

INFORMATION
On the preparation of the Final Report
“NATO Enlargement’s Impact on Moldovan Neutrality”.

I. To carry out the Final Report “Enlargement’s Impact on Moldovan Neutrality” its author has enfolded/participated /in the following activities:

1. Studding the Documents and Materials regarding:

a) NATO’s Foundation and Enlargement, in particular:

- The North Atlantic Treaty, Washington DC, 4th April 1949;
- The Declaration on a Transformed North Atlantic Alliance, Issued in London, UK, on 6 July 1990;
- The Declaration on Peace and Cooperation, issued in Rome, Italy, on 8 November 1991;
- The Alliance’s Strategic Concept, agreed by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Rome on 7-8 November 1991;
- Partnership for Peace: Invitation, Issued by Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council held on NATO Headquarters, Brussels, on 10-11 January 1994;
- Partnership for Peace: Framework Document;
- Declaration of the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council held at NATO Headquarters, Brussels, on 10-11 January 1994;
- Study of NATO Enlargement, September 1995;
- Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security between NATO and the Russian Federation, Issued in Paris, France, on 27 May 1997;
- Madrid Declaration on Euro-Atlantic Security and Cooperation, Issued by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Madrid on 8 July 1997;
- Charter on a Distinctive Partnership between the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation and Ukraine, Issued in Madrid, Spain, on 9 July 1997;
- The Washington Declaration, Signed and issued by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Washington D.C. on 23 and 24 April 1999;
- Washington Summit Communiqué, Issued by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Washington D.C. on 24 April 1999;

- The Alliance Strategic Concept, Approved by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Washington D.C. on 23 and 24 April 1999;

b) International Treaties and Materials on Security and Neutrality:

- Rights and Duties of Neutral Powers and Persons in Case of War on Land (Hague V); October 18, 1907;
- Rights and Duties of Neutral Powers in Naval War (Hague XIII); October 18, 1907;
- The Covenant of the League of Nations (including Amendments adopted to December, 1924) ;
- Communiqué of the Conference of Balkan Concord on February 2-4, 1940;
- The Charter of the United Nations, signed on June 26, 1945;
- Treaty of Friendship, Co-operation and Mutual Assistance (Russian), 14 May 1955.
- The CSCE/OSCE Helsinki Final Act, signed on August 1, 1975;
- The Military Doctrine of the Warsaw Treaty (Russian), 1987;
- The Charter of Paris for a New Europe, signed on November 21, 1990;
- The Commonwealth: Informative Bulletin of the Heads of State and Government of the CIS, (Minsk: 1992-1996 (Russian));
- Russia and the Commonwealth of Independent States: documents, data, and analysis / edited by Zbigniew Brzezinski and Paige Sullivan, (New York: Center for Strategic and International Studies, 1997).
- Istanbul Summit Declaration, issued on November 19, 1999;

c) Foreign States' Documents on Security and Neutrality:

Austria

- State Treaty for the Re-establishment of an Independent and Democratic Austria;
- Federal Constitutional Law of 26 October 1955 on the Neutrality of Austria;

Estonia

- Estonian Neutrality Law of December 1st, 1938;
- Since the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact to the Treaty on the Bases: Documents and Materials;
- The Constitution of Estonia, Adopted on June 28, 1992;

Finland

- Treaty of Friendship, Co-operation, and Mutual Assistance between the Republic of Finland and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, done on April 6, 1948;

- The Military Doctrine of Finland, Statement by the Commander-in-Chief of the Finnish Defence Forces Admiral Jan Klenberg, Seminar on Military Doctrine, Vienna, 9 October 1991;
- Security in a Changing World: Guidelines for Finland's Security Policy, Report by the Council of State to the Parliament 6 June 1995;
- The European Security Development and Finnish Defence, Report by the Council of State to Parliament on 17 March 1997;
- PfP Planning and Review Process, 1999 Draft Planning and Review Assessment, Finland;

Lithuania

- Basics of the National Security Concept of Lithuania (Draft), 30 October, 1991;
- White Paper – 1999;

România

- Communiqué on the neutrality of Romania on September 6, 1939 (Romanian);
- The Constitution of Romania;
- The Romania' Strategy on the Integration into NATO;

Russian Federation

- Information on Conventional Forces of Russian Federation, valid as of January 1, 1995 according to CFE Treaty.
- Information on Conventional Forces of Russian Federation, valid as of January 1, 2000 according to CFE Treaty.
- The National Security Concept of the Russian Federation, signed on January 10, 2000;
- The Military Doctrine of the Russian Federation, signed on April 21, 2000;

Sweden

- The Military Doctrine of Sweden, Statement by the Supreme Commander Swedish Armed Forces General Bengt Gustafsson, Seminar on Military Doctrine, Vienna, 8 October 1991;

Switzerland

- The Neutrality Guide-Lines of the Swiss Ministry for foreign Affairs, 26 November 1954;
- Swiss Security in Times of Change: Report 90 of the Federal Council to the Federal Assembly on Switzerland's Security Policy, Issued in Bern, on 1 October 1990.
- The Military Doctrine of Switzerland, Statement by the Chief of the General Staff of the Swiss Army Lieutenant General Heinz Häsler, Seminar on Military Doctrine, Vienna, 9 October 1991;

- Report by the Council of State to the Parliament “Security in a Changing’ World”, Issued in Helsinki, on 6 June 1995.
- The Swiss Partnership for Peace Programme: Clusters of Competence, Federal Military Department, General Secretariat, Permanent PfP Office, February 1997.
- Rapport annuel du Conseil Fédéral sur la Participation de la Suisse au Partenariat pour la Paix de l’OTAN en 1997 ;
- Report of the Study Commission on the Strategic Studies, Issued in Bern, on 26 February 1998;
- PfP Planning and Review Process, 1999 Draft Planning and Review Assessment, Switzerland;
- Security through Cooperation: Report of the Federal Council to the Federal Assembly on the Security Policy of Switzerland, Issued in Bern, on 7 June 1999;

Turkmenistan

- The Permanent neutrality of Turkmenistan: Collection of political and legal documents;
- Foreign Policy of Neutral Turkmenistan: Speeches, Addresses and Interviews of the President of Turkmenistan Saparmurad Turkmenbashi;

Ukraine

- The Constitution of Ukraine, adopted in 1996;
- The Military Doctrine of Ukraine, issued on October 18, 1993;
- PfP Planning and Review Process, 1999 Draft Planning and Review Assessment, Ukraine;

United States of America

- The Neutrality Act on May 1, 1937;
- The Neutrality Act on November 4, 1939;
- NATO Participation Act of 1994;
- NATO Security Revitalization Act of 1995;
- Hearing before the Committee on International Relations, House of Representatives, One Hundred Fourth Congress, Second Session, June 20, 1996;

d) Documents and Data on the Republic of Moldova

- Archives of the Government of the Republic of Moldova, Section “Decrees and Rulings of the President of the Republic of Moldova” (Romanian);
- The Declaration on Sovereignty of the Republic of Moldova on June 23, 1990 (Romanian);
- The Resolution of the Parliament of the Republic of Moldova on the military service of the citizens of the Republic of Moldova on September 4, 1990;

- The Declaration on Independence of the Republic of Moldova on August 27, 1991 (Romanian);
- The Pact Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact and its consequences for Bessarabia: Documents, (Chisinau, Publishing House “Universitas”, 1991).
- The Declaration of the Parliament of the Republic of Moldova on the security and disarmament aspects on September 10, 1991 (Romanian);
- Republica Moldova / Respublica Moldova / The Republic of Moldova / La République de Moldavie, (Chişinău: Universitas, 1991).
- The Agreement on the principles of the peaceful settlement of the armed conflict in Transnistrian Region of the republic of Moldova on July 21, 1992, Diplomatic Bulletin - *Diplomaticeskii Vestnic*, No. 15-16, 15-31 August 1992 - Russian);
- The Republic of Moldova: Documents and Data, (Author: Nedelciuc, Vasile, Chişinău, July 1992).
- Bessarabia (Documentary Outline), The Institute of Military History and Theory, (Bucharest, 1992).
- Ciobanu, Ştefan, Bessarabia’s Union (Romanian - Unirea Basarabiei: Studiu şi documente cu privire la mişcarea naţională din Basarabia în anii 1917-1918, (Chişinău: Editura “Universitas”, 1993).
- The PfP Presentation Document of the Republic of Moldova on March 16, 1994;
- The resolution of the Parliament of the Republic of Moldova on the ratification of the Charter of the Commonwealth of Independent States, adopted on April 26, 1994;
- The Constitution of the Republic of Moldova, Adopted on 29th July 1994;
- The Foreign Policy Concept of the Republic of Moldova (Romanian), 1995;
- The National Security Concept of the Republic of Moldova (Romanian), 1995;
- The Military Doctrine of the Republic of Moldova (Romanian), 1995;
- The Moldovan/Trans-Dniester Conflict, *Russia and the Commonwealth of Independent States: documents, data, and analysis* / edited by Zbigniew Brzezinski and Paige Sullivan, (New York: Center for Strategic and International Studies, 1997).
- Political Committee’s Resolution 291 on Relations with the Russian Federation – NATO Parliamentary Assembly, Political Committee, Reports adopted in 1999, and 45th Annual Session – Amsterdam – November 1999.
- Collection of informative-analytic materials (Kiev: Fondation “Meridian” – The Crisis Societies Research Centre, 1999-2000 - Russian).
- Law on the participation of the Republic of Moldova in international peacekeeping operations on July 26, 2000 (Romanian);
- OSCE Mission to Moldova: Reports 1993-2001.
- Information on Conventional Forces of the Republic of Moldova, valid as of January 1, 1995 – January 1, 2001 according to CFE Treaty;
- EIU Country Report: Belarus, Moldova, 1999 - 2000, The Economist Intelligence Unit, 15 Regent St, London SW1Y 4LR, United Kingdom.

- Opinion Pool Data: The Republic of Moldova – 2000 (Romanian - Barometrul de opinie publică – 2000, Sondaj de opinie realizat de Institutul de Marketing și Sondaje (IMAS) la solicitarea Institutului de Politici Publice (IPP);
- Opinion Pool Data: The Republic of Moldova – January 2001 (Romanian - Barometrul de opinie publică: Republica Moldova – ianuarie 2001, Sondaj de opinie realizat de Centrul pentru Studiarea Opiniei și Pieței (CSOP) la solicitarea Institutului de Politici Publice (IPP);

e) Books and Articles on the subject of the study (According to the Final Report's Bibliography)

2. Studying in the following research centres:

- Archives of the Government of the Republic of Moldova;
- Information Center of the US Embassy in Chișinău, Republic of Moldova;
- Institute for Political Studies of Defence and Military History, Bucharest, Romania, April 2000;
- Marshall Center Library, Garmisch-Partenkirchen, Germany, December 2000;
- Military Library of the Ministry of Defence of the Republic of Moldova;
- National Library, Chișinău, Republic of Moldova;
- National Military Library, Bucharest, Romania, April 2000;
- Public Politics Institute, Chisinau, Republic of Moldova;

Some documents and materials have been received from:

- NATO Defence College, Rome, Italy;
- National Defence College, Stockholm, Sweden;
- National Defence College, Helsinki, Finland;
- Russian Institute for Strategic Studies, Moscow, Russian Federation;
- General Staff of the Swiss Army, Switzerland;

3. Participation in the following international research activities:

- 1999 Partnership for Peace International Research Seminar “Security in the Northern European Region”, 8-11 December 1999, Stockholm, Sweden;
- International Research Seminar “Security in south-eastern Europe on the Threshold of the 21 Century, 5-6 April, 2000, Bucharest, Romania;
- Moldovan-US Research Seminar “Civil-Military Relation in the Democratic Society,” July 2000, Chisinau, Republic of Moldova;
- International Research Seminar “New Challenges for European Security and Stability on the threshold of the 21 Century”, 12-15 December 2000, Garmisch-Partenkirchen, Germany;

- International Conference “Highway or Barrier?: The Republic of Moldova’s Integration into the Euro-Atlantic Structures”, 26-27 April 2001, Chisinau, Republic of Moldova;
- Discussion on the study “The military aspect of the settlement of the conflict in the eastern zone of the Republic of Moldova,” Public Politics Institute, May 2001, Chisinau, Republic of Moldova;

4. Audiences or meetings with the following persons:

- Mr. Petru Lucinschi, President of the Republic of Moldova;
- Mr. Alexandru Moşanu, Parliamentary Deputy, former Chairman of the Parliament of the Republic of Moldova in the 1990-1993 period;
- Mr. Nicolae Cernomaz, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Moldova;
- Mr. Vasile Nedelciuc, Chairman, Parliamentary Foreign Policy Committee, Parliament of the Republic of Moldova;
- Mr. Yurie Leancă, Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs;
- Mr. Gheorghe Roman, Security Adviser of the President of the Republic of Moldova, Co-Chairman of the Joint Control Commission in the Transnistrian Region of the Republic of Moldova;
- Mr. Gheorghe Cîrlan, Ambassador, Head of the Moldovan Delegation in the bilateral negotiations with Romania and Russia;
- Mr. Ion Stăvilă, Chief, European Security and Political Military Organisations’ Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs;
- Timofei Donica, Deputy Chief, Special Issues Department, Government of the Republic of Moldova;
- Mr. Viorel Moşanu, Parliamentary Adviser, Foreign Parliamentary Relations Department, Romanian Senate, Bucharest, Romania;
- Mr. Viorel Cibotaru, Research Project Chief, Public Politics Institute, Chisinau, Republic of Moldova;

NATO-EAPC

INDIVIDUAL RESEARCH FELLOWSHIPS

NATO ENLARGEMENT'S IMPACT ON MOLDOVAN NEUTRALITY

FINAL REPORT

LIEUTENANT COLONEL MIHAI DRUȚĂ

**CHIȘINĂU
JUNE 2001**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I	3
INTRODUCTION	3
CHAPTER II	10
NATO ENLARGEMENT AND NEUTRALITY	10
II.1. NATO Enlargement in the Post-Cold Era	10
II.2. Neutrality Changes in Western Europe	15
II.3. Neutrality Searches in Central Europe	24
II.4. Arising of Neutrality in the CIS Area	29
CHAPTER III	33
REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA: A PERPETUAL BORDERLAND	33
III.1. Historical Background	33
III.2. Geopolitical Background	39
III.3. National Identity	45
CHAPTER IV	49
MOLDOVAN NEUTRALITY EXPERIMENT	49
IV.1. Reasons for Moldovan Neutrality	49
IV.2. Legal Status of Moldovan Neutrality	55
IV.3. Moldovan Neutrality Policy	61
CHAPTER V	74
NATO ENLARGEMENT AND MOLDOVAN NEUTRALITY'S PROSPECTS	74
V.1. Russian Factor and Yalta Syndrome	74
V.2. Second Wave of the NATO Enlargement and Moldovan Neutrality's Fate: Virtual Scenarios	82
V.3. Strengthening Moldovan Neutrality: Measures to Be Taken	89
V. CONCLUSIONS	92
ABREVIATIONS	95
ANNEXESS	96
BIBLIOGRAPHY	101

CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION

Since the end of the Cold War, North Atlantic Alliance has been playing the predominant role in shaping the new European security architecture. At present, NATO enlargement constitutes the central issue of the European geopolitical process. It will have an essential impact on the European security and stability. As the September 1995 Study on NATO Enlargement stresses “Enlargement will have implications for all European nations, including states which do not join NATO early or at all”.¹ The Atlantic Alliance undoubtedly offers to new members the benefits of common defence. But how does NATO enlargement affect the security of those countries, including the neutral ones, which do not join NATO?

