NATO, but not dilution of the Alliance in the vague multilaterality. (12)

Another point of view on which the Russian authors stand basically is that Permanent Joint Council formation is a symbolic fee for the settlement of Russian opposition to NATO enlargement. Editor in chief of “Observer” journal V. Shtol for example is coming to the conclusion that “Founding Act” signing was only a politically declarative action, but sanctioned the realization of the enlargement plans. He thinks that Moscow should impede NATO enlargement by political means, achieve Alliance’s transformation to the political institution and establishment of the stable balance of power between NATO and Russian Federation. (13)

If we try to evaluate this issue objectively, it could be concluded that NATO acted foresightedly by suggesting RF to interact via PJC. Certainly Russia’s membership in the PJC could not influence on NATO politics and decisions realization radically, the meaning of this initiative had rather moral effect for Russia than practical one. Both sides have managed to gain

benefits from this situation: Russia was not ignored, which was a big achievement for her at that time and NATO reached the desired result with no complications. One question is coming unintentionally, what arguments could Russia present by motivating her resistance to NATO enlargement? Central and Eastern Europe states have demonstrated their desire to become NATO members and to guarantee their security by this step in the future. The possible threat of nuclear weapon use from the Russian side was incompatible with the principles of transparent relations with the West. From another side in the perspective this step meant the beginning of the “new relationship” between Russia and NATO. The Founding Act could be estimated as a base of the international system building in which Russia and NATO could act as equal forces.

Since 1997 till the beginning of 1999 NATO was trying to justify the enlargement process by the declarations of “new image” making. By the beginning of 1999 NATO officials confirmed this by the following arguments: NATO military activity is reducing from 70% to 40%, political one is increasing from 25% to 35% and other activities (ecology, culture, education) from 5% to 25%. But very soon the illusions of NATO transformation were broken by the Balkan crisis around Kosovo.

Insolvency of Rambouillet talks, when each side, following the “Cold war” traditions supported: NATO – Albanians, Russia – Serbs in their unwillingness to come to the common solution of the problem has led to NATO military involvement to the conflict. This contradicted sharply to the RF interests. Voting for the UN Security Council resolutions #1199 and #1244, Russia has used its veto right, when the question of giving mandate for the peacekeeping operation in Kosovo to NATO was discussed. (14) The war in Yugoslavia has divided NATO and Russia.

Events of spring 1999 have demonstrated that military component would always dominate in the North Atlantic Alliance. Since that period NATO has taken a course on the improvement of enlargement strategy. By April 1999 Membership Action Plan had been designed. The aim of this plan was to assist those countries, which wish to join the Alliance in their preparations by providing advice, assistance and practical support on all aspects of NATO membership. According to this plan aspirant countries should participate in annual “19+1” meetings at Council level to assess progress. The nine countries that have declared an interest in joining NATO and are participating in the plan are Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Bulgaria, Romania, Albania, and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. (15)

There existed several forecasts regarding the inviting of the above-mentioned states to NATO. For example, director of the Institute for European, Russian and Eurasian Studies in George Washington University J.M. Golgeier has predicted the following scenario for the Prague Summit:

the invitations are to be issued to the five countries, which are Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Slovenia and Slovakia. He has explained this forecast by the following arguments: not inviting the Baltic Republics would be so obvious to sop to Russian chauvinism that it would be politically unacceptable. Slovenia has met the membership criteria since 1999, if not 1997. And Slovakia would have been included in the first round had it had a different government in the mid-1990s. As regards Romania and Bulgaria, although they provided NATO with useful support during the Kosovo campaign, the political and economic difficulties that have plagued both countries over the years could impede their invitations. (16) The author mentioned nothing about Albania and Republic of Macedonia, perhaps thinking that their time had not come yet. British experts from the International Institute of Strategic Studies evaluated the situation in the same manner, but considered that the first seven states should be invited. (17) Actually their predictions were right and on Prague Summit in November 2002 the invitations were issued to them. American political expert S. Croft considered that, undoubtedly Bulgaria and Rumania are looking not so confident like the Baltic Republics, Slovenia and Slovakia, as regards Macedonia it legs behind considerably, without saying of Albania. But despite of this it would be logically to invite all the applicants in November 2002. He explained this position by the argument, that by inviting all the aspirants the issue of further enlargement could be closed for a long time, thus RF would not have ground for the continuation of reproaches. (18) The official position of the undoubted Alliance leader – USA, presented by the President G. Bush regarding the acceptance of the new members was the following “At the Prague summit we should continue to include new members able and willing to strengthen our Alliance. No state should be excluded on the basis of history or geography”... “The question of ‘when’ may still be up for debate within NATO; the question of ‘whether’ should not be ... (at the Prague summit) the United States will be prepared to make concrete historic decisions with its allies to advance NATO enlargement”. (19) But after the 11 September events the accents in the position of the American administration became displaced a bit. At present Washington is trying to speak about the “new potentials against new threats” firstly and only then do “organizational work”. The cautious approach of the USA toward the acceptance of the new members to the Alliance is caused by the fear of political instability in some states, which intend to be the Alliance members. (20)

It is not by chance that this problem is being discussed so widely. The question if NATO can remain an effective military and political alliance if it keeps growing causes a lot of debates now. NATO enlargement represents part of a more comprehensive NATO reform, a response to the requisites of the new order in Europe, including security needs drastically

different since the end of the Cold war. From another side it could cause consequences undesirable for the Alliance. There exist suspicious that in case of enlargement North Atlantic Alliance would become diluted and cease to be an effective mean of the security provision. Enlargement could present a big problem, since the complexity of NATO would be grown as a consequence. More involved structures are harder to maintain. The expansion of NATO to include new allies will increase this complexity and may inhibit the decision –making ability of the North Atlantic Council and other bodies. (21) Representatives of the EU Committee from the House of Lords in the report “European Defense and Security Policy” are developing this topic and express the view that Alliance enlargement from 19 to 26 members could block it’s activity, because of veto right use. (22) Some “NATO critics”, like D. Reiter consider that enlargement will be a quite costly enterprise, including financial costs to both old and new members and the deterioration of relations with Russia, potentially sacrificing progress on important issues such as Balkan peacekeeping and global nonproliferation. (23)

From another side such analysts as R.D. Asmus think that there are no reasons for worries. He is sure that “whether a larger NATO remains military strong or becomes weaker depends on the policy we craft. There is no law of Alliance politics, dictating that NATO has to get military weaker as enlarges. New members have had a harder time integrating than we had hoped, but they have not weaken NATO”. (24)

The above-mentioned forecasts are quite real, because the larger circle of participants will definitely cause more problems and incompatibility of views on this or that question. Besides that including of the new states to NATO could deprive NATO of military effectiveness and transform it to the body like OSCE, where a lot of time is spending for the bureaucratic procedures and talks. But it is true that everything is in NATO members’ hands and if they are to be really consolidated and share common values and common aim of the provision of stability in the continent they would manage with organizational problems and would not allow Alliance’s demise.

In this context it is very important to examine Russian strategic line to the second round of enlargement. Quite often modern researchers conduct comparative analysis of first and second rounds, trying to explain the reasons of the softening of critics from the Russian political elite to the last one. At the Prague summit it was taken a more significant decision for Russia, than 5 years earlier at the Madrid summit: three ex-soviet republics, which have common borders with Russia were invited to be the Alliance members. President B. Yeltsin wanted to avoid such scenario. He tried unsuccessfully to get President Clinton to shake hands in Helsinki in March 1997 on a ‘gentleman’s agreement’ that the Baltic nations of Estonia,

Latvia and Lithuania would never become NATO members. Since then, Russia has had to accept that it is unable to prevent these countries from joining the Alliance. (25) In connection with this it is worth to note, that when the liquidation of the Warsaw Treaty Organization was going on, the West has ensured USSR (and Russia is its political successor), that ex Warsaw Treaty members would be never invited to join the Alliance.

After the first round of enlargement Russia felt that in case of conflict with NATO it would acquire new adversaries. But from another side in contrast to earlier predictions, membership of Poland, Czech Republic and Hungary in NATO has not caused any deterioration in relations between these three countries and Russia. Gotten a safe guarantee of security from the Western world, these states have lost the fear behind the revanchism from the USSR successor, and accordingly they have ceased the attempts of permanent distancing from Russia in many spheres. For example for the last time Russia and Poland have put their bilateral relationship on a new equitable and beneficial footing. (26) The same tendency is developing in the bilateral relations of Russia with Czech Republic and Hungary. It means that the process of NATO enlargement is not dangerous for Russia, moreover it assists to the improvement of its relations with ex-satellites. But in case of “second Kosovo” Russia should become more tractable partner or it could face with bigger problems and bigger quantity of the potential adversaries.