“The days of neutral states, however, have passed” - ends an article on the neutrality in the 90-s.² It attests that neutrality faces difficult issues in the post-Cold War era. No doubt, the disintegration of the bipolar security system and the overcoming of the East-West global confrontation have changed the conditions, which favoured the maintenance of traditional neutrality since the middle of the 20th century. In the time of geopolitical changes the Western Neutrals have had to adapt their neutrality concepts to the new security environment. Hence, a neutrality review process has started in Western Europe. It seems paradoxical, but at the same time some countries of Eastern Europe, which have yet to assure their place within the further European security system, view the neutrality idea as a security solution. So, have really the days of neutral states passed?

A partial answer to these questions could be given by studying the Moldova’s original case. Placed at the crossroads of Central and Eastern Europe and facing serious security challenges, the Republic of Moldova proclaimed its permanent neutrality in 1994. In spite of sensible geopolitical situation, it pursues neutrality and does not participate in the CIS political-military body nor does it intend to join NATO. This study is an attempt to search the basic features of Moldovan neutrality and to forecast its prospects in the framework of the NATO enlargement impact on European security and neutrality in the post-Cold War era.

¹ Study of NATO Enlargement, (Brussels: September 1995), <http://www.nato.int/docu/basictxt/enl-9503.htm>

² Coh, Michael & MacGinty, Roger, “Farewell to a Beautiful Idea: The End of Neutrality in the Post-Cold World,” *Small States and the Security Challenge in the New Europe*. Edited by Werner Bauwens, Armand Clesse and Olav F. Knudsen, Luxembourg institute for European and International Studies, (London: Brassey’s, 1996), p. 133.

Consequently, the main notions to be analysed are NATO enlargement process, European neutrality evolution, and Moldovan neutrality experience.

Chapter II of the study describes the main events of the NATO enlargement process after the end of Cold War and the attitude to neutrality in Western and Central Europe as well as the CIS area. In order to disclose the reasons for Moldovan neutrality, chapter III analyses the historical and geopolitical background and the issue of national identity in the Republic of Moldova. Chapter IV describes the Moldovan neutrality experiment, in particular the main features of the legal status of the permanent neutrality and the neutrality policy of the Republic of Moldova. And finally, chapter V constitutes an attempt to forecast the impact of the NATO enlargement on Moldovan neutrality. In this respect, some virtual scenarios were described.

For the purposes of this study documents on the foundation, the internal transformation and the enlargement of the North Atlantic Alliance,¹ in particular, those on the PfP,² the relations with Russia³ and Ukraine,⁴ as well as other important aspects concerning the NATO's transformation were used.

¹ The North Atlantic Treaty, Washington DC, 4th April 1949, *NATO Handbook – 50th Anniversary Edition*, Office of Information and Press, NATO, (Brussels, 1998).

The Declaration on a Transformed North Atlantic Alliance, Issued in London, UK, on 6 July 1990.

The Declaration on Peace and Cooperation, issued in Rome, Italy, on 8 November 1991, *NATO Handbook*, NATO Office of Information and Press, (Brussels, 1995).

The Alliance's Strategic Concept, agreed by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Rome on 7-8 November 1991, *NATO Handbook*, NATO Office of Information and Press, (Brussels, 1995).

Study of NATO Enlargement, (Brussels: September 1995).

Madrid Declaration on Euro-Atlantic Security and Cooperation, Issued by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Madrid on 8 July 1997, *NATO Review*, No.4, July-August 1997-Volume 45;

The Washington Declaration, Signed and issued by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Washington D.C. on 23 and 24 April 1999, *The Reader's Guide to the NATO Summit in Washington*, 23-25 April 1999, NATO Office of Information and Press, (Brussels, Belgium).

Washington Summit Communiqué, Issued by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Washington D.C. on 24 April 1999, *The Reader's Guide to the NATO Summit in Washington*, 23-25 April 1999, NATO Office of Information and Press, (Brussels, Belgium).

The Alliance Strategic Concept, Approved by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Washington D.C. on 23 and 24 April 1999, *The Reader's Guide to the NATO Summit in Washington*, 23-25 April 1999, NATO Office of Information and Press, (Brussels, Belgium).

² Partnership for Peace: Invitation, Issued by Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council held on NATO Headquarters, Brussels, *NATO Review*, No.1 – February 1994, Volume 42.

Partnership for Peace: Framework Document, *NATO Review*, No.1 – February 1994, Volume 42.

Declaration of the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council held at NATO Headquarters, Brussels, on 10-11 January 1994. *NATO Review*, No.1 – February 1994, Volume 42.

³ Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security between NATO and the Russian Federation, Issued in Paris, France, on 27 May 1997, *NATO Review*, No.4, July-August 1997-Volume 45.

⁴ Charter on a Distinctive Partnership between the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation and Ukraine, Issued in Madrid, Spain, on 9 July 1997, *NATO Review*, No.4, July-August 1997-Volume 45.

To research the basic feature of permanent neutrality, the 1907 Hague Conventions regarding Rights and Duties of Neutral Powers and Persons in Case of War on Land¹ and Rights and Duties of Neutral Powers in Naval War² are indispensable.

Taking into consideration the circumstances of the proclamation of Austrian permanent neutrality in the 50-s and Finland's dependence from Soviet Union during the Cold War period, the basic documents concerning the Austrian³ and Finnish⁴ neutrality are very useful for the purposes of this study.

The governmental reports and other materials on the security and neutrality policy of Switzerland⁵ and Finland⁶ in the 90-s are the most relevant for the neutrality evolution in post-Cold War Europe.

Documents on the neutrality policy of the Baltic States on the eve of the Second World War and their occupation by Soviet Union⁷ emphasise some similarities with Moldova (Bessarabia)'s fate in the same period.

Concerning the arising of neutrality in the CIS area it is worth mentioning the 12 December 1995 Resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations Organisation "The Permanent Neutrality of Turkmenistan"⁸ as well as the internal acts on neutrality of Turkmenistan.⁹

¹ Rights and Duties of Neutral Powers and Persons in Case of War on Land (Hague V); October 18, 1907, *The Avalon Project at the Yale Law School, Laws of War*, <http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/lawofwar/hague05.htm>

² Rights and Duties of Neutral Powers in Naval War (Hague XIII); October 18, 1907, *The Avalon Project at the Yale Law School, Laws of War*, <http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/lawofwar/hague13.htm>

³ State Treaty for the Re-establishment of an Independent and Democratic Austria, *Austrian Federal Constitutional Laws (selection)*, Published by the Federal Press Service, (Vienna, 1995).

Federal Constitutional Law of 26 October 1955 on the Neutrality of Austria, *Austrian Federal Constitutional Laws (selection)*, Published by the Federal Press Service, (Vienna, 1995).

⁴ Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance between the Republic of Finland and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, *Library of Congress / Federal research Division / Country Studies / Area Handbook Series / .../ Appendix* http://memory.loc.gov/frd/cs/finland/fi_appnb.html

⁵ Swiss Security Policy in Times of Change: Report 90 on Switzerland's Security Policy ", Issued in Bern, on 1 October 1990.

Security through Cooperation: Report of the Federal Council to the Federal Assembly on the Security Policy of Switzerland, Issued in Bern, on 7 June 1999.

Report of the Study Commission on the Strategic Studies, Issued in Bern, on 26 February 1998.

The Swiss Partnership for Peace Programme: Clusters of Competence, Federal Military Department, General Secretariat, Permanent PfP Office, February 1997.

Rapport annuel du Conseil fédéral sur la Participation de la Suisse au Partenariat pour la Paix de l'OTAN en 1997 (du 18 mars 1998).

⁶ Security in a Changing World: Guidelines for Finland's Security Policy, Report by the Council of State to the Parliament 6 June 1995, (Helsinki: Publications of Ministry for Foreign Affairs, 1995).

The European Security Development and Finnish Defence, Report by the Council of State to Parliament on 17 March 1997 (Edita: Helsinki, 1997).

⁷ Estonian Neutrality Law of December 1st, 1938, http://www.letton.ch/lvx_38.htm

Ot pacts Molotova-Ribbentropa do Dogovora o bazah: Dokumenty i materialy, Tallinn: "Periodica", 1990.

⁸ The Permanent neutrality of Turkmenistan: Collection of political and legal documents, Ashgabat, 2000, p.20.

⁹ Ibidem, p.20-23.

The 29 July 1994 Constitution of the Republic of Moldova contains the main provisions on the Moldovan permanent neutrality.¹ In 1997, a Draft of the Concept on the permanent neutrality of the Republic of Moldova had been worked out, which, however, was not adopted.² Some features of the Moldovan neutrality concept are disclosed in the Foreign Policy Concept,³ the National Security Concept,⁴ the Military Doctrine,⁵ as well as other documents adopted by the Moldovan Parliament.⁶

Important issues regarding the foreign relations, the national defence, the withdrawal of foreign troops from the country's territory, as well as other aspects on the national security policy of the Republic of Moldova are addressed in the decrees of the President of the Republic of Moldova.⁷

The Informative Bulletin of the Council of the Heads of State and Government of the member countries of the CIS,⁸ and the 1997 collection of documents, data, and analysis on the CIS, edited by Zbigniew Brzezinski and Paige Sullivan⁹ emphasise the status of the Republic of Moldova within this organisation.

For the purposes of this study documents respecting the national movement and the history of Democratic Moldovan Republic (1917-1918),¹⁰ the Romanian neutrality policy (1939 – 1940),¹¹ the Soviet-Nazi Pact and the annexation of Bessarabia were analysed.¹²

¹ Constituția Republicii Moldova adoptată la 29 iulie 1994, Editor – Direcția de Stat pentru Asigurarea Informațională, Chișinău, 1994 / The Constitution of the Republic of Moldova adopted on 29 July 1994, Editor - The State Direction for Information Assurance MOLDPRESS, Chișinău, 1994.

² One copy of this Draft could be found at the Ministry of Defense of the Republic of Moldova.

³ Concepția Politicii Externe a Republicii Moldova, *Monitorul Oficial al Republicii Moldova*, Nr.20, 6 aprilie 1995.

⁴ Concepția Securității Naționale a Republicii Moldova, *Monitorul Oficial al Republicii Moldova*, Nr. 35-XIII, 29 iunie 1995.

⁵ Doctrina Militară a Republicii Moldova, *Monitorul Oficial al Republicii Moldova*, Nr.38-39, 14 iulie 1995.

⁶ The acts adopted by the Parliament of the Republic of Moldova are published in the collections of acts and other documents “*Legi, hotărâri și alte acte, adoptate de Parlamentul Republicii Moldova de legislatura a doisprezecea, Ediție a Parlamentului Republicii Moldova*, Chișinău, Universitas, 1990 – 1994” and “*Monitorul Oficial al Republicii Moldova*, Editor – Agenția Națională de Presă “Moldpress”. Chișinău, 1994-2001.

⁷ *Arhiva Guvernului Republicii Moldova, Fondul “Decrete și Ordonanțe ale Președintelui Republicii Moldova”, Monitorul Oficial al Republicii Moldova*, Editor – Agenția Națională de Presă “Moldpress”, (Chișinău, 1994-2001).

⁸ *Sodrujestvo: Informaționni vestnic Soveta glav gosudarstv i pravitelstv SNG*, (Minsk, 1992 –1995).

⁹ *Russia and the Commonwealth of Independent States: documents, data, and analysis / edited by Zbigniew Brzezinski and Paige Sullivan*, (New York: Center for Strategic and International Studies, 1997).

¹⁰ Ciobanu, Ștefan, *Unirea Basarabiei: Studiu și documente cu privire la mișcarea națională din Basarabia în anii 1917-1918*, (Chișinău, Editura “Universitas”, 1993, The first edition issued at București in 1929).

¹¹ Comunicat privind neutralitatea României (6 septembrie 1939), *Istoria României între anii 1918-1944: Culegere de documente*, București: (Editura didactică și pedagogică, 1982).

Comunicatul conferinței Înțelegerii Balcanice (Belgrad, 2-4 februarie 1940), *Istoria României între anii 1918-1944: Culegere de documente*, București: (Editura didactică și pedagogică, 1982).

¹² *The Pact Molotov-Ribbentrop and its consequences for Bessarabia: Documents*, (Chișinău, Publishing House “Universitas”, 1991).

The status of the permanent neutrality of the Republic of Moldova has never been thoroughly studied. Only some articles have been published on this subject.

In his article “An uncertain neutrality: its impact on the security of the Republic of Moldova”¹ the former chairman of the Committee for Foreign Affairs of the Moldovan Parliament, Vasile Nedelciuc asserts that the Moldovan neutrality was initially proclaimed because of internal reasons. With the NATO enlargement towards Eastern Europe this uncertain neutrality has already transformed into an issue that has an impact on the regional and European geopolitical interests.²

Lieutenant-colonel Iurie Pântea makes an attempt to identify the duties of the Republic of Moldova as a neutral state in two articles concerning the classical neutrality as well as the reform of the Moldovan Armed Forces.³

The article of the parliamentary adviser (Romanian Senate), Viorel Moșanu underlines that the credibility of the permanent neutrality of the Republic of Moldova is seriously undermined by the presence of the foreign troops on its territory, the separatism, the economic dependence on Russian energy supplies, as well as by the ambiguous policy of the Moldovan authorities.⁴

To disclose the reasons for Moldovan neutrality the issues on the historical and geopolitical background as well the national identity were examined. The official Soviet approach on Moldova’s history is reflected, first of all, by the academic edition, issued in 1967-1970.⁵ Artiom Lazarev’s 900 pages monograph *Moldovan Soviet Statehood and the Bessarabian Question*⁶ represents the synthesis of Soviet arguments on Moldovan statehood and national identity.

The Russian geopolitical interests in the region at different historical periods have been disclosed by I. V. Semenova,⁷ G. S. Grosul,⁸ V. I. Sheremet,⁹ E. E. Certan,¹⁰ M. M. Zalyshkin,¹¹ Paul Cernovodeanu,¹² Nicholas Dima,¹³ Evgeniy

1 Nedelciuc, Vasile, “O neutralitate incertă: impactul ei asupra securității Republicii Moldova,” *Arena Politicii*, Anul II, nr.2 (14), Octombrie 1997.

² Ibidem, p. 8.

³ Pântea, Iurie, “Neutralitatea în lumea contemporană,” *Arena politicii*, Anul I, nr.10, iunie 1997.