It is possible to conclude that the changes in the Russian “NATO strategy” happened in the beginning of 2000, after President V. Putin talks with NATO Secretary General G. Robertson. The famous Putin’s reply “why not” on the question of British journalist “if President suppose Russia’s entrance to NATO” was a significant event, although later V. Putin declared that this answer was “home prepared”, to stump Atlantists. Nevertheless, since February 2000 the line of Russia’s behavior toward NATO has been determined by the realistic recognition that Russia did not have political linchpins of influence on NATO enlargement, the more it would resist this process, the more counterproductive its policy would be.

Tragic events of 11 September 2001 have made a serious impact on the change of traditional approaches to international relations and become an impulse to the more close cooperation between Russia and NATO. President V. Putin and NATO Secretary General G. Robertson meetings in Brussels (October 2001) and in Moscow (November 2001) and several meetings between of the Russian and American Presidents followed by these events have clearly put NATO-Russia and US-Russia relationships on a new level. In a joint statement, following their meeting in Crawford, Texas in November, the two Presidents pledged that Russia and the United States would “work together with NATO and other NATO members, to improve, strengthen, and enhance the relationship between NATO and

Russia, with a view to developing new, effective mechanisms for consultation, cooperation, joint decision, and coordinated/joint action”. Moreover at the December foreign ministers PJC meeting at NATO headquarters, NATO and Russia committed themselves to “forge a new relationship” and tasked ambassadors to explore “effective mechanisms for consultation, cooperation, joint decision, and coordinated/joint action”. (28)

This initiative got practical realization in May 2002, when Permanent Joint Council was changed to NATO-Russia Council. The improvement of Russia’s status in the relations with NATO (i.e. the work of the Council in the frameworks of “20”, but not “19+1”, when Alliance members coordinated their positions firstly and then discussed them with Russia) and reality of the new threats to the world security have changed Moscow’s attitude toward the enlargement process. Understanding its inevitability and impossibility to withstand it, V. Putin announced in October 2001, that the impact of global terrorism is leading Russia to take “an entirely new look at NATO enlargement”. He marked: “If NATO takes on a different shade and is becoming a political organization ... we would reconsider our position with regard to such expansion, if we are to feel involved in such process”. (29) By this statement President has begun the process of the Russian strategy to the NATO enlargement adaptation to the new political reality. Undoubtedly, he understands that NATO transformation to the political organization in the near future will bear superficial character and the sense and consequences of enlargement will not be changed. Besides that Russia could not but worry about the creation of military-political block GUUAM (Georgia, Ukraine, Uzbekistan, Azerbaidzan, Moldova) on its southern borders, which is supported by NATO. NATO military exercises are conducting on the territories of the above-mentioned states, their officers are training in the West and armies are re-equipping according to the NATO standards. All these could direct at idea that in the future Russia could face with serious challenges to its security.

As deputy director of the Carnegie Moscow Center D. Trenin has marked, Russia has neither power, nor the influence to block NATO membership for other European countries. Moreover, should it try to do would almost certainly fail. Russia should study to handle the enlargement process. To be able to do it, President Putin would expect a package of measures aimed at minimizing the perceived slight to Russia. This would mean, for example, no deployment of nuclear weapons and no permanent stationing of foreign forces on the new members’ territory in peacetime. It would also probably require Baltic accession to the 1990 Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE) Treaty, since this would make military activity and to stationing of foreign forces in the Baltic Republics more transparent. (30) Moreover Russia could get credits for the modernization of its army.

Despite of the signing of Rome Declaration, which marked the new stage of relationship between NATO and Russia, RF is still standing on a position of negative attitude toward NATO enlargement. For example, director of the Department of Information and Press of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Russian Federation A. Yakovenko, considers that no NATO neither its new members would add security because of enlargement, and the objective reasons for NATO expansion do not exist. According to the Russian Foreign Minister I.Ivanov opinion, in the creation of “20” Russia sees the alternative to enlargement. (31) Such scenario will scarcely be realized, the aspirant states have too weighty arguments for the entrance to NATO, and the new level of relations between the Alliance and Russia, will hardly influence to reconsider them.

In principle Russian Federation has a serious potential to occupy a key place in the Euro-Atlantic security system. Tendency towards NATO European orientation could be quite profitable for Russia if the latter would not abuse the play on American-European contradictions. Inside of NATO command structures the process of formation of pure European subdivisions, which in case of necessity would conduct military operations independently, is going. But their potential is still too weak, and if USA would not have a possibility or desire to help them, it would be quit difficult for them to conduct large-scale military operation successfully. Thus Russia could become a good ally for Europe, because it is the only one state in the Eurasian continent, which posses reconnaissance sputniks, satellite communication and large military contingents in the aggregate.

Summarizing all the above-written, it could be noted that the issue of NATO enlargement is one of the most complicated in the relations between the Alliance and Russia. It could be interpreted like an attack on Russia’s national interests as well as like a possibility for Russia to be integrated to the system of international security in a role of the key actor and like a settlement of the new quality relations with the ex Warsaw Treaty states and ex Soviet republics. Confrontational line of Russia’s behavior is not topical anymore. Russia could reach far more positive results if it choose the way of cooperation and gradually taking the enlargement process under control. Chosen a flexible strategy toward NATO, Russian Federation could realize its interest and gain the situation when NATO, conducting its policy, would further never ignore Russian position. In a perspective, only the relations of mutual understanding, trust and transparency between NATO and Russia could supply security and stability in the Euro-Atlantic region.

Notes:

1. The Alliance’s Strategic Concept approved by the Heads of State and Government participating in the Meeting of the North Atlantic Council. Washington D.C., 23-24

- April 1999 // The NATO Handbook Documentation – NATO Office of Information and Press, 1999. P.415.
2. Moore R. NATO's mission for the new millenium. A value-based approach to Building security // Contemporary Security Policy. Vol. 23, #1. April 2002. P.14.
 3. The Alliance Strategic Concept ... P.410.
 4. The Alliance Strategic Concept ... P. 417.
 5. Robertson G. Challenges for the next decade // NATO's Nations. 50th Anniversary SHAPE Allied Command Europe. Brussels, #1, 2001. P.9.
 6. Kremenyuk V. Russia and NATO: Sworn friends // Observer #8 (127), 2000. P.45.
 7. Clinton B., quoted in R.D. Asmus, R.L. Kugler and F.S. Larrabee "NATO expansion: the next steps" // Survival #1 (37), spring 1995. P.7.
 8. Declaration of the Heads of State and Government participating in the Meeting of the North Atlantic Council. Brussels, 11 January 1994; Study on NATO enlargement issued by the Heads of the State and Government participating in the Meeting of the North Atlantic Council. Brussels, 3 September 1995 // The NATO Handbook Documentation – NATO Office of Information and Press, 1999. Pp. 326-369.
 9. Yuryeva T. Russia and NATO // Vneshnyaya politika Rossiyskoy Federatsii 1992-1999 – Moscow:ROSSPEN, 2000. P. 181.
 10. Ibid. P.189.
 11. Kazantsev B. The consequences of NATO enlargement // Mezhdunarodnaya zhizn. #11-12, 1997. P.22.
 12. Kissinger H. Be realists // USA: Ekonomika, Politika, Idelologiya. #7, 1994. P.85.
 13. Shtol V. Russia and NATO: On the verge of the ages // Observer. #8 (127), 2000. P.39.
 14. Parkhalina T. Russia and NATO: one year on // Observer. #8 (127), 2000. P. 42.
 15. NATO Handbook. – Brussels: NATO Office of Information and Press, 2001. P.65.
 16. Goldgeier J. Not when but who // NATO Review. Spring 2002. www.nato.int/docu/review/2002/issue1/art1.html
 17. Russia-NATO: British experts about the changes in the world policy situation // Compas. #21, 2002. P.79.
 18. Croft S. Guaranteeing Europe's security? Enlarging NATO again // International Affairs. Vol.78, #1, January 2002. P.112.
 19. Bush G. W. Excerpted remarks to the North Atlantic Council. 13 June 2001; Remarks at the University Library, Warsaw. 16 June 2001 // in Croft S. Guaranteeing Europe's security? Enlarging NATO again // International Affairs. Vol.78, #1, January 2002. P.100.
 20. Russia-NATO: British experts about the changes in the world policy situation // Compas. #21, 2002. P.79.
 21. Sandler T., Hartley K. The Political Economy of NATO. Past, Present, and into the 21st Century. – Cambridge University Press, 1999. P.248.
 22. Russia-NATO: British experts about the changes in the world policy situation // Compas. #21, 2002. P.79.
 23. Reiter D. Why NATO enlargement does not spread democracy // International Security. Vol25, #4 (spring 2001). P.67.
 24. Debate. Can NATO remain an effective military and political alliance if it keeps growing? Charles Grant versus Ronald A, Asmus // NATO Review. Spring 2002. <file://A:\NATODialogue.htm>
 25. Goldgeier J. Not when but who // NATO Review. Spring 2002. www.nato.int/docu/review/2002/issue1/art1.html