Pântea, Iurie Vladimir, “The Reform of the Armed Forces of the Republic of Moldova,” *International Seminar: Rebuilding the Armed Forces for the XXIst Century*, Editors: Jeffrey Simon, Nicolae Uscoi and Constantin Moștofleii, (Bucharest, 1999).

⁴ Moșanu, Viorel, “The Neutrality Policy of the Republic of Moldova. A Case Study,” *Central European issues – Romanian Foreign Affairs Review*, Volume 5, No.2, 1999/2000.

⁵ Istoria RSS Moldovenești, Volumul I-II, (Chișinău, Cartea Moldovenească, 1967, 1970).

⁶ Lazarev, A.M., *Moldavscaia sovietscaia gosudarstvennosti i bessarabskii vopros*, (Chișinău: Cartea Moldovenească, 1974).

⁷ Semenova, I. V., *Rossia i osvoboditelinaia boriba moldavscogo naroda protiv ottomanscogo iga v contse XVIII v.*, (Chișinău: Știința, 1976).

⁸ Grosul, G. S., *Dunaiskie Kneajestva v politike Rossii 1774 – 1806*, (Chișinău: Știința, 1975).

⁹ Sheremet, V.I., *Turtsia i Adrianopoliskii mir 1829 g.*, (Moskva: Izdatelistvo “Nauca”, Glavnaia redactsia vostocinoini literatury, 1975).

¹⁰ Certan, E. E., *Relațiile ruso-române în anii 1859-1863*, (Chișinău: Cartea Moldovenească, 1969).

¹¹ Zalyshkin, M. M., *Vneshneaia politika Rumynii i rumyno-russkie otnoshenia 1875-1878*, (Moskva: Izdatelistvo “Nauca”, 1974).

¹² Cernovodeanu, Paul, *Drama unei provincii istorice românești în context politic internațional*, (București: Editura Albatros, 1993).

¹³ Dima, Nicholas, *Basarabia și Bucovina în jocul geopolitic al Rusiei*, (Chișinău: Editura Prometeu, 1998).

Climov,¹ Oleg Serebrian² as well as other researchers. In this respect, the collective work *The South-West Theatre of Military Actions* published by the Ministry of Defense of the former Soviet Union could be especially mentioned.³

Perhaps the national identity of Moldovans is one of the most disputed issues of Moldova's history. On the one side, the Soviet historians and politicians insisted to prove the existence of a separate Moldovan nation.⁴ On the other side, the researchers from Romania and the Republic of Moldova (since 1990) see the national unity of Romanians and Moldovans as a doubtless fact.⁵ The perennial problems of identity, politics and cultural change that the Moldovans endured during the 19th - 20th centuries have been illuminated in the books and articles of assistant professor in the School of Foreign Service and the Department of Government at Georgetown University Charles King.⁶ He reveals why, in the case of Moldova, a project of identity construction succeeded in creating a state but failed to make an independent nation.

The historian Gheorghe E. Cojocaru (Ph.D.) has researched important issues on foreign policy and national security of the Republic of Moldova.⁷

Diplomat Mihai Gribincea has disclosed in his monographs and articles the nature of Russian Doctrine on military bases and the negative impact of the Russian

¹ Climov, Evgeniy, "Moldova v contexte geopoliticescilor intereselor Rusiei v Iugo-Zapadnoi Evrope: istoria, sovremennosti i perspectiva," *Politica Externă a Republicii Moldova: aspecte ale securității și colaborării regionale, Materiale ale Simpoziului științific internațional, Chișinău, 16-17 octombrie 1997*, (Chișinău, 1998)

² Serebrian, Oleg, *Va exploda Estul? Geopolitica spațiului pontic*, (Cluj-Napoca, Editura Dacia, 1998).
Serebrian, Oleg, *Politosfera*, (Chișinău, Cartier, 2001).

³ Yugo-Zapadnyi Teatr Voennykh Deistvii: Obschii Obzor, (Moscvă: Voennoe izdatelstvo Ministerstva Oborony SSSR, 1981).

⁴ See Grosul, V.Ia., Zelenciuc, V.S., Kozlov, V.I., Lazarev, A.M., Mohov H.A., *Formirovanie moldavskoi burjuaznoi natsii*, (Chișinău: Știința, 1978).

Grecul, A., *Rastsvet Moldavskoi Sotsialisticeskoi Natsii*, (Chișinău: Cartea Moldovenească, 1974).

Repida, A., *Obrazovanie Moldavskoi ASSR*, (Chișinău: Știința, 1974).

Ursul, D.T., *Înflorirea și apropierea națiilor sovietice*, (Chișinău: Cartea Moldovenească, 1971).

Lisetskii, A.M., *Voprosy natsionalnoi politiki CPSS v usloviah razvitogo sotsializma*, (Chișinău: Cartea Moldovenească, 1977).

Morari, A.G., *Pravda protiv vymysla*, (Chișinău: Cartea Moldovenească, 1977).

Mohov, H.A., *Ocherki istorii formirovania moldavskogo naroda*, (Chișinău: Cartea Moldovenească, 1978).

Bodiul, I.I., *Pe calea renașterii și înfloririi*, Chișinău: Cartea Moldovenească, 1978.

⁵ For instance see Ciobanu, Ștefan, *Cultura românească în Basarabia sub stăpânirea rusă*, (Chișinău: Editura enciclopedică "Gheorghe Asachi" 1992, The first edition issued at Chișinău in 1923).

Negru, Gheorghe, *Țarismul și mișcarea națională a românilor din Basarabia*, (Chișinău: Prut Internațional, 2000).

⁶ King, Charles, *The Moldovans. Romania, Russia, and the Politics of Culture*, (Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 2000).

King, Charles, *Post – Soviet Moldova: A Borderland in Transition / Moldova post – sovietică: un ținut de hotar în tranziție*, (Iași: The Center for Romanian Studies, 1997).

King, Charles, "Eurasia letter: Moldova with a Russian face," *Foreign Policy*, Washington, Winter 1994, Issue No.97.

⁷ Cojocaru, Gheorghe E., *Politica externă a Republicii Moldova (studii)*, (Chișinău: Civitas, 1999).

Cojocaru, Gheorghe E., *Politica externă a Republicii Moldova (studii)*, *Ediția a doua revăzută și adăugită*, (Chișinău: Civitas, 2001).

Cojocaru, Gheorghe E., *Separatismul în slujba Imperiului*, (Chișinău: Civitas, 2000).

troops' presence in Transnistrian region on the national security of the Republic of Moldova.¹

The various aspects of the Moldovan foreign and security policy were also examined in the framework of the traditional international seminars, organised by the International Research Centre "Perspectiva" (Republic of Moldova) and the Foundation "Friedrich Ebert" (Germany).²

¹ Gribincea, Mihai, "Challenging Moscow's Doctrine On Military Bases", *Transition*, Vol. 1, No. 19, 20 October 1995.

Gribincea, Mihai, *Trupele Ruse în Republica Moldova factor stabilizator sau sursă de pericol ?*, (Chişinău: Civitas, 1998).

Gribincea, Mihai. *Politica rusă a bazelor militare în Moldova și Georgia*, (Chişinău: Civitas, 1999).

² *Moldova, România, Ucraina: Bună vecinătate și colaborare regională; Materiale ale Simpozionului Științific Internațional* (Chişinău, 15-16 octombrie 1998), (Chişinău, 1998).

Moldova, România, Ucraina: Integrare în structurile europene; Simpozionul Științific Internațional Tradițional: Materiale, (Republica Moldova, Chişinău, 15-16 octombrie 1999), (Chişinău, 2000).

Politica externă a Republicii Moldova: Aspecte ale securității și colaborării regionale; Materiale ale Simpozionului Științific Internațional (Chişinău, 16-17 octombrie 1997), (Chişinău, 1998).

CHAPTER II NATO ENLARGEMENT AND NEUTRALITY

II.1. NATO Enlargement in the Post-Cold Era

The parties may, by unanimous agreement, invite any other European state in a position to further the principles of this Treaty and to contribute to the security of the North Atlantic area to accede to this Treaty.

The North Atlantic Treaty

Washington DC, 4 April 1949

It is a myth that NATO enlargement was launched in 1994. What happens after the end of the Cold War is a new phase of the North Atlantic Alliance's enlargement process. Its first phase started with the Alliance's foundation. The composition of NATO membership has been a problem right since the conception of the Alliance in 1948-1949. Initially, The North Atlantic Alliance included the American pillar (USA and Canada), the Western Union "core" (United Kingdom, France, Belgium, Netherlands, and Luxembourg), and the peripheral members (Norway, Iceland, Denmark, Portugal and Italy). Greece and Turkey joined the Alliance in 1952, when NATO planned to organise Europe into defensible region versus Communist aggression in Western Europe. West Germany was admitted into NATO in 1955, after the realisation of three "D": de-Nazification, demilitarisation and democratisation.¹ Finally, Spain entered the North Atlantic Alliance in 1982 that facilitated its joining EEC and has provided the democratisation of Spanish society. Therefore, as a process NATO enlargement consists of both Cold War and post-Cold War phases.

During Cold War period the enlargement process unfolded in accordance with the NATO essential purpose to safeguard the freedom, security and stability in the North-Atlantic area.² In this regard, it is necessary to mention joining NATO of both Greece and Turkey in 1952 as well of Germany in 1955. In addition, NATO

¹ Henry Kissinger point out in his famous book *Diplomacy* the 1952 so-called Peace Note on a unified and neutral (!) Germany based on free elections, and one that would be allowed to maintain its own armed forces though all foreign troops would have to leave within a year. Henry Kissinger considers that had Stalin offered the so-called Peace Note four years earlier – before the Berlin blockade, the Czech coup, and the Korean War – it almost certainly would have stopped German membership in NATO in its tracks. See Kissinger, Henry, *Diplomacy*, New York: Simon & Schuster, 1994, p. 497-498.

² The North Atlantic Treaty, Washington DC, 4th April 1949, *NATO Handbook – 50th Anniversary Edition*, Office of Information and Press, NATO, (Brussels, 1998), p. 395.

The Alliance's Strategic Concept, agreed by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Rome on 7-8 November 1991, *NATO Handbook*, NATO Office of Information and Press, (Brussels, 1995), p.238.

enlargement played a considerable role in strengthening the security and stability within West European area. Germany accession to the Alliance radically changed relations between the former enemies of the II World War. The German - French conciliation especially had positive consequences for the stability in Western Europe. Also, it should be noted the importance of the NATO membership for the diminution of the friction between Greece and Turkey. Finally, the process of NATO enlargement at that time supported the domestic stability and provided the democratic development in all member countries.

The entering of the NATO enlargement process in a new phase coincided with the adoption of the Charter of Paris for a New Europe, which reflected the geopolitical changes and the end of the bloc confrontation, which had taken place in Europe.¹ The expansion of the Western system was obviously made possible by the institutional vacuum in the East, accompanied by a similar security vacuum, in the wake of the abrupt disintegration of the Warsaw Pact and the Soviet Union.²

With the collapse of Communism, new security risks showed up resulting "from the adverse consequences of instabilities that may arise from the serious economic, social and political difficulties, including ethnic rivalries and territorial disputes, which are faced by many countries in Central and Eastern Europe".³ Because of this, the main mission of the NATO enlargement in the post-Cold War era is to stabilise Central and Eastern Europe and to provide security and stability in Europe as a whole. As the former NATO Secretary General Manfred Wörner urged in September 1993: "A major and perhaps the primary, future mission of NATO will be to project stability to the East... The time has come to open a more concrete perspective to those countries of CEE which want to join NATO and which we consider eligible for future membership."⁴

The demands for NATO membership from the countries of Central and Eastern Europe was caused, also, by the internal political instability in the URSS/Russia. Thus, the summit that gave the Group of Visegrad its name took place on 15 February 1991, following the Moscow violent intervention in the Baltic republics in January 1991. Yet the emotional speeches of CEE parliamentarians on NATO membership during the October 1993 Session of the NAA followed just after the Moscow bloody events.

It should be remarked that the second phase of the NATO enlargement process had started before the January 1994 Brussels Summit of the NAC approved the PfP Programme. As earlier as in July 1990, at the London Summit of the NAC the allies declared: "The Atlantic Community must reach out to the countries which

¹ The Charter of Paris for a New Europe (Russian edition), *Izvestia*, No 325, 23 noiabrea 1990.

² Kissinger, Henry, Quoted work.

³ The Alliance's Strategic Concept, agreed by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Rome on 7-8 November 1991, *NATO Handbook*, NATO Office of Information and Press, (Brussels, 1995), p.237.

⁴ Wörner, Manfred, Speech to the International Institute for Strategic Studies, Brussels, September 10, 1993. Quoted in Solomon, Gerald B., *The NATO Enlargement Debate, 1990-1997*.

were our adversaries in the Cold War, and extend to them the hand of friendship.”¹ This unprecedented, historical NATO’s “hand of friendship” could be seen as the first official expression of the intention to move Alliance towards Eastern Europe.

In fact, the first step of the NATO Enlargement towards Eastern Europe in the post Cold War era was the inclusion of former Democratic Republic of Germany into NATO as a result of Germany’s unification. On the one hand, the Soviet leadership initially objected to the acceptance of East Germany in NATO framework and, like in the 50-s, wanted a neutral unified Germany. On the other hand, the Western powers, again like in the 50-s, accepted the principle of German reunification but rejected the idea of neutrality.² However, the collapse of Communism and the East Germans’ movement towards freedom determined the Germany unification and the absorption of East Germany into the NATO area.

At the Rome Summit in November 1991, NAC adopted a new strategic concept, which defined NATO’s role in the new Europe,³ and proposed to institute the North Atlantic Co-operation Council (NACC)⁴ that reflected the growing demands for NATO membership from the countries of Central and Eastern Europe. It is interesting that, at that time, even Russian President Boris Yeltsin raised “a question of Russia’s membership in NATO ... as a long term political aim”.⁵

The Brussels Summit of January 1994 approved the PfP Programme, providing an institutional basis for NATO expansion.⁶ The former block enemies started to work towards transparency in defence planning and budgeting processes, ensuring democratic control of defense forces, joint planning, training and exercises, common operations under the authority of the UN and/or the responsibility of the OSCE, and creating an ability to operate with NATO forces.”⁷ The NAC declared that “the Alliance, as provided for in Article 10 of the Washington Treaty, remains open to membership of other European states in a position to further the principles of the Treaty and to contribute to the security of the North Atlantic area.”⁸ According to the Partnership for Peace Invitation “active participation in the Partnership for Peace will play an important role in the evolutionary process of the expansion of NATO.”⁹ In sum, the January 1994

¹ The Declaration on a Transformed North Atlantic Alliance, Issued in London, UK, on 6 July 1990.

² See Kissinger, Henry, Quoted work, p. 499.

³ The Alliance’s Strategic Concept, *NATO Handbook*, NATO Office of Information and Press, (Brussels, 1995), p.235-248.

⁴ The Declaration on Peace and Co-operation, issued in Rome, Italy, on 8 November 1991, NATO Office of Information and Press, (Brussels, 1995).

⁵ Solomon, Gerald B., *The NATO Enlargement Debate, 1990-1997*, p.13.

⁶ Partnership for Peace: Invitation, Issued by Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council held on NATO Headquarters, Brussels, *NATO Review*, No.1 – February 1994, Volume 42. Partnership for Peace: Framework Document, *NATO Review*, No.1 – February 1994, Volume 42.

Declaration of the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council held at NATO Headquarters, Brussels, on 10-11 January 1994. *NATO Review*, No.1 – February 1994, Volume 42.

⁷ See Partnership for Peace: Framework Document, *NATO Review*, No.1 – February 1994, Volume 42, p. 29.

⁸ Declaration of the Heads of State and Government, *NATO Review*, No.1 – February 1994, Volume 42, p.31.

⁹ Partnership for Peace: Invitation, *NATO Review*, No.1 – February 1994, Volume 42, p. 28.

Brussels Summit played a crucial role in enhancing the NATO expansion process. In October 1994 the US Administration begun consultations with its NATO allies about how to speed the admission of former Soviet-bloc countries into the Western alliance.¹

The so-called “first wave of NATO expansion” began formally at the July 1997 Madrid meeting of the NAC, when Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland received the official invitation to begin accession talks with NATO.² With regard to the aspiring members, the NAC recognised with great interest and took account “of the positive development towards democracy and the rule of law in a number of southeastern European countries, especially Romania and Slovenia.”³ At the same Summit recognition was given to “the progress achieved towards greater stability and co-operation by the states of the Baltic region which are also aspiring members.”⁴ After the ratification of the accession protocols by the parliaments of NATO member countries,⁵ Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland joined the Alliance on 12 March 1999. The April 1999 Washington Summit of the NAC recognised and welcomed once more continuing efforts and progress made by Romania, Slovenia, Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania to join the Alliance in meeting the responsibilities and obligations for possible membership.⁶ It has also welcomed the positive developments in both Bulgaria and Slovenia, and has encouraged the reform efforts in both Macedonia and Albania.⁷

The Washington Summit coincided with NATO military operation in Yugoslavia, which put the issue of the mandate of such actions outside the Alliance’s territory.⁸ In this respect UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan has remarked that while the genocide in Rwanda will define for our generation the consequences of inaction in the face of mass murder, the Kosovo conflict has prompted important questions about the consequences of action in the absence of complete unity on the part of the international community.”⁹

¹The New York Times, Thursday, October 27, 1994, p.5.

² Madrid Declaration on Euro-Atlantic Security and Cooperation, Issued by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Madrid on 8 July 1997, *NATO Review*, No.4, July-August 1997-Volume 45, Special insert: Documentation, p. 1.

³ Ibidem, p. 2.

⁴ Ibidem

⁵ For instance, the US Senate ratified NATO enlargement by a vote 80 to 19, 12 more votes than the two-thirds majority required. Though the opponents said “de decision was the greatest error in US foreign policy since the fall of the Berlin Wall,” the vote, however, suggested that the extent of opposition had been exaggerated. See US Senate ratifies NATO expansion to Russia’s borders, *The Times*, 2 May 1998; US Senate backs plan for NATO expansion, *The Independent*, 2 May 1998.

⁶ Washington Summit Communiqué, Issued by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Washington D.C. on 24 April 1999, *The Reader’s Guide to the NATO Summit in Washington*, 23-25 April 1999, NATO Office of Information and Press, (Brussels, Belgium), p. 15.

⁷ Ibidem

⁸ See Arbatov, Alexei, Transformatsia Rossiiskoi voennoi doctriiny – uroki Kosovo i Chechni, *The Marshall Center Papers*, No. 2.

⁹ Jane’s 2010: The challenges to Global Security, A supplement of Jane’s Defense Weekly, Vol.32, 22 December 1999, Issue No.25, p.9.

It seems that the second “wave of NATO expansion” will start in 2002, at the next NAC Summit. Unlike the 1997-1999 step, when NATO moved into Central European area, at this stage the battle for Alliance membership is going to take place in both Baltic and southeastern European regions. At present, Romania and Bulgaria are at crossroads in their efforts to stabilise and change their economies and integrate into Western military and economic institutions. As Bulgarian Foreign Minister Nadejda Mihailova is confident, “despite its late start in reforms, Bulgaria will be ready to join NATO by next year and the EU by 2006.”¹ Also her Romanian counterpart Mircea Geoana said that early membership in NATO and the EU is the cornerstone of Romanian foreign policy.²

In the post-Cold War era, NATO enlargement has led to the extension of the European area of security and stability. The positive impact of the enlargement on the relations between aspiring countries took place already in the pre-joining period, when they re-evaluated their ethnic, territorial and other disputes. Thus, Hungary signed with Slovak Republic and Romania agreements based on the OSCE principles, including developing good neighbourly relations, advancing respect for human rights, including those of persons belonging to national minorities. Such agreement was also signed between Romania and Ukraine. Atlantic Alliance offers to new members the benefits of common defence and provides their integration into European institutions. The NATO membership also provides the democratisation of societies and will protect the further democratic development in the former Communist area.

At the same time, it is more difficult to forecast the NATO enlargement impact on the security of those European countries, which may be unlikely to join the Alliance early or at all. This regards first of all the Baltic States as well as the countries of southeastern Europe. Of course, according to the NATO assurances active participants in the Partnership for Peace will consult with the Alliance in case of perceiving a direct threat to their territorial integrity, political independence, or security.³ Nevertheless, for the time being the national security of non-NATO countries is less protected and consequently their future remains unpredictable.

¹ Keay, Justin, “Romania and Bulgaria Sit on the Fence of Change,” *International Herald Tribune*, Monday, March 26, 2001.

² *Ibidem*

³ Partnership for Peace: Invitation, *NATO Review*, No.1 – February 1994, Volume 42, p. 28.

The Alliance Strategic Concept, Approved by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Washington D.C. on 23 and 24 April 1999, *The Reader's Guide to the NATO Summit in Washington*, 23-25 April 1999, NATO Office of Information and Press, (Brussels, Belgium), p. 53.

II.2. Neutrality Changes in Western Europe

The application of our policy of neutrality changes as the world changes although the basis of the policy itself remains the same.

**Urho Kekkonen,
President of Finland**

Neutrality is prevalently defined according to threat perceptions. It has been stated that the transnational nature of contemporary threats mean that no state – no matter how large or small – can remain isolated¹ and consequently neutrality can offer few solutions in the conditions of global era.² In this respect, it should be remarked that the applicability of neutrality has constituted a matter for many times during the 20th century. The first one was connected with the foundation of the League of Nations, whose system of collective security included much more far-reaching obligations than anything envisaged in the CFSP of the Maastricht Treaty. As earlier as in 1924, an author stressed metaphorically: “The organisation of the League of Nations at Geneva would ring the knell for neutrality”.³ Nonetheless the neutrality survived first of all because of the fall of the policy of the collective security. Switzerland, Ireland, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, and Turkey, as well as certain South American countries managed to maintain their neutrality even during the Second World War. But at the same time, the idea of collective security revived and consequently the issue on the compatibility of neutrality with the United Nations’ membership arose. In 1945, given the strict interpretation of the UN Charter and faced with deciding between membership in the United Nations and neutrality, Switzerland chose the latter.⁴ Finally, the question of the neutrality’s applicability was put again in the last decade of the 20th century, when a new security landscape was created.

Since the middle of the last century the political-military environment of neutral states was determined by the East-West global confrontation. The end of the Cold War raised expectations for a durable peace and improved considerably the security of neutral countries. On the one side, the Warsaw Pact was dissolved and Soviet/Russian forces have left Central Europe, including the Baltic States. The conventional military threat affecting the security of neutral states during decades

¹ Carrafiello, Lewis J. & Vertonen, Nico, “Removing the last wall: rethinking the Baltic security concept,” *Baltic Security: Looking towards the 21st century*, Edited by Gunnars Artéus & Atis Lejiuns. (Riga: Latvian Institute of International affairs & Försvarshögskolan, 1997), p. 209.

² Coh, Michael & MacGinty, Roger, p. 123.

³ A. Rolin, *La crise de la neutralité* (Communication de l’Académie des sciences de Bruxelles), 1924. Quoted in Verdross, Alfred, *The Permanent Neutrality of Austria*, Verlag für Geschichte und Politik Viena, 1978), p.13.

⁴ Petitpierre, Max, “Is Swiss Neutrality Still Justified?”, *Ogley, Roderick, The theory and Practice of Neutrality in the Twentieth Century*, p. 174.

has been drastically reduced. On the other side, NATO started a process of enlargement towards Eastern Europe that exercises an overwhelming influence on their foreign policy. The new threats already are not restricted to particular bloc, nor are they exclusively military in character that requires a multi-dimensional approach to security.¹ In other words, a new security environment requires a new foreign and security policy. Hence, the adjustment of neutrality to the post-Cold War era security landscape has constituted a matter for all five Western Neutrals, i.e. Austria, Finland, Sweden, Ireland and Switzerland.

The permanent neutrality of Austria is a product of the Cold War, “the price for regaining her full sovereignty in 1955”² after nine years of foreign occupation. It was the April 1955 Moscow Memorandum, by which Austria agreed to make a declaration “in a form imposing upon Austria an international obligation, that Austria will maintain permanent neutrality of the same type as that maintained by Switzerland.”³ The 26 October 1955 Constitutional Law on Austrian Neutrality committed to “permanent neutrality” and declared that “Austria will never in the future accede to any military alliances nor permit the establishment of military bases by foreign states on her territory.”⁴ Taking into account the origin of the Austrian permanent neutrality, there was no doubt that with the end of the East-West confrontation, Austria will move towards Western security system. Austria departed from her policy of strict neutrality during the Gulf War, permitting allied aircraft to fly through Austrian airspace and allowing the transport of military equipment across Austrian territory.⁵ After a referendum on 12 June 1994, in which 67 per cent of Austrians voted for EU membership, Austria acceded to EU and has become a WEU observer on 1 January 1995.⁶ Thus Austria brought the commitment to participate in the shaping of a CFSP, being sure that there is no contradiction between such policy as provided for in the Maastricht Treaty and the core element of Austrian neutrality law, namely non-participation in military alliances and no stationing of foreign troops on Austrian territory.⁷ Austria has also joined NATO PfP on 10 February 1995, focusing her participation in particular in

¹ Buzan, B., *People, States and Fear: An Agenda for International Security Studies in the Post-Cold War Era* (Harvester Wheatsheaf: London, 1991), p. 13-14.

Coh, Michael & MacGinty, Roger, Quoted work, p. 129.

The Alliance’s Strategic Concept, *NATO Handbook*, (Brussels, 1995), p. 236-240.

The Alliance Strategic Concept, *The Reader’s Guide to the NATO Summit in Washington*, 23-25 April 1999, (Brussels, Belgium), p. 50-51.

² Mock, Alois, “Austria’s role in the new Europe,” *NATO Review*, No 2- March 1995, Volume 43, p. 15.

³ Lyon, Peter, “Austria – A Neutralized State,” *Ogley, Roderick, The theory and Practice of Neutrality in the Twentieth Century*, p. 183.

⁴ Federal Constitutional Law of 26 October 1955 on the Neutrality of Austria, *Austrian Federal Constitutional Laws (selection)*, Published by the Federal Press Service, (Vienna, 1995), p.174.

⁵ Lahodinsky, Otmar, “The changing face of Austrian neutrality,” *NATO Review*, No.6 – December 1992, Vol. 40, Web Edition, A:\NATO Review 9206-5.htm, p. 1 of 7.

⁶ Mock, Alois, Quoted work, pp. 17-18.

⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 17.

the area of peacekeeping.¹ Concerning NATO membership, the former Chancellor Vranitzky rejected this idea, declaring that “A system of collective security, such as the future European security system, should not be confused with a military alliance. NATO membership is therefore inappropriate.”² The debates on NATO membership have speeded-up after the formation of a centre-right coalition government on 4 February 2000, which, however, underlined that an official change of Austrian neutral status or a possible entry into some alliance must obviously be subject to a referendum.³

It seems, for the time being Austria’s neutrality still has a role to play.

The international position of Finland during the Cold War was based on the 1948 Finnish-Soviet Treaty of Friendship, Co-operation and Mutual Assistance,⁴ which led to excessive Finnish responsiveness to Soviet interests. The term “Finlandization” was commonly understood as substantive political adaptation to the Soviet Union, and was hardly a fair characterisation of Finnish policy during the first stage of the Cold War.⁵ On the other side, taking into consideration that the treaty preamble made mention of the Finnish desire to stay outside any great power conflicts,⁶ from a Finnish perspective, it helped preserve Finnish independence and provided a new start for Finland’s policy of neutrality.⁷ As Henry Kissinger remarked, Finnish model was respectful of Soviet security but also democratic and free to conduct a nonalignment foreign policy.⁸ The core of Finland’s neutrality was non-membership in military alliances.⁹

Amid radical security changes, the policy of neutrality that Finland followed in the Cold War period became no longer a viable line of action. With the failure of the August 1991 Communist coup in Moscow, Finland began negotiations to rewrite the 1948 Soviet Finnish Treaty and, by January 1992, a new pact with Russia was signed,¹⁰ and there was neither mention of Finnish-Russian military co-

¹ Ibidem, p. 19.

² Lahodynsky, Otmar, Quoted work, p. 2 of 7.

³ Scheibner, Herbert, “There is a clear concession to European solidarity,” *Jane’s Defence weekly*, Volume 33, 8 March 2000, p. 40.

⁴ Treaty Of Friendship, Co-operation, and Mutual Assistance between the Republic of Finland and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, *Library of Congress / Federal Research Division / Country Studies / Area Handbook /.../ Appendix*, http://memory.loc.gov/frd/cs/finland/fi_appnb.html

⁵ Zetterberg, Kent, “Swedish Security Policy 1945 – 1953: Finland in the Soviet Shadow,” *Security and Insecurity: Perspectives on Finnish and Swedish defence and foreign policy*, Edited by Gunar Artéus & Jukka Nevakivi, (Stockholm: Försvarshögskolan, 1997), p.42.

⁶ Ibidem

⁷ Nevakivi, Jukka, “Finnish Security Policy in a Geostrategic Perspective,” *Security and Insecurity: Perspectives on Finnish and Swedish defense and foreign policy*, Edited by Gunar Artéus & Jukka Nevakivi, Stockholm: Försvarshögskolan, 1997, p.23.

⁸ Kissinger, Henry, Quoted work, p.408.

⁹ The Military Doctrine of Finland: Statement by the Commander-in-Chief of the Finnish Defence Forces Admiral Jan Klenberg at the Seminar on Military Doctrine, (Vienna, 9 October 1991).