26. Karkoszka A. Following the footsteps // NATO Review. Spring 2002.
www.nato.int/docu/review/2002/issue1/art4.html
27. Goltz A. To NATO because of need: Vladimir Putin would like to change guarantees of security to the financial support of the West // Itogi. 14 March 2000. Pp.24-25.
28. Matser W. Towards a new strategic partnership // NATO Review. Winter 2001/2002. P.21.
29. Black I. Russian resolution // Guardian. 5 October 2001.
30. Trenin D. Silence of the bear // NATO Review. Spring 2002.
www.nato.int/docu/review/2002/issue1/art4.html
31. Rome summit Russia – NATO results: principal new stage in the relations // Compas. #23, 2002. P.11.

Chapter 3. The issue of crisis management in NATO-Russia's relationship.

Toady crisis management means a new approach towards security provision in the Euro-Atlantic region. It is an important component of "conflict prevention" strategy, which includes except it preventive diplomacy and conflict resolution. (1) At present NATO's crisis management is based on three mutually reinforcing elements: dialogue, cooperation with other countries and the maintenance of NATO's collective defense capability. Each of these is designed to ensure that crises affecting Euro-Atlantic security can be prevented or resolved peacefully. (2)

In NATO's relations with Russia crisis management is identified as one of the leading directions of mutual cooperation. This statement is fixed in the Founding Act and in the Declaration of the Heads of Governments and States of Russian Federation and NATO member states, signed in Rome on May 28 2002. New threats and challenges demand new format of relations especially in this sphere. The short history of NATO-Russia's cooperation proves that this issue is the most challenging in the relations and needs more realistic, carefully thought approach from the both sides.

The establishment of stability in Europe, based on the democratic rules demands from the governments, which are aimed on this, to develop crisis management strategy fair and acceptable for all sides. Political leaders should react on ethnic, religious and political conflicts, which threaten to undermine international security standards and rules. To supply maintenance of such standards it is necessary to use stimulating measures. Sometimes such stimulating influence demands the threats of use or even use of military force. But if one of the parties, involved into the conflict settlement decides that the imposition of such measures is purposeless or the costs of them are too high it would be very difficult to realize such action. Such situation has been formed around former Yugoslavia. The Kosovo crisis was the brightest example of different models of behavior and understanding of the situation by both sides – NATO and Russia.

NATO's military interference to Kosovo led to the tensions in NATO-Russia's relationship. Even more the conflict threatened to create s serious and lasting breach in the relationship between Russia and the west. With powerful domestic factions favoring a policy whereby Russia would actively support the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, the potential existed for any escalation to ultimately lead to a direct Russia-NATO military confrontation. (3) One of the principle questions, which has caused hot debates before and after the crisis and which is a keystone of crisis management in general was: who, when and on what level should decide

that all political methods of crisis management are exhausted and only military force should be applied.

A lot of hopes were connected with Rambouillet diplomacy. Afterwards some critically oriented politicians in Russian Federation wondered whether the war might have been avoided by more cautious and flexible diplomacy than was conducted during the Rambouillet negotiations?

The talks lasted for 17 days and as a result of them the proposals were made to the both sides and they offered them a great deal, but also required major concessions. The Kosovar Albanians were offered considerable autonomy, ensured by the presence of a NATO-led force, but no independence. The Serbs were asked to concede autonomy, but sovereignty, with Kosovo's ultimate status left open. (4) S. Milosevic, who was not at the conference refused to accept NATO forces and unknown KLA leader Hashim Thaci refused to give up the principle of independence, so Albanian acceptance was subsequently obtained with the promise of a review after three years. S. Milosevic conducted a referendum, where on the question "will you accept the participation of foreign representatives in resolving the Kosovo issue; 95 per cent answered "no". (5) Even while the discussions continued, the Yugoslav military and police forces were preparing to intensify their operations against ethnic Albanians in Kosovo. Perhaps Milosevic would like to use the forthcoming foreign intervention to crush the KLA, yield with honor obtains a deal and end a conflict, that was weakening his grip on power.

The objectives that drove NATO's intervention in Kosovo were not purely humanitarian in nature. To a significant extent the enhancement of NATO's political dimension and the Alliance's tendency to define interests in terms of values had made the intervention necessary one. (6)

NATO's position on the crisis was formed on the following ideas and factors: 1. Actually Kosovo threatened NATO's cohesion and its credibility and no NATO direct interests had been threatened. NATO had a perfect chance to raise its prestige through Kosovo campaign. The negotiation process came to the dead end, UN Security Council had no chances to approve military campaign because of the Russian and Chinese "veto". In the circumstances of such paralysis of activity NATO could demonstrate its effectiveness.

2. NATO has protected Human Rights, using an argument that balanced analysis of the situation in Kosovo particularly since 1998, would acknowledge that serious acts of violence and provocation were committed against the Serb population by Kosovar Albanians, and in particular by the KLA, however the actions of the KLA paled in comparison to the premeditated, well-orchestrated and brutally implemented campaign of violence and destruction conducted by the forces of the Yugoslav regime against the Kosovar Albanian population. (7) Undoubtedly it was a multi-

level ethnic-religious and political conflict and perhaps NATO should not openly support one of the parties. The problem was in the Human Rights interpretation: the truth is on the side of those people who are suffering more.

3. Milosevic's treatment of Kosovar Albanians might not have threatened the security of individual NATO members, but did threaten NATO's new political mission: the construction of Europe "whole and free". As H. Solana put it if NATO had not acted in Kosovo, 'the entire logic of turning Europe into a common political, economic and security space have been invalidated. This crisis threatened to further destabilize areas beyond the FRY. Perhaps the most dramatic scenario was that the conflict would spread to the South, ultimately drawing in both Greece and Turkey. (8)

4. Taking part in the building of undivided Europe NATO like any other European structure would not approve FRY under the communist leadership. By this FRY was introducing disharmony to the creation of monolith of the European democratic nations. So Milosevic regime should be changed to the more western-oriented.

5. Additional argument for NATO intervention is that Milosevic's actions could fill the "small struggling democracies" surrounding Kosovo by refugees. (9)

The use of military force against sovereign state without UN Security Council sanctions was a subject of heated debates both beyond and inside NATO. After the end of the military stage of Kosovo conflict some state officials from the Alliance countries have tried to ensure public opinion that taken action was an exception, but not a rule.

Although in Russian historiography the views that Kosovo crisis has become a precedent for NATO "force policy" in the future and that the Alliance Strategic Concept adopted in April 1999 has reflected NATO's desire to act sometimes without UN Security Council sanctions are very popular, (10) it must be stressed that there is no one article in the Concept, which could prove that directly.

From the one side Kosovo has proved NATO's effectiveness, but from another sharp criticism from the international society, much evidences of KLA cruel behavior regarding Serbs, found after the military phase of campaign, could not but prick up the Alliance members and to incline them to conduct more restrained and well-thought policy in the future to try to avoid actions with the use of force if there exist at least one possibility for peaceful settlement. The situation around Iraq is an evidence of NATO careful approach: NATO's European protagonists Germany and France were ready to go on a risk of complications in the relationship with the USA, by not supporting their intention to wage a war against Iraq. It could be concluded that "force policy" is not popular among NATO members anymore and even could lead to the serious tensions in the Alliance.

European Alliance members are looking for NATO transformation from a mainly military instrument of collective defense to a largely political agent of collective security. (11)

Russia's behavior during the crisis was determined by the following factors: 1. Desire to keep its political presence and influence in the Balkans.

2. National idea, which meant the necessity to support Slavs. While asking for political and military assistance, Milosevic was making an accent on Slavonic brotherhood. Strong pro-Serb sympathies could be found within the Russian parliament and within the Russian press, who have seen in pan-Slavism the means by which a distinctive Russian identity can be furthered in international affairs. But it did not have strong support among Russian population. The influence of the pan-Slavic case on Russian policy in general has been marginal. Actually Russian public opinion was not ready to perceive the situation objectively. Official authorities gave almost no information about "ethnic cleanings" in Kosovo. So NATO's interference to the conflict was taken by the Russian public opinion purely like an aggression. It has been stressed several times that North Atlantic Council adopted the decision of military action against the FRY only because Yugoslavia did not have possibilities to respond by adequate measures.

3. Economic sanctions against the FRY have been costly to the Russian economy. Actually this problem was arisen on the early stages of the Balkan crisis, when in January 1993 Sergey Glazjev, Minister of Foreign Economic Relations, suggested that the international community should compensate Russia for its trade losses.

4. Destabilization in the Balkans would also threaten Russia's free passage from the Black Sea to the Mediterranean, (12), which is quite important for the provision of its economic and political influence.

It could be concluded that until 1999 great power ambitions had been kept among Russian political elite. Perhaps this led to the opinion that it was a proper time to demonstrate to the West that Russia had its own distinct interests in the former Yugoslavia. Examining Russian foreign policy of that period it could be noted that situation in Yugoslavia has demonstrated its inconsistency. Actually such stubborn position of Yugoslav delegation during the Rambouillet talks was a result of Russian policy: Russia ensured Milosevic that in case of NATO's military interference to Yugoslavia Russia would give him military and political support. That's why the break of these promises by Russia could be considered as Russia's betrayal of Yugoslav leader.

Perhaps such inconsequent behavior of Russian leadership could be explained by the unhealthy political climate in the RF at that time. Simultaneously to the bombing, the State Duma was considering a variety of impeachment charges against President B. Yeltsin. Yeltsin's position

was also weakened by illnesses that kept him from day-to-day management of national and international affairs. (13) It could be said that Milosevic has saved Russian reputation, when he managed to stand before NATO's air campaign, kept his troops and was ready to withstand NATO in land operation. This allowed Russia to take a role of peacekeeper during and after Kosovo crisis. In connection with this it is important to refer to the words of A. Elchibey – ex-president of Azerbaydzhan: “Yugoslavia has become a victim of of Moscow's foreign policy. Without Moscow Milosevic would have been more compliant. Russia lost her influence in Europe after Yugoslav crisis. Moscow should not have supported such terrorist as Milosevic, who terrorized the entire nation”. (14)

Kosovo has brought valuable lessons to every party of the conflict. One of the lessons of Kosovo crisis for Russia is that it has no potential to withstand united West beyond its borders. The leader of the Russian Communist party G. Zuzanov marked, that “ we must acknowledge that in modern conditions any attempt of Russia to play the game as a superpower is a fully shady enterprise”. (15) From another side the menacing behavior of the RF in the beginning of the crisis could not but prick up the west seriously. Such misunderstanding and ignoring of Russian opinion could provoke the development of military-political ties between Russia and its potential strategic partners in the Middle East and Far East. This scenario would inevitably mean the failure of the policy of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

All this means that for the successful crisis management firstly the common approaches to the security issues should be elaborated. They should not conflict with the interests of all parties. It is necessary to understand that the interests of this or that party should not be based on ethnic or religious calculations in general. It is possible to build up a crisis management policy only by the directing by the Human Rights Protection ideas and provision of the common security.

The disintegration of the Euro-Atlantic society because of different approaches to one or another regional crisis could become a real threat to the international stability. Kosovo crisis has shown how this could happen. Learning the lessons from this experience must lead to the development of more effective mechanism of coordination of aims and interests of protagonist-states during the emergence of regional crises. Like J.E Goodby, prominent American diplomat, marks if states, which could take a collective action for crisis prevention have no idea about their final aims, they would not obtain a lot of chances for the effective crisis resolution. (16) It is necessary to pay attention to the internal conflicts, which potentially could be developed to the armed conflicts, threaten to the international society on the more early stage.

Another factor which should be taken into account during the elaboration of crisis management instruments is that it is very difficult to predict an exact number of participants whose interests are to be connected with a conflict and parties, which will finally suffer from the conflict. It is worth to remember a tragic mistake of NATO during Belgrade bombing, which has led to the serious complications in relationship with China. Like special representative of RF President for the situation around Yugoslavia settlement V. Chernomyrdin has marked, "the bombing of Chinese embassy in Belgrade by NATO proves that the policy with the use of force, conducting by the western powers, makes the negotiation process difficult and leads to the dead end". (17)

Crisis should not be a mean for any international organization or one or another state to demonstrate its credibility and superiority. The crisis should be resolved only in the cooperative atmosphere of all parties responsible for that. For example, without Russia's understanding and support, partnership of the USA and Western Europe in Kosovo crisis would inevitably face with serious difficulties. For the international society it is of vital importance to develop common rules, which would help to react on the crisis.

Notes:

1. Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security Between NATO and the Russian Federation // The NATO Handbook Documentation. – Brussels: NATO Office of Information and Press, 1999. P.133.
2. NATO Handbook. - Brussels: NATO Office of Information and Press, 2001. P.115.
3. Aleprete M.E. Democratic Politics and Russian Foreign Policy: Russia's Domestic Debate and the Conflict in Kosovo // Journal of International Relations and Development. #3(4) December 2000. P.349.
4. Robertson G. Kosovo one year on. Achievement and Challenge. - Brussels: NATO Office of Information and Press, 2000. P.9
5. Pavlowitch St. K. Serbia: The history behind the name. – London: Hurst and Co., 2002. Pp.218-219.
6. Moore R. NATO's mission for the new millenium. A value-based approach to building security // Contemporary Security Policy.Vol. 23. #1. April 2002. P.20.
7. Robertson G. Kosovo one year on. Achievement and Challenge. - Brussels: NATO Office of Information and Press, 2000. P.8
8. Moore R. NATO's mission for the new millenium. A value-based approach to building security // Contemporary Security Policy.Vol. 23. #1. April 2002. P.21.
9. Ibid.
10. Yuryeva T. Russia and NATO // Vnechnyaya politika Rossiyskoy Federatsii 1992-1999. – Moscow, 2000. P.199.
11. Sperling J. (ed.) Europe in change. Two tires or two speeds? The European security order and the enlargement of the European Union and NATO. – Manchester University Press, 1999. P.157.
12. Webber M. The international politics of Russia and the successor states. – Manchester University Press, 1996. P.264.

13. Aleprete M.E. Democratic Politics and Russian Foreign Policy: Russia's Domestic Debate and the Conflict in Kosovo // Journal of International Relations and Development. #3(4) December 2000. P.349.
14. Makarenko V. Kto soyuzniki Rossii? Mentalnost, geopolitika, paradozi politiki bezopasnosti Rossii. – Moscow: Stradiz, 2000. P.29.
15. Zaganov G. Geographia pobedi. Osnovi Rossiyskoy geopolitiki. – Moscow, 1997. P.237.
16. Goodby J. Europe undivided. The new logic of peace in U.S. – Russian relations. – Moscow, 2000. P.203.
17. Savenkov Y. China had heard USA excuses but did not accept them // Izvestiya, 12 May 1999.

Chapter 4. Combating terrorism issue in NATO-Russia's Cooperation.

The fundamental changes in international relations occurred in the last decade proved that the world is coming to the serious regrouping of the global forces, which is to change the bipolar system of the Cold war period.

The new threats to the world security require the new responds and international terrorism is one of the serious factors of XXI century. If earlier counter-terrorism success in democratic societies was mainly the result of advanced computer technology, cooperation with population and work of international services, now it demands more broad cooperation and transparent relations in international scale. International terrorism in modern life proves that the international security structure, created in the previous decades was effective for neutralizing former threats. Today it is unable to withstand the new challenges. The phenomena of international terrorism, appeared in XX century, includes drug and weapons trafficking, national intolerance, religious fanaticism, aggressive separatism, political extremism. The spreading of weapons of mass destruction and means of their delivery present the growing threat to the world security and stability. This problem also has a clear terrorist component.

It is not absolutely clear now how the new system of the world order will look like, but it is more likely that the progress of its building would unite the majority of international institutions – from the UN and Big 8 to the regional organizations. In such situation it is necessary to determine the place of Russia in international world order and the degree of its influence on the global processes. Being a great Eurasian power, Russia on its economic essence, demographic distribution, ethnical structure, history and culture is a European country. It is very important for it that the forthcoming transformation of the world order would not lead to the emergence of the new “crossing lines” on the continent, but supply Russia's participation in the decision-making processes concerning most considerable European security problems. Today the idea of impossibility of effective security system in Euro-Atlantic region creation without Russia's participation is well acknowledged. But it is also very difficult to imagine Russia's security without such international organizations as NATO, OSCE, and Council of Europe.