¹⁰ Häikiö, Martti, “Changes in Finnish Security Policy: the Koivisto Presidency, 1981-1994,” *Security and Insecurity: Perspectives on Finnish and Swedish defense and foreign policy*, Edited by Gunar Artéus & Jukka Nevakivi, Stockholm: Försvarshögskolan, 1997, p. 92.

operation or objection for Finland's active engagement in European co-operation. Finland was the first of the neutral states to request observer status in the North Atlantic Co-operation Council (NACC). It joined the PfP Programme in May 1994, PfP PARP in February 1995, and has participated in the NATO-led IFOR and SFOR operations in Bosnia from the beginning.¹ By joining European Union and making a commitment to the EU CFSP in January 1995, in the former President Martii Ahtisaari's words the Finns have given up their "former policy of Cold War-era neutrality."² With regard to NATO enlargement, Finland is not seeking Alliance membership.³ The majority of Finns are against membership of the North Atlantic Alliance, fearing attempts to change the policy of neutrality.⁴ In this context, Finland has stressed that changes in Europe's military configuration and national solutions must not be allowed to create new security problems or inequalities or to create new spheres of interest in Europe.⁵

Giving up the former policy of neutrality, Finland has, nevertheless decided to maintain its policy of military non-aligned and credible national defence. As the Report by the Council of State to the Parliament of 6 June 1995 states Finland will further the goal of foreign and security policy "by remaining outside military alliances and by maintaining an independent defence."⁶ Also, the Finnish security and defence policy White Book specifies that "the basic factors in Finnish security policy are: non-participation in military alliances, an independent defence, and membership of the European Union."⁷ According to the official point of view, this policy is the best way to preserve the stability in northern Europe under the present circumstances. As the Commander-in-Chief of the Finnish Defence Forces General Gustav Haggglund pointed out in 1995: "Any assessment leading to an alteration of course would now be premature because of uncertain factors such as the very unpredictable course of Russia and the still evolving European security structure."⁸ Indeed, "geopolitics determine the preconditions of Finnish security."⁹ According to the opinion of the highly esteemed Finnish foreign policy expert and historian Max Jakobson, in a wider European context, Finnish neutrality has many advantages, but "joining NATO would harm the relations with Russia and could

¹ Järvenpää, Pauli, "What comes after Madrid? A view from Helsinki," *NATO Review*, No 5, September/October 1997 – Volume 45, p.31.

² Taina, Anneli, *Security in a Changing Europe: A Finnish View*, <http://www.csd.org/96Book/Taina.htm>

³ *Security in a Changing World: Guidelines for Finland's Security Policy*, Report by the Council of State to the Parliament 6 June 1995, (Helsinki: Publications of Ministry for Foreign Affairs, 1995), p. 51.

⁴ Debate about Finnish neutrality in New Europe intensifies, *EAGLE Street*, January 1999, <http://www.polarities.net/articles/international/NATO.htm>

⁵ *Security in a Changing World...*, p.51.

⁶ *Security in a Changing World...*, p.67.

⁷ *The European Security Development and Finnish Defence*, Report by the Council of State to Parliament on 17 March 1997 (Edita: Helsinki, 1997), p. 47.

⁸ Haggglund, Gustav, "Finnish defence policy aims to protect against external pressures," *NATO Review*, No 4 – July 1995, Volume 43, p.20.

⁹ *Security in a Changing World...*, p.66.

provoke Moscow to put pressure against the Baltic countries.”¹ After coming to power of the new Finnish President in 2000, non-alignment still remains the basic principle of Finnish security policy and Government does not intend to abandon it in the foreseeable future.²

Therefore, the analysis of the Finnish security policy in the nineties attests that Finland overcame the former security dependence from Soviet Union/Russia and has moved towards European integration. At the same time, it should be stressed that the core of Finnish neutrality - non-membership in military alliances - remains unchangeable. In other words, Finland gave up the policy of Cold War-era neutrality, but not of neutrality at all.

The Swedish experience of neutrality started since Napoleonic wars.³ During the 20th century, Sweden has perpetually stayed out of military alliances and also out of war, including both world wars. With dividing of Europe into two opposing military-political blocs, Swedish neutrality has constituted the core of the so called Nordic Balance of security, which was constructed around Danish and Norwegian NATO membership, Sweden’s armed neutrality, and Finnish limited neutrality vis-à-vis the USSR. To assure the reliability of this balance during the Cold War period, Sweden invested heavily in its defence, maintaining, for instance, one of the largest air force in the world.⁴ During this time of East-West confrontation, Sweden has also strictly observed the principle of non-alignment in peacetime aiming at neutrality in war. Concerning the EC membership, there were three intensive debates on the question of Swedish neutrality’s compatibility with EC/EU membership: in 1961-1963, in 1967, and in 1970-1972.⁵

Since 1990 debates over Swedish neutrality intensified rapidly, especially regarding to the EC/EU membership and the NATO-issue. In 1991-1992, the conservative government of Carl Bildt managed to give a broader interpretation to the concept of neutrality.⁶ The new approach to the Swedish concept of neutrality, allowed Sweden to accede to the European Union in January 1995 and shortly thereafter to become WEU observer. Sweden has also joined NATO PfP

¹ Neutrality said to leave Finland and Sweden weak in the future Europe, *EAGLE Street*, November 1998, <http://www.polarities.net/articles/international/neutrality.htm>

² See Oboronnaia politika ostaetsea neizmennoi (Defence policy remains unchangeable: Interview with Defence Minister of Finland (Russian), *Nezavisimoe voennoe obozrenie*, 26 May – 1 June 2000, no 18 (191). Seregin, A., “O problemah ucreplenia natsionalnoi i regionalnoi bezopasnosti Finleandii,” *Zarubejnoe voennoe obozrenie*, No 11, (644) 2000, p.2.

³ Ugglas, “Margaretha af, Old and New Pillars of Swedish Security In a Changing Europe,” <http://www.csdr.org/94book/ugglas.htm>, p. 1 of 5.

Sztucki, Jerzy, “Sweden’s neutrality experience,” <http://diplo.diplomacy.edu/publishing/neutrality/sweden.htm>

⁴ Swedish security in the 1990’s: the implications for neutrality, <http://rubiin.physic.ut.ee/~toomasr/swedsecur.html>, p. 2 of 5.

⁵ See Hultdt, Bo, “Sweden and European Community-Building 1945-1992,” *Neutral States and the European Community edited by Sheila Harden*, pp. 105-143. (London: Brassey’s, 1994). (There was used the Russian Reproduction for educational purposes by George C. Marshall European Center for Security Studies, pp.7-9).

⁶ Ibidem, pp.18-20.

Programme in May 1994 and has been actively taking part in NATO-led IFOR and SFOR operations in Bosnia.¹ The pragmatic side of Swedish non-alignment is also manifesting in the strong support of Baltic States.

Nevertheless, the core of Swedish non-allied security policy in peacetime aiming at neutrality in war remains unchanged. Sweden neither is nor aspires to become a NATO member.² Many opinion polls have showed that the majority of the population of Sweden, like in neighbouring Finland, is in favour of continued neutrality.³ In 1999, the Swedish government has restated the nation's long-standing policy of being what is described as "alliance-free in peacetime, neutral in war."⁴

It seems Sweden, like Finland, has found the solution to adapt its traditional security policy to the new European security environment without compromising its capacity for neutrality. As there has been mentioned the instincts of Swedish and Finnish populations, who clearly do not share the enthusiasm of some of their elites to move to early NATO membership, may be well founded. Neutralism and non-alignment stood them well enough in the Cold War.⁵

It should be remarked, the strong neutrality traditions in the Northern Europe have influenced even the security policy of Denmark and Norway - NATO members since the foundation of the Alliance. Already in 1949 the Danish government had emphasised the non-offensive character of its NATO membership, and this was followed by some self-imposed restrictions on it, including the refusal to host Allied aircraft and personnel, as well as the nuclear weapons from NATO.⁶ Norway had also declared such self-imposed restrictions.⁷ In this way the two countries came to serve – together with Sweden and Finland – as buffer states vis-à-vis the Soviet Union.

In 1990-1996, Ireland seemed to be the strongest defender of its neutrality, rejecting the opportunity to adhere either to NATO or to the emerging co-operative defence framework in Europe. Even, PfP has been a problem for Irish neutrality, which is based on the desire not be caught up in "Britain's wars". The opposition

¹ Dahl, Ann-Sofie, "Not if but how: Sweden's future relations with NATO," *NATO Review*, No 3, May-June 1997, Volume 45, p.20.

² Ugglas, Margaretha af, Quoted work, p.3 of 5.

³ Dahl, Ann-Sofie, Quoted work, p.20.

⁴ Georgieff, Anthony, NATO: Sweden Reaffirms Neutrality – For Now, <http://www.rfrl.org.nca/features/1999/01/F.RU.990111140030.html>

⁵ See Eric J. Grove, "A NATO view with comments on Dr. Knudsen's presentation," *Security in the Northern European Region, 1999 Partnership for Peace International Seminar*, (Stockholm, 8-11 December 1999,) p.47.

⁶ See Danish Security Policy: A Survey by The Board of The Danish Commission on Security and Disarmament, (Copenhagen, 1993), p.8.

Norgaard, Ole, "Danish Policy in the Baltic Sea Area, 1945-1989. Looking at the Past through the Eyes of the Present," *German and Danish Security Policies towards the Baltic Sea Area: 1945 until Present*, Edited by Gunnar Arteus & Bertel Heurlin, (Copenhagen: Danish Institute of International Affairs, 1998), p. 73.

⁷ Type, Born, "Dobrososedscoe sotrudnicestvo," *Nezavisimoe Voennoe Obozrenie*, No. 32 (205), 1-7 September 2000, p.4.

forces feel that PfP participation could lead to Irish forces being placed under NATO and perhaps British command. Consequently, they insist that “Ireland should pursue a positive neutrality and independent foreign policy and not to join or form an association with any military alliance, such as the WEU or NATO.”¹ Hence, Ireland joined PfP programme lately on 1 December 1999.² In his remarks to the North Atlantic Council, Irish Foreign Minister emphasised that Ireland’s decision to join PfP was “in full accordance with Ireland’s policy of neutrality”, and that Ireland had no intention of joining the North Atlantic Alliance, or any other alliance.³ Though, Ireland joined EU as early as in 1972, its participation in the CESDP⁴ has intensified the debate on the future of Irish neutrality much more. Concluding, the Irish approach of neutrality remains strictly. As the Taoiseach, Bertie Ahern, has stressed: “In this post-Cold War era a policy of military neutrality has continuing relevance as long as the doctrine of nuclear deterrence, which is rooted in Cold War concepts, remains in force.”⁵

The adjustment of legendary Swiss neutrality to the new security environment and the current international relations is surely the most relevant. Already in 1990, the Swiss Federal Council asserted that Switzerland wishes to contribute to and co-operate in the process of European economic and political integration “because by standing apart, the country would run the risk of isolation and economic disadvantages, and because it sees itself as a part of the European community... .”⁶ The essential issue of Swiss security policy in the nineties has been the harmonisation of the Switzerland’s strong engagement in the international and European co-operation with the status of the permanently neutral state. More or less this question was anchored in all reports regarding foreign and security policy of Switzerland at this time.⁷ In particular, the 1999 integrated Report sets that the

¹ Cole, Roger, “Irish neutrality under threat from EU,” *Irish Democrat*, Issue: December/January 1998, <http://www.midnet.ie/connelly/irishdem/irishneutralitydecjan.htm>, p.3 of 3.

² Ireland joins Partnership for Peace, *NATO Review*, No 4, Winter 1999 – Volume 47, p. 26.

³ *Ibidem*

⁴ According to Lieutenant General McMahon, who examines the defence implications for Ireland in the framework of the CESDP, the Irish Defence Forces’ contribution would involve somewhere between 800 and 1,000 soldiers. See Debate needed on role in EU defence, *The Irish Times*, Wednesday, June 21, 2000, p.3 of 4.

⁵ EU security role consistent with neutrality, *The Irish Times*, Monday, December 20, 1999, <http://www.ireland.com.newspaper/opinion/1999/1220/opt2.htm>, p. 2 of 4.

⁶ Swiss Security Policy in Times of Change: Report 90 on Switzerland’s Security Policy”, Issued in Bern, on 1 October 1990, p.10.

⁷ See Swiss Security Policy in Times of Change: Report 90 on Switzerland’s Security Policy”, Issued in Bern, on 1 October 1990.

Report on the Membership in the European Union of 18 May 1992.

Report on the Foreign Policy of Switzerland in the Nineties of 29 November 1993.

Report on Neutrality on 29 November 1993.

The Swiss Partnership for Peace Programme: Clusters of Competence, Federal Military Department, General Secretariat, Permanent PfP Office, February 1997.

Rapport annuel du Conseil fédéral sur la Participation de la Suisse au Partenariat pour la Paix de l’OTAN en 1997 (du 18 mars 1998).

Report of the Study Commission on the Strategic Studies, Issued in Bern, on 26 February 1998.

continuation of “permanent neutrality is no obstacle to active participation, in the spirit of solidarity, in measures against common threats and in the establishment of a stable international system of security.”¹ Moreover, “neutrality is no obstacle for a participation of Swiss troops in international peace operations abroad or for co-operation with friendly states in the areas of military training or defence research and development. In these areas, the law of neutrality permits also contractual agreements with NATO or the WEU outside a membership, e.g. for the implementation of mandates issued by the UN Security Council.”² With regard to the question whether neutrality is compatible with EU membership, all mentioned documents have arrived unanimously at the assessment: a state desiring to join the EU has to make the necessary adjustments in its foreign and security policy, but the status of neutrality is no obstacle.³

The 1990-1991 war in Iraq and the events of Kosovo 1999 conflict underlined the existence of limits to the foreign policy of a permanent neutral state. Switzerland was in some cases obliged by the law of neutrality to refuse support for measures taken by other states, even if these measures were compatible with the objectives of Swiss foreign and security policy.⁴ Hence, as the Study Commission on Strategic Studies recommended to the Swiss federal authorities, it is important to continue the course of interpreting neutrality pragmatically and with flexibility, considering it a means for protecting Swiss interests, not as an end in itself.⁵

The participation of Switzerland in the Partnership for Peace is eloquent for current Swiss security policy. Joining the PfP Programme on 11 December 1996, Switzerland considers the Partnership as framework for political consultations and practical co-operation with NATO.⁶ As a result of the unfolding of the first Individual Partnership Programme (IPP), all planned activities, in which 688 officers, diplomats and experts took place, was realised successfully.⁷ In the following years, Switzerland has reinforced its participation in Partnership activity and it is very impressive the overwhelming majority of Swiss approve it.

Nevertheless, Switzerland does not intend either to join NATO or to abandon its status of neutrality, remaining committed to permanent and armed neutrality.⁸ In

Security through Cooperation: Report of the Federal Council to the Federal Assembly on the Security Policy of Switzerland, Issued in Bern, on 7 June 1999.

¹ Security through Cooperation, p.33.

² Ibidem, p. 34.

³ Ibidem, p. 37.

⁴ Ibidem, p.34.