The present international situation is unique for the Russian history – for the first time there is no real military threat to Russia from the west, but the serious danger from the South “international terrorism is growing up. This danger is spreading on the global “shaft-bow of instability” from Philippines to Chechnya and Balkans under the slogans of Islamic religious extremism. (1) Stable future of Russia is closely connected with the strategic partnership with the west. But the aspirations of Russia to develop

open, stable relationship with the Near Eastern and Far Eastern states should not contradict this aim, as long as these states conduct peaceful policy.

As for Russia's – NATO cooperation in the sphere of security building and combating terrorism, although like Russian Foreign Minister I. Ivanov has marked that "Russia does not support NATO-centrist scheme for European building as far as it does not give an answer to the real threats to security and stability of the continent", (2) Russia acknowledges that NATO continues to be a serious instrument of security guaranteeing in the Euro-Atlantic region. After the 11 September tragedy issue of combating terrorism has become one of the central in NATO-Russia's relationship. If to compare NATO-Russia's Founding Act and Declaration of the Heads of States and Governments of Russian Federation and NATO member-states signed in Rome on 28 May 2002, it becomes obvious that in the section III "Areas for Consultation and Cooperation" of the Founding Act the issue of combating terrorism is among the least priorities, while in the Declaration it occupies the first place. (3)

For the first time, after 11 September tragedy NATO invoked Article 5. NATO demonstrated that its members are united and determined to defeat the new security challenges posed by terrorism, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery. This fact has proven to Russia that NATO has always been ready to meet new threats and seize new opportunities that the Alliance still matters and remains the key to the stability and security of the Euro-Atlantic area. (4) It is quite obvious that attacks of the terrorists on New York and Washington have shown new important factors of international life, which mean the beginning of the new era. Lot of problems, which were considered to be latent, has come out on the surface and became integral components of the modern world. Before analyzing them it is necessary to identify what does the definition of intentional terrorism mean.

To my mind the success in the mutual cooperation in combating terrorism is determined by two basic factors: transparent relations of all the anti-terrorist coalition states and identical understanding of the definition. In the Resolution 42/159 from 19.08.1988 of the UN General Assembly it is marked that "the effectiveness of combating terrorism could be enhanced by the elaboration of the universal definition of international terrorism". (5) There exist more than 100 definitions of terrorism.

According to the Penguin Dictionary of International Relations, terrorism is the use or threatened use of violence on a systematic basis to achieve political objectives. Terrorism is not a species of guerrilla warfare although it is often confused with it. Nor is it an ideology or a political movement. It is a strategy or a method that is common to groups of widely different political, philosophical and religious beliefs. (6)

In “The Terrorism reader” the whole chapter addresses the question what is terrorism and how it may be defined? It presents a selection of 10 straightforward definitions, which should help understanding and discussion. One among them is the definition of international terrorism, given by the recognized expert in this issue – P. Sederberg: “International terrorism is the threat or use of violence for political purposes when 1. such action is intended to influence the attitude and behavior of a target group wide than its immediate victim and 2. its ramifications transcend national boundaries. (7) Following the definitions given in the above-mentioned book it is possible to come to the conclusion that all of them more or less cover the essence of this phenomenon, but perhaps do not advance understanding very far. Actually this term should be considered in a wide context, taking into account such questions as: by what criteria should terrorists to be considered to carry out unlawful or illegitimate acts; how rational are they who advocate and plan the use of force to achieve political objectives; how far can intimidation and coercion establish and secure desirable outcomes; is it possible to appraise terrorist motivation dispassionately and without bias? (8) The problem of terminology is quite complicated because it has practical consequences. Who should be considered as terrorists – separate persons, organizations or the whole countries? If we consider any attempt to solve this or that political problem with the help of violence and weapons as terrorism, it would be possible to refer almost the half of the world to the states where terrorism is thriving.

It is not a secret that USA, for example, perceived Iraq or Afghanistan as the states, which conducted the policy of state terrorism. The US President G. Bush moved forward in this issue and suggested an expression of “axis of evil”. His decision to use this term for Iraq, North Korea, Iran has led to the perception of American approach to the situation around the “unstable states” in the European capitals from the positions of doubt but not the united support like it was expected in Washington. (9)

Russian position differs considerably from American one as well. Russia makes an accent on the point that it is necessary to find more diverse approach by evaluating this or that state, taking into account the fact that military actions against any state inevitably lead to the victims among the peaceful population. This is a big humanitarian problem, because the price of war is not only the finances invested to its waging, but also great sufferings of civil population, UN marginalization, new attempts of the weapons of mass destruction spreading. Especially if the aim of the war is to change a regime, another question is arising: what to do with the other potentially dangerous dictatorships? There is an experience in this sphere in the Balkans, Afghanistan, Iraq, North Korea and Iran are approaching. It also should not be forgotten that there exist the whole sets of countries with

“obedient” dictatorial regimes, which do not irritate and pose to international stability now but the situation could be changed tomorrow.

It is worth to think who will manage with all the results of humanitarian catastrophe in who will finance defeated country? Are there enough resources for that?

Actually RF has been facing with all these problems on it's own territory almost for a decade. Chechnya is a big source of terrorism, moreover there are lot of problems on Russia's exterior borders: drug trafficking through Afghanistan and Tadjhikistan, Islamic extremism activation on the Middle East territory, in Uzbekistan in particular. The specific character of Russian geopolitical position makes it necessary to pay more profound attention to the terrorism problem. For a long time RF political leaders were trying to overcome Western criticism of position towards Chechnya. Chechen field commanders, who were directly involved into international terrorism net use to be called “the soldiers of freedom”. (10) 11 September events, which became a symbol of terrorism threat to the world, have assisted Russia to the understanding of her policy in Chechnya and softening of critics from the West, although some Western politicians are quite far from the understanding that Chechen commanders are politically and financially integrated with the international terrorist structures. To overcome this misunderstanding and double standards it is important to reach an international agreement regarding an exhaustive definition of terrorism and its criteria. Moreover present situation demands to endorse means of classifying countries according to the features and the level of their sponsorship of terrorism.

Transparency in the cooperation of combating terrorism is quite important as well. It is useless to fight with terrorism, while keeping important information in secret from each other. Moreover transparency demands the parties to share the basic ethic views, to be guided by the similar logic of actions or to be the members of one organization or union. This idea was stressed several times in the statement of Russian Duma “About combating International terrorism”, made after 11 September tragedy. The Deputies applied to the parliaments of all countries to develop and sign on the high state level international convention on “combating international terrorism”, which should include concrete responsibilities of all its signatories on preventing terrorist acts in national and global scale and punishment of their organizers and performers. (11)

In this context NATO-Russia's partnership could be the most valuable. Although Russia is not a member of the Alliance and some critics write that “Russia is not a wholly European power and has interests that are not necessarily consistent with NATO objectives” (12), Russian and NATO approaches toward this problem are not too far from each other. It is not by chance that NATO and Russia have taken steps to give new impetus and

direction to their extensive cooperation in the aftermath of 11 September. As President G. Bush observed at the founding meeting of the new NATO-Russia Council in Rome: “The NATO-Russia Council offers Russia a path toward forming an alliance with the Alliance. It offers all our nations a way to strengthen our common security and it offers the world the prospect of a more hopeful century”. (13)

Combating terrorism is one of the key rapproching factors for NATO and RF, which can lead to further cooperation. The attitude towards Russia has been changed greatly in the last decade. Certainly, in the discussions about RF possible entry to the Alliance some influential politicians are of the opinion that RF is not culturally suited for membership and that its interests diverge fundamentally from NATO's. However Putin's cooperation in the “war on terrorism” and his apparent desire to move Russia closer to the West in the wake of the 11 September attacks have prompted somewhat greater willingness to at least reassess NATO's relationship with RF. (14). Taking into account the tendency toward more independence of NATO European structures from the USA, their cooperation with Russia is becoming more attractive. During the last years the US policy was built mainly on the idea of superiority, which meant that USA did not need the allies at least in the military sphere. Together European NATO members are spending for the defense about 2/3 out of American defense budget. (15)

The idea of National Missile Defense system, implemented by President G. Bush was considered to be the final symbol of American unassailability. From the one side, as 11 September events have proved NABM system can't defend from the threats. From another side modern terrorism differs greatly by the real possibility of use the weapons of mass destruction and thus it could protect. This circumstances demand a new approach of democratic nations towards defense, especially now, when NABM system, introduced by the USA has undermined the whole system of collective security, based on more than 60b treaties and agreements for almost 30 years. That is why Europe and Russia should think about Russian-European ABM system. This work has been already started in the frameworks of NATO-Russia Council. Moreover Russia and NATO are developing cooperation in the creation of strategic mobility transport means. (16)