Rösh, Manfred, L'évolution de la politique de sécurité de la Suisse, Revue de l'OTAN, No 6 – Decembre 1993.

⁵ Report of the Study Commission on the Strategic Studies, p. 20.

⁶ The Swiss Partnership for Peace Programme: Clusters of Competence, p. 1.

Dahinden, Martin, “Swiss security policy and partnership with NATO,” *NATO Review*, No 4, Winter 1999-Volume 47, p. 27.

⁷ Rapport annuel du Conseil fédéral sur la Participation de la Suisse au Partenariat pour la Paix de l'OTAN en 1997, p. 14.

⁸ Presentation Document of Switzerland for the Partnership for Peace of 11 December 1996, p. 1.

Dahinden, Martin, Quoted work, p. 24.

1999, the Swiss Federal Council concluded that a renunciation of neutrality in spite of the existing uncertainties would be dangerous in the absence of alternatives (EU, NATO) that could be realised rapidly.¹ For the time being, the Swiss reject even the EU membership. Thus, in a recent vote 77 percent of voters said “No” to a measure called “Yes to Europe” and which called for immediate negotiations to join Union of 17 countries.² It should be remarked over the past 15 years, Swiss voters have firmly rejected by referendum the attempts to coax them into the UN – or even into making formal arrangements with it.³

However, the evolution of Swiss neutrality attests that the days of neutral states have not passed, yet.

Concluding the above-mentioned on the neutrality changes in Western Europe, it should be underlined that the foreign and security policy of Western Neutrals in the post-Cold War era testifies to the modification of the content of neutrality in accordance with the new security environment. Their neutrality policy has become more flexible and co-operative on the basis of the principle on solidarity. The restricted policies of neutral countries during the Cold War have been replaced by activism towards European integration and co-operation with NATO. All Western Neutrals joined NATO PfP and have been participating in EAPC and NATO-lead peacekeeping operations. In addition, as EU members, Ireland, Austria, Finland and Sweden participate in CESDP. Nevertheless, the neutrality evolution in Western Europe attests that the assertion about the nonsense of the neutrality in the post Cold War period seem to be exaggerated. The participation of neutral states in the PfP Programme will not result in their obligatory inclusion into the North Atlantic Alliance. Also, neutral states' adhering to the European Union does not mean the abandonment of neutrality. Though, the debate on whether to join NATO is clearly underway in Austria, Sweden and Finland, the official position of these countries remains unchanged: they will not seek NATO membership in the near future. In any case, the assertions on the neutrality abandonment are premature.

¹ Security through Cooperation, p.33.

² Olson, Elizabeth, “Swiss Voters Reject EU Talks,” in *International Herald Tribune*, Monday, March 5, 2001, p.6.

³ Is it still happier alone? *The Economist*, December, 16th-22nd 2000.

II.3. Neutrality Searches in Central Europe

Our time is one of rapid change. Nobody knows what the future will bring.

**Swiss Security Policy in the Times of Change:
Report 90 on Switzerland's Security Policy**

In 1854, Bruno Bauer defined Central Europe as “a great territory of unanswered questions and unresolved contradictions”.¹

According to the June 1992 WEU Petersberg Declaration there were nine countries, which geographically belong to this area, i.e. Poland, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Hungary, Romania, Bulgaria, and the Baltic States. Also, the US State Department in 1994 decided to use the term “Central European” for those countries, which geographically belong to the area and are neither parts of any Western or Eastern multilateral structure.²

It should be reminded that neutrality was a dream of the Central Europeans during the Cold War. For instance, on November 1, 1956, the Hungarian Government declared Hungary's neutrality and its withdrawal from the Warsaw Pact. In particular, the Declaration stipulated: “The Hungarian people, on the basis of independence and equality and in accordance with the spirit of the UN Charter, wishes to live in true friendship with its neighbours, the Soviet Union, and all the peoples of the world. The Hungarian people desires the consolidation and further development of the achievements of its national revolution without joining any power blocs.”³ At the same time, Hungary asked the United Nations to recognise Hungarian neutrality, but it never received a reply.

When the Communist system collapsed, among other security options, Central Europeans considered the neutrality solution, too. The idea of a Central European union of neutral states was quite popular in the early 1990s. Henry Kissinger argued that the most realistic security system in Central Europe “would include Austrian type of neutrality for Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Poland”.⁴ Also, the Soviet leadership agreed to the eventual neutrality policy of CEE countries like the Austrian or the Finnish type.⁵

¹ Quoted in - Pușcaș, Vasile, “The New Political Geography of Post-Madrid Central Europe,” *Central European Issues – Romanian Foreign Affairs Review*, Volume 5, Number 1, Bucharest, 1999, p. 63.

² Holbrooke, Richard C., “United States relations with Romania,” *Central European Issues – Romanian Foreign Affairs Review*, Volume 5, Number 1, Bucharest, 1999, p. 32.

³ See Kissinger, Henry, Quoted work.

⁴ See Newsweek, June 18, 1990, Quoted in Solomon, Gerald B., *The NATO Enlargement Debate, 1990-1997*, Published with the Center for Strategic and International Studies, The Washington Papers / 174, (Washington D.C. 1998), p. 8.

⁵ Izvestia, No 48, 26 February 1991.

In 1990-1991, when the leaders of the former Communist countries understood that Soviet Union would see the NATO membership of their states hostilely, they rejected the neutrality solution and proclaimed the doctrine “neither neutral state, nor member of any bloc.”¹ This ambiguity of this concept was reflected in the statements of Polish leadership. Thus, in February 1991, the Polish Foreign Minister stated that Poland want to be neither neutral state nor part of any buffer zone between Soviet Union and Germany, but, at the same time, the Polish Defence Minister considered the status of armed neutrality for Poland.² Because of the increasing instability in Eastern Europe, determined, first of all, by the internal instability in Russia and its unpredictable course, the Central Europeans rejected the concepts of neutrality and “grey zone” for the advantage of the NATO membership. As early as in May 1991, the NATO Secretary General Manfred Wörner stated that the democracies of Central Europe “neither want to be neutral, nor components of a buffer zone, and nor do we.”³ In 1992, the Czech President, Vatslav Havel stressed that it is without sense for Czechoslovakia to be an island of neutrality in the centre of Europe.⁴ Finally, on the eve of joining North Atlantic Alliance, the Visegrad countries abandoned definitively the idea of neutrality. As the Hungarian Foreign Minister stated in 1996, in the post-bipolar world “neutrality lost its original sense” and it is not a viable solution in the Central European region.⁵ Nevertheless, the neutrality searches in these countries have influenced the mentality of a part of the people, causing them some kind of neutrality nostalgia. Even the 1997 Madrid Summit had passed, some opponents of Hungary’s membership in NATO wrote about “the thousand-year-old dream” to declare “Hungary a neutral and non-allied nation.”⁶

Also both Romania and Bulgaria, like the Visegrad countries, did not initially express their intention to join Atlantic Alliance, but considered both the neutrality solution and the doctrine “neither neutral state, nor member of any bloc”. In 1991, the Romanian Defence Minister stated that Romania does not intend to participate in any alliances, but will develop its security co-operation on the bilateral basis.⁷ A 1993 security study proposed the solution of Romania’s active neutrality and security, which would preserve her territorial integrity, the state’s national character, the normal development of sovereignty etc.⁸ Concerning the

¹ Frost, Howard E., “Eastern Europe’s Search for Security,” *Orbis*, (Winter 1993), (There was used the Russian Reproduction for educational purposes by George C. Marshall European Center for Security Studies, p.5).

² *Ibidem*, p. 9.

³ See International Herald Tribune, May 6, 1991, Quoted in Solomon, Gerald B., *The NATO Enlargement Debate, 1990-1997*, p. 7.

⁴ Frost, Howard E., Quoted work, p. 7.

⁵ Hungarian opinion on neutrality, *Press release of the Embassy of the Hungarian Republic in Chişinău*, 5 March 1996.

⁶ Nepszabadsag, 22 August 1997, Quoted in Public Diplomacy Query, September 1997.

⁷ Frost, Howard E., Quoted work, p. 12.

⁸ Chelaru, Mircea, *O posibilă soluție*, (Bucureşti: Editura Balek, 1993), p. 41.

Bulgarian neutrality search, there was mentioned the impact of internal issues, including the national minority question, on the possibility to proclaim the neutrality of the country.¹

The histories of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania during the 20th century have so many common features that they could be named the Siamese Baltic States. Indeed, prior Baltic countries proclaimed their independence in 1918, they had been Russian colonies. The following 22 years were a period of relative economic and cultural blossoming for all three nations. In September 1934 the Treaty of Concordia and Co-operation among three Baltic States was signed in Geneva.² In the late 1930s, all three Baltic States declared themselves neutral, which made the Baltic Entente practically irrelevant.³ Soviet troops occupied the entire territory of the Baltic States at the same time - June 1940 – and according to the same Soviet-Nazi Pact of 23 August 1940. After 1940, 50 years of collectivisation, industrialisation and Sovietisation followed in all the three countries, and finally they obtained independence together in August 1991.

During the initial stage of sovereignty and independence (1990 -1991) the Baltic States strove for a neutral status as a means to achieve independence from the crumbling Soviet Union. When the independence goal was reached, they more and more sought to bolster their security organisations. Lithuania taking the lead in January 1994, they officially asked for membership, as NATO geared up to a decision on admitting new members in Eastern Europe in July 1997.⁴

According to the 1990 Draft of the Basics of Lithuania's National Security Conception, worked out by the Lithuanian Defence Department, the aim was stipulated to proclaim the neutrality of the Lithuanian Republic and to acquire its Soviet recognition. The draft also proposed the creation of a High Confidence Neutral Baltic Zone between Eastern and Western countries, which would be recognised by the international community.⁵ Later, all options for guaranteeing Lithuania's security – from maintaining the policy of neutrality to dependence on international organisations or security guarantees provided by certain countries – have proven unrealistic and Lithuania has made a clear choice: to seek membership of NATO, the EU and WEU.⁶ The Lithuanian Constitution explicitly prohibits the

¹ Frost, Howard E., Quoted work, p. 10.

² Haab, Mare: Estonia and Europe: security and defense, *The Baltic States: security and defense after independence*, (Paris: Institute for Security Studies of Western European Union, June 1995), p.48.

³ Ibidem.

⁴ Oldberg, Ingmar, No love is lost – Russia's relations with the Baltic States, *Baltic Security: Looking towards the 21st century*, Edited by Gunnars Artéus & Atis Lejiuns. (Riga: Latvian Institute of International affairs & Försvarshögskolan, 1997), p.153.

⁵ The author of this study posses a fax copy of the named Draft.

⁶ Bajarunas, Eitvydas, "Lithuania's security dilemma," *The Baltic States: security and defense after independence*, p.11.

country from joining any new political, military, economic or any other state alliances or commonwealths formed on the basis of the former USSR.¹ Lithuania has also rejected the model of the so-called bridge between East and West or the role of any type of buffer zone.

With its formal declaration of independence and subsequent withdrawal from the Soviet Union, Latvia also began to enact its security policy oriented towards Euro-Atlantic security organisations.² Riga considers PfP as a sort of antechamber for future NATO membership. Although it is concerned that selective enlargement of the Atlantic Alliance could divide the continent into a safe part and an insecure part, Latvia support every state that aspires to NATO membership, in the hope that European area of security and stability will be larger.

Since 1990 Estonia, like Latvia and Lithuania, has considered several security options, ranging from neutrality or close relations with Nordic Community and other Baltic Sea states to the option of strengthening relations with and joining NATO, the EU and WEU.³ Estonia rejected strongly the Moscow proposal on the creation of a neutral zone in the Baltic area. It seems that Estonian nation can not forget that Stalin had once stressed the neutrality of Estonia could be usefully for Soviet Union.⁴ According to the Estonian opinion, unlike in the case of its neighbours Sweden and Finland, no one seriously considered Estonia to be a neutral country. Had Estonia not applied for NATO membership, it would have run the risk of being (re-) placed in the public perception among the former Soviet states, none of which has expressed its intention to join Atlantic Alliance.”⁵ Hence in Tallinn’s view, the participation in the PfP Programme is not a goal in itself, but a part of a process leading to eventual NATO membership.⁶

In 1997, Moscow made a proposal to the Baltic States, according to which, they should stay out of the NATO Alliance by “maintaining a block-free status, followed by the policy of non-alliance similar to that of Finland and Sweden”.⁷

Vitkus, Gediminas, “At the crossroad of alternatives: Lithuanian security policies in 1995-1997,” *Baltic Security: Looking towards the 21st century*, p.53.

¹ See White Paper '99, issued by the Ministry of National Defence of the Republic of Lithuania, (Vilnius, 1999), p.9.

² See Viskene, Ilmars, “Latvia and Europe’s security structures,” *The Baltic States: security and defense after independence*;

Lejins, Atis & Zaneta Ozolina, “Latvia – the Middle Baltic State,” *Baltic Security: Looking towards the 21st century*.

³ Haab, Mare, Estonia and Europe: security and defense, *The Baltic States: security and defense after independence*, p.45-46.

⁴ See Ot Pacta Molotova-Ribbentropa do Dogovora o Bazah: Documenty i Materialy (in Russian), Tallinn: “Periodica”, 1990, p.181-182.

⁵ See Klaar, Toivo, Estonia’s Security Policy Priorities, *Baltic Security: Looking Towards the 21st Century*, p.19.

⁶ See Andrus Oovel, Estonian defence policy: independence and international co-operation, *NATO Review*, No.5-September 1996, Volume 44, p. 7.

⁷ Vystuplenie Victora Chernomyrdina na mejdunarodnoi konferentsii “Sosushchestvovanie gosudarstv i dobrososedskie otnoshenia – garantia bezopasnosti i stabilnosti v Evrope”, Vilnius, 5-6 September 1997., *Diplomaticeskij Vestnik*, No.10, Octeabri 1997 g., p.10.

Both Baltic States and the Western powers rejected the Moscow offer. As some analysts have pointed, the creation of a neutral or non-aligned zone would be of no security value to either the West or the Baltic States. Such a demilitarised zone would leave the Baltic States exposed and vulnerable and allow Russia the advantage to station forces in the geographical proximity without a counterbalance from the West.¹ For the Baltic States it is very important that NATO does not recognise them, directly or indirectly, as part of the Russia's sphere of interest and does not treat them differently from other CE countries. They fear becoming neutralised in a Russian manner, which would mean not being completely free from Russia in the orientation of their foreign and security policies. Their security lessons have convinced them that it is not possible for the Baltic States, in current geopolitical circumstances, to exist as neutral states, because a European armed conflict involving Russia on one side will invariably involve the Baltic countries, too. In a researcher's words, the Baltic States "cannot allow a neutrality status to become a strategic ghetto, where external powers will fear to tread, because the risk is too high, and the reward too far removed from vital interests."²

The traumatic memory of the Baltic nations accomplished by a difficult regional geopolitical location seems to be incompatible with neutrality.