Terrorism related issues are one of the areas of enhanced cooperation in the frameworks of NATO-Russia's partnership. Responses on the terrorist attacks have become a regular theme of meetings of the NATO-Russia Permanent Joint council and then NATO-Russia Council. Lord Robertson met President Putin several times after the tragedy in the USA to discuss ways that NATO and Russia can work together to fight terrorism and develop a close relationship that reflects cooperation in this and other areas. (17). During Prague Summit a Partnership Action Plan against terrorism

was discussed. Before that the concrete measures were taken. From 25 to 27 September 2002 a joint NATO-Russia crisis response exercise “Bogorodsk 2002” took place in Noginsk, 70 km outside Moscow. The exercise was to stimulate an international response to a terrorist attack on a chemical plant. The exercise was a part of NATO’s cooperation program with partner countries – The Partnership for Peace Work Program. About 700 Russian and 300 international personnel took part. (18)

Undoubtedly one of the quite important issues of the problem is the roots of international terrorism. Some politicians and analysts in Russia and in the Western Europe consider that the essence is lying in the big difference of the level of life between “the golden billion” and other five billions of population. Director of the Center of Historical Studies of the Institute of the USA and Canada A. Utkin, for example, writes that after 11 September the precipice in the level of life (the difference is 30 to 1) became the key factor of the world policy. That is why it is impossible to ignore that for the last 15 years the income per head was reduced in more than 100 countries, the per-capita consumption in more than 60 countries. (19) It is quite clear that in the conditions of the world transparency and advanced information technologies and mass media the young generation of the “more legging behind South” is losing the illusions to occupy a decent place in life. This feeling is leading to the radicalism. Poverty is one of the factors and stimulating sources of terrorism. Belgian Prime Minister G. Verhovstadt went too far to say that the “golden billion” is trying to legalize the backwardness and poverty of the world population. Prime Minister in his open letter to the “opponents of world integration” acknowledged the illegality of the Western states actions in such cases like “moral speculations against weak currencies”, “dumping of agricultural wastes”, “trade in the one direction from the North” with a wide declarations about its freedom. (20) It is possible to come to the conclusion that the West is not planning to reconsider its policy considerably to the measures of the effective solutions of such world problems as poverty, diseases, ecology pollution and by such actions it feeds terrorists ground. But it is certainly a part of the problem. It would be unfair to explain this phenomena by the poverty only. The roots are deeper. Billions of dollars are spending for terrorist acts by the people whom we can’t identify as poor. They are using social and religious factors to attract more people to their nets and on eof the aims, pursuing by the international terrorism is re-division of the world.

Such situation demands the unity and cooperation of all states in combating terrorism. If it is not reached the world society can get a row of serious regional and world-scale conflicts.

Concluding all the above written it must be stressed that general objective of combating terrorism programs is neutralizing terrorist groups. In this context it basically means preventing attacks and minimizing the effects if

one should occur. It includes any action to weaken the terrorist organization and its political power and to make potential targets more difficult to attack. Moreover the objective can be further refined as spoiling action, deterrence and response.

Uniting NATO and Russia's forces in the development of an effective strategy against terrorism it should be taken into consideration that the search of terrorism sources must be conducted firstly. The three levels of terrorism could be suggested: concrete persons, organizations and states, which give terrorists political, financial or even ethical support. Then the stimulating motivations of terrorist should be revealed. It is very popular today to accuse Muslims in all tragedies. By the way it is quite dangerous, especially for Russia, millions citizens of which confess Islam. We should not fight with the religion, but with radical organizations, which use it. The forecast of the clash of civilizations, made by S. Huntington is dangerous, it is a dead end for the development of international relations. As far as there is still no international agreement regarding an exhaustive definition of international terrorism, there is a big risk of endless fight between the "civilized North" and "barbarian South".

Tragic events, caused by terrorists and terrorist attacks of 11 September (as one of the most striking tragedies) made the call for a dialogue among civilizations even more compelling (21) and proved that international security demands the consolidation and cooperation of all international and regional organizations and nation-states. As far as the "terrorist world" is becoming more united (Chechen terrorist for example demonstrated their solidarity with terrorists who attacked USA in September 2001) it is important to use collective experience in combating this phenomena. (22)

Moreover it is quite important to reveal the "financial ground" of terrorists in every case, as far as they could be supported financially not only from the Arabian multi-millionaires but also from the European or Latin American drug princess and organized economic criminals. In this context NATO and Russia's joint efforts are considered as a key factor of international stability. But even if all the efforts of the world society are to be successful and we find common understanding in this issue and elaborate common effective strategy of combating terrorism, it should not be forgotten that it is impossible to defeat terrorism utterly. People must be ready psychologically to live close to this phenomenon, not to fear it but to oppose.

Notes:

1. Uspensky N. Open and frank dialogue // Europe. #2 (20), 2002. P.10.
2. Ivanov I. Russian Foreign Policy at contemporary stage // The Diplomatic Journal. #5, 2001. P.15.
3. Declaration of the Heads of States and Governments of Russian Federation and NATO State-members // <http://www.nato.int/docu/basic/txt/b020528r.htm>

4. Grossman M. New capabilities, new members, new relationships // <http://www.nato.int/docu/review/2002/issue2/english/art2.html>
5. Vestnik MID SSSR. #10, 1988. P.21.
6. Evans G., Newnham J. The Penguin Dictionary of International Relations. – London: Penguin Books, 1998. Pp. 530-531.
7. Whittaker D. (ed.) The Terrorism reader – London: Routledge, 2001. P.4
8. Ibid. P.4.
9. Russia-NATO: British experts about the changes in the situation of world policy // Kompas. #21, 2002. P.73.
10. Fedorov A. Terrorism and double standards // Rossiyskaya Federatsiya segodnya. October 20, 2001. P.3.
11. Russian State Duma Statement about Combating International Terrorism // Rossiyskaya Federatsiya segodnya. October 19, 2001. P.19.
12. Kissinger H. NATO: make it stronger, make it larger // The Washington Post, 14 January 1997. P.A.15.
13. Grossman M. New capabilities, new members, new relationships // <http://www.nato.int/docu/review/2002/issue2/english/art2.html>
14. Moore R. NATO's mission for the new millenium. A value based approach to building security // Contemporary Security Policy. Vol.23, #1 April 2002. P.23.
15. Utkin A. World order of the XXI century. – Moscow: Algoritm, 2001. P.213.
16. Yavlinsky G. More effective than war // Izvestiya, 11 February 2003.
17. Bennet C. Aiding America // NATO Review. Winter 2001/2002. P.7.
18. Joint NATO-Russia crisis response exercise // <http://www.nato.int/docu/update/2002/0923/e0925a.htm>
19. Utkin A. The first victim- international law // Rossiyskaya Federatsiya segodnya. October 20, 2001. P.32.
20. Anokhin A. Roots of terrorism // Rossiyskaya Federatsiya segodnya. October 20, 2001. P.34.
21. Crossing the Divide: dialogue among civilizations. – School of Diplomacy and Internationla Relations, Seton Hall University South Orange, New Jersey, 2001. P.213.
22. Nikolaev A. It is impossible to manage with the treats of XXI century separately // Rossiyskaya Federatsiya segodnya. October 19, 2001. P.8.

Conclusions.

It could be stated without exaggeration that all happened in Europe recently has dis-balanced international relations, destabilized situation, increased uncertainty of nations in the future and possibility of use of force. The situation is provoking the question to what extent the new balance of power is stable and if it is able to supply peaceful development in Europe on the equal co-beneficial base, or it would be the source of permanent tensions, conflicts and estrangement? The answer depends on many factors and NATO-Russia's relationships are one of the most important of them. Actually the future model of the security system in Euro-Atlantic region depends on them to much extent.

Undoubtedly the model of collective security is the most preferable approach, but it is impossible to ignore that great powers, using such factors as power and geographical closeness are slipping to the "spheres of influence" approach. That's why it is very important to combine the elements of these two approaches, but not clash them. This is a task for NATO and RF for the nearest future. Russian party sees only one obstacle to fulfill it successfully. As President Putin declared in his annual address to the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation, "We believe that the problem we have is because NATO often ignores the opinion of the international community and the provisions of the documents of international law when adopting its decisions. This is the cause of the main problem. That is why the future of our relations with the Alliance depends on the precision with which the provisions of basic documents of international law are going to be observed. First of all in matters of the use of force and the threat to use of force our position is clear. The only organization empowered to authorize the use of force in international relations is the United Nations Security Council." (1)

Examining the models of future NATO-Russia's relationships it is important to take into consideration the circumstance that presently the change of paradigms is going in international relations: "NATO-centric" model is less being associated with the "American-centric" one, although USA is still trying to keep its influence in Europe through NATO. This is one of the most effective "levers", because America has not participated in the EU enlargement. In this context the problem of NATO enlargement could be considered as USA attempt to keep its leadership in the Alliance and its presence in Europe, but not as an attack on Russia's national interests. USA is interested in enlargement because the new members would be more dependent from its military and economic strength and as a result would be more obedient ally. The speech delivered by the US Defense Minister D. Ramsfeld, which has gotten wide repercussions in press is proving this : "France and Germany are not the whole Europe yet.