¹ Austin, Daniel F.C., NATO Expansion and the Baltic States, Sandhurst: Conflict Studies Research Centre, Royal Military Academy, February 1999, p. 7.

² Birskavs, Valdis, Baltic States and European security, *Cooperation and Partnership for Peace: a Contribution to Euro-Atlantic security into the 21st century*, Editors: Carr, F. & Ifantis, K., p.25

II.4. Neutrality Arising in the CIS Area

Unlike the Central Europe and the Baltic region, the neutrality idea has gained strong position in the area of CIS. There are four countries, i.e. Turkmenistan, Ukraine, Belarus, and Moldova, - which have seriously advanced on the way of neutrality.

The first official intention of Turkmenistan to become a neutral state was made at its admittance to CSCE on 10 July 1992.¹ In the following year, the Turkmenistan's President Niazov stated that Turkmenistan proclaimed the course of positive neutrality as the basis of its foreign policy.² During the 18 May 1995 official visit of the Russian President in Turkmenistan, President Yeltsin expressed his understanding on the contents of Turkmen neutrality policy and this had an essential role for the receiving of the support of the international community to the proclaimed Turkmen neutrality.³ After some months, the 11th Conference of the Heads of State and Government of the NAM, (14-20 October 1995, Cartahens, Columbia) "welcomed Turkmenistan as a new member of NAM and expressed their support and a full understanding of the commitment of Turkmenistan to play a constructive, peaceful role in providing stability and mutual understanding between the States on the basis of the principles of positive neutrality."⁴ On 12 December 1995, the General Assembly of the United Nations Organisation approved the Resolution "The Permanent Neutrality of Turkmenistan". The Resolution stipulates that the UN General Assembly "recognises and supports the permanent neutrality status declared by Turkmenistan" as well as "calls on other UN member-countries to honour and back up this status of Turkmenistan, respect the nation's independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity."⁵ The provisions on the permanent neutrality of Turkmenistan were later specified in the Constitutional Law on Turkmenistan's Permanent Neutrality⁶ and the Concept for Foreign Policy of Turkmenistan as a Neutral State⁷. As there was remarked, the recognition of the permanent neutrality of Turkmenistan is unprecedented: for the first time in the history, the neutrality status of a country has received the support of all international community.⁸ Also, taking into consideration the regional geopolitical situation in the Middle Asia, it could be asserted that the Turkmen positive neutrality constitutes the most interesting case in the post-Cold War era.

¹ Vnesneaya Politika Neytralinogo Turkmenistana: Reci, Vystupleniya i Interviu Prezidenta Turkmenistana Saparmurada Turkmenbashi, (Ashabad, 1997), p.17.

² Kepbanov, E.A., Postoyanniy neytralitet Turkmenistana: Programma na XXI vec, (Ashabad, 1999), p. 26.

³ Ibidem, p. 30.

⁴ The Permanent neutrality of Turkmenistan: Collection of political and legal documents, Ashgabat, 2000, p.20.

⁵ Ibidem

⁶ Ibidem, p.20-21.

⁷ Ibidem, p. 21-23.

⁸ Kepbanov, E.A., Quoted work, p.37.

As the Charter on a Distinctive Partnership between the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation and Ukraine has stressed, “an independent, democratic and stable Ukraine is one of the key factors for ensuring stability in Central and Eastern Europe, and the continent as a whole”.¹ Hence, the Ukrainian search for neutrality is very important for this part of Europe.

One has pointed out Ukraine’s adoption of a neutral status was largely a reflection of the neutrality strategy adopted by the Baltic States in the transition period towards their independence.² The first main outlines of Ukraine’s foreign and security policy were established in the 16 July 1990 “Declaration on the State Sovereignty of Ukraine” adopted by the then Verkhovna Rada (Parliament) of the Ukrainian SSR, under the former USSR. The Declaration claimed Ukraine’s “intention to become in the future a permanently neutral state, which does not participate in military alliances and adheres to three non-nuclear principles.”³ It seems it was Ukraine that insisted to include the following neutral clause in the CIS founding agreements: “The parties will respect one another’s aspiration to attain the status of a non-nuclear zone and a neutral state.”⁴ However, Ukraine has abstained from entering into the CIS Collective Security Treaty, signed in Tashkent on May 15, 1992.⁵ As some analysts stressed the advantage of neutrality was that it helped to avert any attempt by Russia to reintegrate Ukraine into a new military or security order dominated by Moscow.⁶ Nevertheless, Ukraine has participated in some CIS defence programmes. Thus, it signed the Agreement on Creation of the Joint Air Defence System (JADS) of States Members of the CIS that foresees an integrated air defence system designed to protect the CIS air space.⁷

In 1993, the Ukrainian Parliament further codified Ukraine’s foreign and security policy. The “Main Guidelines of Ukrainian Foreign Policy”, approved by the Parliament on 2 July 1993, transcended the “neutrality clause”, but other

¹ Charter on a Distinctive Partnership between the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation and Ukraine, *NATO Review*, No.4, July-August 1997-Volume 45, p. 5.

² See Bohdan Lupiy, *Ukraine and European Security: International Mechanisms as Non-Military Options for Ukraine*, Peter Lang Europasher Verlag der Wissenschaften Frankfurt am Main, 1996, p.41.

³ Kharchenko, Ihor, “A view from Ukraine,” *NATO Enlargement: Opinions and Options*, Edited by J. Simon, (Washington D.C., 1995), p. 141.

⁴ Soglaşenie o sozdanii Sodrujestva Nezavisimih Gosudarstv. (Podpisano 8 decabrea 1991 v Belovejscoi puşce, pravitelstvennaia rezidenĭia Visculi, Brestcaia oblasti, Belarusi), *SODRUJESTVO: Informaĭionnii vestnic Soveta glav gosudarstv i pravitelstv SNG*, Vĭpusc pervii, Minsk 1992, p.7.

See also The Minsk (Belovezh Forest) Agreement on Creation of the Commonwealth, 8 December 1991 (FBIS Translation), *Russia and the Commonwealth of Independent States: documents, data, and analysis* / edited by Zbigniew Brzezinski and Paige Sullivan, New York: Center for Strategic and International Studies, 1997. p. 43.

⁵ Dogovor o collectivnoi bezopasnosti stran uchiastnits SNG, in *SODRUJESTVO: Informaĭionnii vestnic Soveta glav gosudarstv i Soveta glav pravitelstv SNG*, Vĭpusc piatyi, Minsk 1992, p. 9-10.

See also CIS Treaty on Collective Security, 15 May 1992, (FBIS Translation), *Russia and the Commonwealth of Independent States: documents, data, and analysis*, p. 541.

⁶ See Kulinich, N., “The Paradox of Ukrainian Neutrality”, *Golos Ukrainy*, 25 and 26 September 1992;

Dunn, John, “The determinants and Future of Ukrainian Foreign and Security Policy,” F45, CSRC, February 1995, p. 11.

⁷ CIS Unified Air Defense Agreement, (FBIS Translation), *Russia and the Commonwealth of Independent States: documents, data, and analysis*, p. 543-545.

important act - “The Military Doctrine of Ukraine” on 19 October 1993 - includes the claim of Ukraine’s adherence to “non-bloc country status”.¹ Though, the 1996 Ukrainian Constitution does not include the “non bloc-country status”, it stated that the stationing of foreign military bases is not admitted on the Ukraine’s territory.² Given the neutrality status, Ukraine adheres to the policy of non-participation in military alliances and does not put the issue of NATO or any other military alliance membership. “The claims that Ukraine is striving for NATO membership are absurd and the idea of NATO’s eastward expansion is “premature,” the Ukrainian Defense Minister Valeriy Shmarov said in 1996, emphasising that Ukrainian legislation provides for the “off-bloc and neutral position of the country.”³

Nevertheless, since independence, Ukrainian foreign policy was directed westward and Ukraine “has not put the issue of NATO membership on the agenda for the time being”⁴ because it is “not yet ready to become a NATO member in terms of meeting the necessary criteria.”⁵ In October 2000, however, the first signs of an eastward shift appeared. The pro-Western foreign minister, Boris Tarasiuc, was sacked and replaced with Anatoly Zlenko, regarded as more acceptable to Russia. Simultaneously, Kuchma began to articulate the need for a more balanced approach to Kiev’s external relations and for an improvement in ties with Moscow.⁶ The recent dismissal of the Yushchenko Government may hamper the process of economic and political reforms and in addition it is likely to change much more the Ukrainian foreign and security policy that could have geopolitical consequences. As the Hungarian Prime Minister, Victor Orban said: “Without the guaranteed independence of Ukraine, the whole post-Cold War security architecture of Europe is in danger.”⁷

Like Ukraine, Belarus has established the first outlines of its foreign and security policy in the 1990 Declaration on State Sovereignty that specifies that Belorussian Soviet Socialist Republic put a goal of becoming a nuclear free zone and making the state a neutral one.⁸ The provision on Belarus’ quest for neutrality was consolidated in the 1992 Military Doctrine that is based on the concept on armed neutrality. The 1994 Belorussian Constitution reaffirmed the choice made in 1990: “The Republic of Belarus has a goal to make its territory into a nuclear free

¹ Voenna Doctrina Ukrainy, approved by Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine on 18 October 1993, Paragraph 1.1.

² Konstitutsia Ukrainy, Priineata na piatoi sesii Verhivnoi Rady Ukrainy 28 cervnea 1996 roku, Kiev, 1996, p.11.

³ Defense Minister Shmarov Considers Joining NATO “Absurd”, *Interfax*, 31 January 1996, Quoted in - *Russia and the Commonwealth of Independent States: documents, data, and analysis*, p. 501.

⁴ Udovenko, Hennadiy, “European stability and NATO enlargement: Ukraine’s perspective,” *NATO Review*, No 6 – November 1995-Volume 43, p.17.

⁵ Horbulin, Volodymyr, “Ukraine’s contribution to security and stability in Europe,” *NATO Review*, No 3, Autumn 1998 –Volume 46, p. 12.

⁶ Karatnycky, Adrian, “Meltdown in Ukraine,” *Foreign Affairs*, Volume 80, Number 3, New York, May/June 2001, p. 80.

⁷ Erlanger, Steven, “Growing Turmoil in Ukraine is Seen as Regional Threat,” *International Herald Tribune*, Wednesday, May 2, 2001, p.7.

⁸ Latypov, Ural, Belarussian Neutrality as a Factor of National and European Security, NATO-EAPC Fellowships.

zone, with its State having a status of neutrality”¹. Though up to 1994, Belarus tried to avoid becoming involved in the CIS Tashkent military Treaty, later on, under Lukashenka presidency, one has made significant changes in Belarus’ policy towards both Russia and the CIS. Since the proclamation of the neutral status its political goal Belarus has done very little to receive recognition as a neutral state. The participation of the Republic of Belarus in the military alliance of the CIS and the establishment of the Commonwealth/Union of Russia and Belarus has essentially eroded the credibility of the Belorussian course towards neutrality.

¹ Ibidem

CHAPTER III

REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA: A PERPETUAL BORDERLAND

III.1. Historical Background

Moldova has never existed as an independent political entity within its present borders.

In the antiquity, the present-day Moldova's territory was part of the Dacian State,¹ founded by the Geto-Dacian* people – the northern branch of Thracians. As a result of the Hellenic colonisation in the Black Sea region there was founded the Tyras at the River Nistru's mouth, Istria – nearby Danube as well as other Greek harbours-colonies on the western seacoast of the Black Sea.²

At the beginning of the 2nd century AD, Dacia was conquered by the strongest ancient state - Roman Empire – and an intensive process of romanisation of the autochthonous people started.³ The Romanised Geto-Dacians were the forefathers of Moldovan/Romanian people.

The 270 years of Roman domination were followed by a millennium of instability and change, including the so-called “great people's migration.”⁴

In 1359 there was founded the Moldovan feudal state, which included the territories between the Eastern Carpathians, Galitsia, River Nistru (Dniester), Black Sea and the River Danube. The 15th century was a period of economic and cultural blossoming of the Principality of Moldova. At the same time, Moldova was permanently involved in defence wars against the aggression of the Ottomans to the south, Hungarians to the west, Tatars to the east, and Poles to the north. In January 1475, the Moldovan army defeated a enormous Ottoman army in the Vaslui Battle, after that Papa Sixtus IV named the Moldovan Ruler Ștefan cel Mare (Stephan the Great, 1457-1504) “Christianity's athlete,” his name becoming famous in the whole of Europe.⁵

In the first half of the 16th century, the difficult external situation and the lack of support from Western Christian countries imposed Moldova to accept the Ottoman suzerainty and to become a vassal state of the Ottoman Porte. Nevertheless, principality was never incorporated fully into the Ottoman Empire. The 1513 and 1538 Moldovan-Ottoman vassalage treaties foresaw mutual obligations. On the one side, Moldova was obliged to pay a tribute to the Turkish sultan and help with her army in time of war, as the Porte will demand it. On the other side, the Sublime Porte recognised Moldova's independence (as free and

¹ Boldur, Alexandru, *Istoria Basarabiei*, (București: Editura Victor Frunză, 1992), p. 42 – 46.

² *Istoria RSS Moldovenești, Volumul I*, (Chișinău: Cartea Moldovenească, 1967), pp. 33-34.

³ *Ibidem*, pp. 38 – 43.

⁴ Boldur, Alexandru, *Quoted work*, p. 62 – 89.

⁵ *Istoria RSS Moldovenești, Volumul I*, p. 152.

unconquered), her right to direct herself by Christian law, and also pledged to ensure the country's territorial integrity. On the occasion of the 1699 Karlowitz Peace, when Poland asked for the territory of Moldova, the Porte answered that according to the concluded treaties she had no right to make any transfer of Moldovan territories.¹

Later, the Ottoman Empire, however, did not respect its obligations. As a result of the struggle of the Ottoman, Russian and Austrian powers for supremacy in the southeastern Europe, the Porte contributed to the territorial disintegration of Moldova. In 1775, the Ottoman Empire allowed the annexation by Austria of the North of Moldova, which later was named Bucovina. As a result of the Russian-Turkish War of 1806-1812, the Ottoman-Russian Bucharest Treaty was concluded, by which Russia incorporated the eastern part of Moldova, having given it the name of Bessarabia.² It should be remarked that Bessarabia's rape was also favoured by French-Russian Erfurt Treaty, concluded in September 1808, which had stipulated the Russia's right over Walachia, Moldova and Finland.³ This way the population of Moldovan Principality was divided by political borders fixed in an arbitrary manner by foreign powers.

In 1812, Bessarabia comprised 45,630 square kilometres and included about 350,000 people, the overwhelming majority of whom were Moldovans.⁴ According to the 1856 Paris Treaty the South of Bessarabia was receded to the Principality of Moldova, which united with Walachia in 1859 and, thus, constituted Romania. In 1877-1878 War, Romanian and Russian armies fought aside against the Ottomans and Romania obtained the state independence. But in spite of the April 1877 Romanian - Russian Treaty, by which Russia recognised the territorial integrity of Romania, at the end of that victorious war, Russian Empire annexed southern Bessarabia again.⁵

¹ Şişcanu, Ion, *Împotmoliţi în tranziţie*, (Chişinău: Civitas, 1999), p.16.