Europe is moving to the East. Soon NATO will have 26 members and we should listen to their opinion.” This phrase is connected with the events, taken place on the eve of the war in Iraq. While discussing future actions, NATO members did not come to the single decision as regards USA support in war waging. (2) This has demonstrated that with the end of the Cold war era NATO began to lose its role of the USA marionette.

This situation leads to another question: if NATO stays relevant to the Euro-Atlantic security problems. Disappearance of Warsaw Pact has given way to a multitude of threats sparked off by ethnic, religious, national-territorial conflicts in South-Eastern Europe, which have the potential to affect Western Europe, especially in the conditions of single European space building. So centrifugal tendencies in South-Eastern Europe became the reflection of centripetal processes in its Western part, which are in their turn two links of the one chain – the formation of the post-bipolar world system and new architecture of international relations. This force NATO to think about deep reforms which would allow dealing effectively with the “new generation “ conflicts, threatening to destabilize Euro-Atlantic security. New Strategic Concept, adopted on Washington jubilee summit is an attempt of the Alliance reforming. But recent events have proven that it would be quite difficult to implement it. Western Europeans are not ready for the globalization of NATO responsibilities. They would really doubt about their involvement to the ethnic conflicts, taking place beyond the NATO traditional zone of actions. In this context the definition “Euro-Atlantic” space becomes a bit vague and Europe perhaps is still not ready to accept it fully. This circumstance should be taken into consideration, while discussing the possible models of NATO-Russia’s cooperation and its effectiveness.

Firstly, it must be stressed that NATO and Russia are not adversaries anymore and it is very hard to imagine their open enmity today. Rome Declaration is an evidence of their “new level” relations. The question is to what extent this cooperation should be developed. The “Declaration” could be just a base for something more serious. The issue of Russia’s membership to the Alliance automatically raises questions about NATO’s ability to encourage democratic reforms in areas not universally regarded as historically part of the west, it brings a big risk to NATO to be involved into the busy agenda of Russian interests. (3) So the flexible model of relations should be developed, which would correspond both to NATO and RF interests the spheres of interaction and the clear scheme of behavior should be developed as well.

All these allows to determine the following scenarios of relations:

1. Europe will build separate “European” security system on the base of European Defense Forces. The USA would be “excommunicated” from the European affairs, which would undermine the political base of the

Alliance and lead to its destruction or transformation to the regional pure European organization. In this case transatlantic partnership would lose its essence and RF has to choose whom it prefers to be with USA or Europe? Perhaps geopolitical reasons would motivate to choose EU. From another side, with the US help Russia has already secured its Southern borders. Moreover for the USA Russia could be the most effective partner than European NATO members. But it is very difficult to imagine that a deep split could happen between the USA and Europe, which pushes NATO to choose between them and to gain any benefits from this situation.

2. Enlarged NATO could dilute the Alliance and its activity. It would cause complications in the decision-making process and relations with RF in particular as far as the new NATO members could remind Russia their suffering from its totalitarian past. In that case NATO-Russia's relationship would be quite limited and hardly could become a core of Euro-Atlantic security.
3. USA could enhance its role in the Alliance and in Europe. This more likely could happen in case of increased threat from the South and Europe could not manage to build up effective defense forces and modernize them. It is not a secret that European armed forces are only in the beginning of modernization, in the time when the USA has already reached a strong progress in this sphere. In the foreseeable future the EU force is not going to be able to engage in global missions without depending heavily on the United States. Strengthening American positions in the Alliance, Atlantic ally could suggest Europe the part of great and high profitable American weapons' market and give modernized military equipment, which is of big importance for the European defense. This would enhance Europe's dependence from the USA. It is possible to ascertain that in case if this model is realized, this would mean the retreat to previous times or building up the uni-polar world with American dominance. In that case Russia together with European states will try to counterbalance USA in the frameworks of NATO by applying to the International Law and UN Security Council decisions. But in case of the uni-polar world structure building it would be difficult to oppose any US decision. The recent events in Iraq have proven that America is self-sufficient and can conduct the policy, it considers to be right.
4. The most preferable scenario is that Euro-Atlantic partnership will be strengthened from every side. The USA would refrain from the role of "NATO chief" and become one of the equal members of the Alliance, which acts only in the frameworks of the UN Security Council decisions. It is in the EU interests that a cooperative relationship with NATO and Washington are to be developed, as far as in the foreseeable

future it is difficult to imagine a serious operation in South-Eastern Europe for the EU forces without the risk of large casualties in the absence of NATO support. Democratically reformed Russia with developed market economy would be integrated to the European institutions and dividing common Western values, acknowledging the idea of Europe whole and free would become a strong NATO's ally.

It could be concluded that in the in the age of globalization security can no longer be conceived in purely state-centric terms. Euro-Atlantic security depends on three main actors: USA, Europe and Russia, which efforts could be accumulated in the frameworks of NATO. Being a link for these actors, NATO can make Euro-Atlantic space safe for democracy. All these would be possible if Russia continues the way of democratic reforms and civil society building, EU be sensitive to RF internal problems, USA would not try to thrust "Pax Americana" to the rest of the world. The cooperation would be successful if Euro-Atlantic society solve the problem of search of the new anti-crisis settlement doctrine, universal model of management with ethnic-national and political-territorial conflicts, which are the consequences of structural, transitional crisis. It will be beneficial if the criteria of international terrorism and measures of combating this phenomenon are elaborated strictly and would be obligatory for every state. The absence of comprehensive, long-term anti-crisis policy, developed by the EU, USA, RF and NATO jointly could cause not less troubles than intensification of regional ethnic-national, political-territorial conflicts, terrorist attacks and spread of weapons of mass destruction. This determines the necessity of the new methods of crisis management development. By developing mutual cooperation it is important to study to examine various scenarios of crisis events, to reveal and forecast the factors of potential conflicts in time, to adopt effective measures for their neutralization. Only in that case Euro-Atlantic region would become a space with stable peace and security.

Notes:

1. From the President Vladimir Putin's Annual Address to the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation. April 3 // The Diplomatic Journal. #5, May 2001. P.10.
2. Stepanov G. Help your self. NATO members rebel against USA // Izvestiya 11 February 2003. P.7
3. Havel V. NATO's quality of life // The New York Times 13 May 1997.

Bibliography.

Primary Sources.

1. The Alliance's Strategic Concept approved by the Heads of State and Government participating in the Meeting of the North Atlantic Council. Washington D.C., 23-24 April 1999 // The NATO Handbook Documentation – NATO Office of Information and Press, 1999.
2. British Parliamentarians about European security, NATO and Russia // *Compas*. #9, 28.08.2002.
3. Clinton B., quoted in R.D. Asmus, R.L. Kugler and F.S. Larrabee "NATO expansion: the next steps" // *Survival* #1 (37), spring 1995.
4. Declaration of the Heads of States and Governments of Russian Federation and NATO State-members // <http://www.nato.int/docu/basic/b020528r.htm>
5. Declaration of the Heads of State and Government participating in the Meeting of the North Atlantic Council. Brussels, 11 January 1994 // The NATO Handbook Documentation – NATO Office of Information and Press, 1999.
6. Debate. Can NATO remain an effective military and political alliance if it keeps growing? Charles Grant versus Ronald A, Asmus // *NATO Review*. Spring 2002. <file:///A:/NATODialogue.htm>
7. Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security Between NATO and the Russian Federation // The NATO Handbook Documentation. – Brussels: NATO Office of Information and Press, 1999.
8. From the President Vladimir Putin's Annual Address to the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation. April 3 // *The Diplomatic Journal*. #5, May 2001.
9. Joint NATO-Russia crisis response exercise // <http://www.nato.int/docu/update/2002/0923/e0925a.htm>
10. National Security Concept of Russian Federation. 10 January 2000 // *The Diplomatic Journal*. #2, 2000.
11. Robertson G. Challenges for the next decade // *Nato's Nations*. 50th Anniversary SHAPE Allied Command Europe. Issue 1., 2001.
12. Robertson G. Kosovo one year on. Achievement and Challenge. - Brussels: NATO Office of Information and Press, 2000.
13. Rome summit Russia – NATO results: principal new stage in the relations // *Compas*. #23, 2002.
14. Russia-NATO: British experts about the changes in the world policy situation // *Compas*. #21, 2002.
15. Russian State Duma Statement about Combating International Terrorism // *Rossiyskaya Federatsiya segodnya*. October 19, 2001.

16. Study on NATO enlargement issued by the Heads of the State and Government participating in the Meeting of the North Atlantic Council. Brussels, 3 September 1995 // The NATO Handbook Documentation – NATO Office of Information and Press, 1999.

Secondary Sources.

1. Aleprete M.E. Democratic Politics and Russian Foreign Policy: Russia's Domestic Debate and the Conflict in Kosovo // Journal of International Relations and Development. #3(4) December 2000.
2. Anokhin A. Roots of terrorism // Rossiyskaya Federatsiya segodnya. October 20, 2001.
3. Bennet C. Aiding America // NATO Review. Winter 2001/2002.
4. Black I. Russian resolution // Guardian. 5 October 2001.
5. Brzezinski Z. The grand chessboard. American primacy and its geostrategic imperatives. – Moscow: "Mezhdunarodnie otnosheniya", 1999.
6. Carpenter T.G., Conry B. (ed-s) NATO enlargement: illusions and reality – Washington, D.C.: Cato Institute, 1998.
7. Croft S. Guaranteeing Europe's security? Enlarging NATO again // International Affairs. Vol. 78, #1. January 2002.
8. Crossing the Divide: dialogue among civilizations. – School of Diplomacy and International Relations, Seton Hall University South Orange, New Jersey, 2001.
9. Davidov Y. Enlargement of the Atlantic world sphere of responsibility // USA – Canada: Ekonomika, Politika, Kultura. #3, 2000.
10. Delyagin M. If Russia has forces to manage with the US new pragmatism? // Mezhdunarodnaya zhizn. #3, 2001.
11. Duffield J. NATO's function after the Cold war // Political Science Quarterly. Vol.109, #5 (winter 1994-1995).
12. Evans G., Newnham J. The Penguin Dictionary of International Relations. – London: Penguin Books, 1998.
13. Fedorov A. Terrorism and double standards // Rossiyskaya Federatsiya segodnya. October 20, 2001.
14. Galiev A. Against NATO // Expert. #12, 1997.
15. Goldgeier J. Not when but who // NATO Review. Spring 2002.
16. Goltz A. Repeated marriage // Itogi. 22 February 2000.
17. Goltz A. To NATO because of need: Vladimir Putin would like to change guarantees of security on the financial support of the West // Itogi. 14 March 2000.
18. Goodby J. Europe undivided. The new logic of peace in U.S. – Russian relations. – Moscow, 2000.

19. Grossman M. New capabilities, new members, new relationships // <http://www.nato.int/docu/review/2002/issue2/english/art2.html>
20. Havel V. NATO's quality of life // The New York Times 13 May 1997.
21. Havel V. Prague predictions // NATO Review. Spring 2002.
22. Ivanov I. Russian Foreign Policy at contemporary stage // The Diplomatic Journal. #5, 2001.
23. Karkoszka A. Following the footsteps // NATO Review. Spring 2002. www.nato.int/docu/review/2002/issue1/art4.html
24. Kazantsev B. The consequences of NATO enlargement // Mezhdunarodnaya zhizn. #11-12, 1997.
25. Kissinger H. Be realists // USA: Ekonomika, Politika, Ideologiya. #7, 1994.
26. Kissinger H. NATO: make it stronger, make it larger // The Washington Post, 14 January 1997.
27. Kobrinskaya I. Russia: facing the facts // Enlarging NATO. The National debates. Mattox G., Rachwald A. (ed-s) – London: Lynne Reinner Publishers, 2001.
28. Kremenyuk V. Russia and NATO: Sworn friends // Observer #8 (127).
29. Kydd A. Trust building, trust breaking: the dilemma of NATO enlargement // International Organization. Vol. 55, #4 (autumn 2001).
30. Makarenko V. Kto soyuzniki Rossii? Mentalnost, geopolitika, paradoxi politiki bezopastnosti Rossii – Moscow:Stradiz, 2000.
31. Mandelbaum M. A perfect failure: NATO's war against Yugoslavia // Foreign Affairs. Vol. 78, #5 (September/October 1999).
32. Mandelbaum M. The dawn of peace in Europe – N.Y.: Twentieth Century Fund Press, 1996.
33. Matser W. Towards a new strategic partnership // NATO Review. Winter 2001/2002.
34. Mattox G. A. New realities. New challenges // Enlarging NATO. The National debates. Mattox GA., Rachwald A.R. (ed-s) – London: Lynne Reiner Publishers, 2001.
35. Moore R. NATO's mission for the new millenium. A value-based approach to Building security // Contemporary Security Policy. Vol. 23, #1. April 2002.
36. NATO Handbook. – Brussels: NATO Office of Information and Press, 2001.
37. Nye J. Redefining NATO's mission in the information age // NATO Review. Vol. 47, #4 (winter 1999).
38. Nikolaev A. It is impossible to manage with the treats of XXI century separately // Rossiyskaya Federatsiya segodnya. October 19, 2001.
39. Parkhalina T. Russia and NATO: one year later//Observer #8 (127), 2000.

40. Pavlowitch St. K. Serbia: The history behind the name. – London: Hurst and Co., 2002.
41. Primakov Y. Russia, the West and NATO // Obscschaja gazeta. #37, 21-27 September 1996;
42. Primakov Y. Russia and international relations in the conditions of globalization // Mezhdunarodnaya zhizn. #3, 2001.
43. Reiter D. Why NATO enlargement does not spread democracy // International Security. Vol. 25, #4 (spring 2001).
44. Sandler T., Hartley K. The political economy of NATO. Past, present and into the 21st century. – Cambridge University Press, 1999.
45. Savenkov Y. China had heard USA excuses but did not accept them // Izvestiya, 12 May 1999.
46. Shakleina T. Concept of the new Atlantic society and Russia's security // USA: Economica, Politika, Ideologiya. #2, 1997.
47. Shtol V. Russia and NATO: On the verge of the ages // Observer. #8 (127), 2000.
48. Sperling J., Kirchner E. Recasting the European order: security architectures and economic cooperation. – Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997
49. Sperling J. (ed.) Europe in change. Two tiers or two speeds? The European security order and the enlargement of the European Union and NATO - Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999.
50. Stepanov G. Help your self. NATO members rebel against USA // Izvestiya 11 February 2003.
51. Strelyaev S. Russia and NATO: what is further? // Observer. #8 (127), 2000.
52. Trenin d. Silence of the Bear// NATO Review. Spring 2002. www.nato.int/docu/review/2002/issue1/art3html
53. Terekhov V. Germany – fifty years on // Mezhdunarodnaya zhizn. #10, 1999.
54. Tretyakov V. Pragmatism of V. Putin's Foreign Policy // Mezhdunarodnaya zhizn. #5, 2002.
55. Utkin A. Amerikanskaya strategiya dlya XXI veka – Moscow: Logos,2000;
56. Utkin A. Mirovoy poryadok XXI veka – Moscow:Algoritm, 2001.
57. Utkin A. The first victim- international law // Rossiyskaya Federatsiya segodnya. October 20, 2001.
58. Uspensky N. Open and frank dialogue // Europe. #2 (20), 2002.
59. Waterman H., Zagorcheva D. Correspondence. NATO and democracy // International Security. Vol. 26, #3 (winter 2001/2002).
60. Webber M. The international politics of Russia and the successor states. – Manchester University Press, 1996.

61. Williams G.L. Jones B.J. NATO and the Transatlantic Alliance in the 21st century. The twenty-year crisis. – Antony Rave Ltd, Chippenham. Wiltshire, 2001.
62. Whittaker D. (ed.) The Terrorism reader – London: Routledge, 2001.
63. Yavlinsky G. More effective than war // Izvestiya, 11 February 2003.
64. Yost D.S. Transatlantic relations and peace in Europe // International Affairs. Vol. 78, #2. April 2002.
65. Yuryeva T. Russia and NATO// Vneshnyaya politika Rossiyskoy Federatsii 1992-1999 – Moscow:ROSSPEN, 2000.
66. Zupanov G. Geographia pobedi. Osnovi Rossiyskoy geopolitiki. – Moscow, 1997.

67.