² Until 1812, the area between the Prut and Nistru Rivers was neither considered a distinct territory of the Moldovan principality, nor had a particular name. The original region known by the name of Bessarabia was the swath of territory between Danube and Dnestr and washed by the waters of Black Sea. The area came to be known as the land of the Basarab dynasty, or Basarabia, after that the Walachian prince Mircea cel Bătrîn (the Old, 1386-1418) of the Basarab dynasty had wrested the region from the Tatars. The reason to expand the name of Bessarabia over the entire part of Moldova between the Prut and Nistru, north as far as the fortress at Hotin, was of a political nature. In keeping with the 1807 French-Russian Tilsit Treaty, Russia pledged to withdraw its troops from Moldova and Walachia, obligation that was not fulfilled. In the subsequent negotiations in 1908, the Russian representative showed that the Tilsit Treaty did not mention anything about Bessarabia, interpreting its name in a larger sense, and insisted that it remained to Russia.

³ Boldur, Alexandru, Quoted work, p. 284 -285.

⁴ According to the following authors, by 1812, the population of Bessarabia was:

- 482,630 people, - see Nistor, Ion, *Istoria Basarabiei*, (Chişinău: Cartea Moldovenească, 1991), p.179;

- 327,197 people, - see Ciobanu, Ştefan, *Cultura românească în Basarabia sub stăpînire rusească*, (Chişinău: Editura enciclopedică "Gheorghe Asachi", 1992), p. 21;

- between 240,000 and 350,000 people, - see King, Charles, *The Moldovans. Romania, Russia, and the politics of Culture*. (Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 2000), p.18-19.

⁵ For more information see Zalyshkin, M. M., *Vneshneia politika Rumynii i rumyno-russkie otnoshenia 1875-1878*, (Moscv, Izdatelistvo "Nauca", 1974).

Between 1812-1918, Russian Tsarism applied colonisation of Bessarabia with people of other kin. The Tsarist policy in Bessarabia was aimed at denationalisation of the Moldovan element. The national legislation and the initially allowed autonomy have been liquidated and the Moldovan (Romanian) language has been ousted from the state institutions, schools, churches, and social life.¹ There were two periods of Russian ethnic policy in Bessarabia: since the annexation in 1812 until the unification of the Romanian Principalities in 1859, when Russia applied a relatively flexible ethnic policy, and later, when this policy was replaced by a strategy of forceful Russification. In 1871, Bessarabia's status was changed from an imperial region (oblast') to a Russian province (gubernia), an indication that it formed an inseparable part of the Russian Empire.²

In spite of the Tsarist policy of colonisation and denationalisation the autochthonous population of Bessarabia always made up the majority and managed to preserve its national identity.³ With the breakout of the 1917 revolution and the collapse of the Russian Empire the movement of national liberation unfolded in Bessarabia.⁴ The democratically elected Bessarabia's Parliament (Sfatul Țării – the Country Council) proclaimed on 2 December 1917 the creation of the Moldovan Popular Republic within the Democrat Russia,⁵ and few times later – on 24 January/6 February 1818 – the Declaration of Independence of Bessarabia.⁶ On 27 March/9 April 1918 Sfatul Țării approved the Declaration of union with Romania.⁷ As the researcher Charles King remarked this act was determined by “the triple peril of Bolshevism, Ukrainian expansionism, and political anarchy”.⁸ The Act of Union was recognised by the great powers of the world in the Paris Treaty of October 28, 1920,⁹ but was never recognised by the Soviet Russia/Soviet Union.¹⁰ The subsequent events proved that the Bolsheviks had allowed only the Bessarabia's autonomy but not her union with the “bourgeois” Romanian Kingdom.

During the inter-war period, the Soviet Union formulated claims to former Tsarist colony, but it was guarantees of European powers that ensured the integrity of Romania. On 12 October 1924, the soviet leadership established the Moldovan

¹ For more information see Ciobanu, Ștefan, *Cultura românească în Basarabia sub stăpînirea rusă*, (Chișinău: Editura enciclopedică “Gheorghe Asachi”, 1992).

² King, Charles, *The Moldovans. Romania, Russia, and the politics of Culture*, p.23.

³ Boldur, Alexandru, Quoted work, p. 481.

⁴ For more information see Ciobanu, Ștefan, *Unirea Basarabiei. Studiu și documente cu privire la mișcarea națională din Basarabia în anii 1917-1918*, (Chișinău: Editura Universitas, 1993).

⁵ Cojocaru, Gheorghe E., “Sfatul Țării Itinerar,” p. 57.

⁶ *Ibidem*, p.168-169.

⁷ *Ibidem*, p.171.

⁸ King, Charles. *The Moldovans. Romania, Russia, and the politics of Culture*, p. 33.

⁹ *Istoria României între anii 1918-1944: Culegere de documente*, editor: Ioan Scurtu, București: Editura didactică și pedagogică, 1982, p.36.

¹⁰ For more information on this subject see Lazarev, A.M., *Moldavscaia sovietscaia gosudarstvennosti i bessarabskii vopros*, (Chișinău: Cartea Moldovenească, 1974).

Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic (MASSR) inside Soviet Ukraine.¹ The new autonomous republic comprised 8,100 square kilometres and included 545,000 inhabitants, including Moldovans (34.2 percent), Ukrainians (50.4 percent), Russians (5.7 percent), Jews (4.8 percent) and other nationalities (4.9 percent).² MASSR was primarily intended to increase the effectiveness of Soviet propaganda in Bessarabia and to put pressure on Bucharest within respective negotiations.³

The Nazi-Soviet Pact of 23 August 1939,* which divided Europe in spheres of influence, decided the Bessarabia's fate, too. As paragraph 3 of the Confidential Additional Protocol stipulated: "In respect to Southeast Europe, the Soviet Party performed its interest in Bessarabia. The German Party clearly expressed its total political disinterest in these territories."⁴

On 6 September 1939, faced with the peril of the external aggression, Romania decided "to observe strictly the neutrality's rules established by international conventions."⁵ Nevertheless, the neutrality policy of Romania, including her actions to establish a Balkan Neutral Bloc, failed.⁶ On 26 June 1940, the Soviet government issued an ultimatum note to Romania, demanding the immediate retrocession of Bessarabia and assigning the Northern Bucovina to the USSR.⁷ Given the grim fact that France and Britain were in no position to come to Romania's aid, Moscow's demands were accepted and the Soviet troops occupied Bessarabia and the Northern Bucovina. During the May 1942 Molotov's visit in London, a Soviet-British Treaty was concluded that contained a secret clause, by which Great Britain would recognise the Soviet Union's "right" over the occupied territories. In the summer of the same year, the Soviet leadership imposed its point of view to US, too.⁸ Finally, the Paris 1947 Peace Treaty established for good the territorial "realities" originated by the Soviet-Nazi Pact.⁹ It should be underlined that since 1939 until 1989 Moscow contested the conclusion of the secret additional

¹ See Repida, A., *Obrazovanie Moldavskoi ASSR*, (Chişinău, Ştiinţa, 1974).

² *Ibidem*, p. 112.

³ King, Charles. *The Moldovans. Romania, Russia, and the politics of Culture*, p.54.

* It could be remarked that the 1939 Soviet-Nazi Pact was preceded by the 1887 Russian-German Treaty, oriented against both France and Austro-Hungary and the April 1926 Soviet-German Pact on neutrality.

⁴ *The Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact and its consequences for Basarabia. Documents*, Chisinau, Publishing House "Universitas", 1991, p. 8.

⁵ Comunicat privind neutralitatea României, 6 septembrie 1939, *Istoria României între anii 1918-1944: Culegere de documente*, p. 405.

⁶ Buzatu, Gheorghe, *România şi Războiul Mondial din 1939-1945*, (Iaşi: Centrul de istorie şi civilizaţie europeană, 1995), p. 8.

Muşat, Mircea şi Ardeleanu, Ion, *România după Marea Unire*, Vol. II, Partea a II-a, noiembrie 1933-septembrie 1940, (Bucureşti: Editura ştiinţifică şi enciclopedică), 1988, p.1521.

⁷ *The Pact Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact and its consequences for Basarabia. Documents*, p. 18-19.

⁸ Petrencu, Anatol, *România şi Basarabia în anii celui de-al doilea război mondial*, (Chişinău: Epigraf, 1999), p.156. For more information see Dobrinescu, V., Constantin, I., *Basarabia în anii celui de-al doilea război mondial, (1939-1947)*, Iaşi, 1995, p.254.

⁹ Scurtu, Ioan şi Buzatu, Gheorghe, *Istoria Românilor în Secolul XX (1918-1948)*, Bucureşti: Editura Paidea, 1999, p.515.

protocol and considered the Bessarabia's occupation as "liberation" and "peaceful solving of the issue."¹

Having incorporated these territories, the Soviet leadership proceeded to their dismemberment. By the decisions of the USSR Supreme Soviet of 2 August 1940 the Moldovan Soviet Socialist Republic (MSSR) was formed, but only 6 out of 9 Bessarabian districts and only 6 out of the 14 former districts of the MASSR entered the MSSR. Three Bessarabian districts with a population of 959,000 inhabitant were included into the Ukrainian SSR.² The reshaped Moldovan republic emerged with a surface of 33,700 square kilometres and a population of 2.4 million, of which 68.8 percent were Moldovans. In the areas apportioned from the autonomous republic, Moldovans formed almost 49 percent of the population.³ The territory of the new Moldovan republic, even including the Transnistrian region, constitutes three-fourths of Bessarabia and only one-third of the Moldovan feudal state.

Since the 1940 Soviet occupation, Moldova's population got to know the horrors of the policy of genocide implemented by means of mass deportations, organised famine and forced denationalisation. At minimum, some 115,000* peasants died from hunger and related diseases from December 1946 to August 1947.⁴ According to the official data, at least 60,000 people were deported from Moldova during the 5th decade of the last century.⁵ The document data attest that the Moldovans were especially deported.⁶ The anti-Soviet resistance movement was suppressed cruelly.⁷ Deportations and out-migrations reduced the Moldovan component and immigration by industrial workers increased the Slavic component of the population. Some 68.8 percent of the population in 1941, Moldovans represented 63.9 percent by the 1979 census, rising slightly to 64.5 percent by 1989. At the same time, ethnic Russians almost doubled their share of the populations from 6.7 percent to 13 percent.⁸

In the late 1980s a strong movement of national liberation began to emerge in Moldova. Its initially main aims were the Latin script and the status of State

¹ Istoria Vnesnei Politiki SSSR, Tom pervyi: 1917-1945g.g., pod redactsiei A.A.Gromyco, B.N.Ponomariova, Moscva: Nauca, 1986, p.399.

² Petrencu, Anatol, Quoted work, p.38.

³ King, Charles. The Moldovans. Romania, Russia, and the politics of Culture, p.95

The A. Repida's monograph *Formarea RSS Moldovenești*, (Chișinău: Cartea Moldovenească, 1977) contains the following data: The RSSM included a population of 2,607,622 inhabitants, including Moldovans (66.5 percent, Ukrainians (9.7 percent), Russians (7.2 percent) and other nationalities.

* There are also other data. Fore instance, The Republic of Moldova, (Chișinău: Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 1999) relates of 200,000 inhabitants.

⁴ King, Charles. The Moldovans. Romania, Russia, and the politics of Culture, p.96.

⁵ For more information see Pasat, Valeriu, Surovaya pravda istorii: Deportatsii s territorii Moldavscoi SSR 40-50 g.g., (Chișinău: Momentul, 1998),p.369.

⁶ Ibidem, p.293.

⁷ See Postică, Elena, Rezistența antisovietică în Basarabia, 1944 – 1950, (Chișinău: Întreprinderea editorial-poligrafică "Știința", 1977).

⁸ King, Charles. The Moldovans. Romania, Russia, and the politics of Culture, p.101.

language for Moldovan (Romanian). On June 23, 1990, the new elected Parliament approved the Declaration of the Sovereignty. In March 1991, the Moldovan people rejected the Gorbachev referendum for preservation of the Soviet Union. The process of national self-determination culminated on 27 August 1991, when, after 50 years of Soviet domination, Moldova proclaimed her independence.¹

On February 26, 1992 the Republic of Moldova signed the Helsinki Final Act entering into CSCE/OSCE.²

On March 2, 1992, at the 46th Session of General Assembly of the United Nations, the Republic of Moldova was admitted to the UNO.³

As conclusion to this paragraph, it should be mentioned that the past has a relative importance for the present and for the future. Nevertheless, the assessment of historical past allows finding of adequate solutions in the new historical era.

History's knowledge is extremely important for Moldova - a country with tragic history and unpredictable future.

¹ Legea privind Declarația de Independență a Republicii Moldova, *Legi, hotărâri și alte acte, adoptate la Sesiunea a șasea a Parlamentului Republicii Moldova de legislatura a douăsprezecea*, Volumul 2, (Chișinău, Universitas, 1991), p. 14.

² Moldova Suverană, nr.31, (17901), 29 februarie 1992.

³ Ibidem, nr.33 (17903), 5 martie 1992.

II.2. Geopolitical Background

Moldova is placed on the way of all evils
Ion Neculce (1672-1745)
Moldovan Chronicler

”Basarabia - a geopolitical tramp?” – it is the question of the young Moldovan expert in geopolitics, Oleg Serebrian, who has entitled one of his essays in this manner.¹ “A post-Communist Nation loses its way” – it is the answer of the International Herald Tribune’s correspondent, Justin Keay, who has non less eccentrically entitled one of his articles on the Republic of Moldova.² Though, the first material regards some aspects of the current Moldovan foreign policy and the second one – pre-eminently the economic and financial problems of the Republic of Moldova, however, their titles are very suggestive.

During centuries, Moldova’s territory has been in a distinct geographic situation in Europe. Thus, in the antiquity, it represented the eastern part of the Dacian State, the northern extremity of the Hellenic colonisation and the northeastern space of the Roman domination. In the Middle Age, Moldova constituted the eastern out-post of Christianity and the northern extremity of the Ottoman expansion. In the 19th century, almost half of Moldova (Bessarabia) became a southeastern province (gubernia) of the Russian Empire. Between the two world wars of the 20th century, Bessarabia represented the first defensive line against the Communist expansion and, after the 1940 annexation, became a southeastern republic of the Soviet Union. Finally, in the post-Cold War era, Moldova faces again its perennial geopolitical question “Qwo vadis?”.

Usually, the Republic of Moldova is referred to the southeastern Europe or Balkan Peninsula. Perhaps, this conclusion was favoured by facts of historical connotation, i.e. the long Ottoman domination as well as the Balkan Russian-Turkish wars, in which the Bessarabian territory served as a bridgehead for the Russian army. In this respect, it should be remarked that it is not taken into account that Moldova is geographically located on the territory of Northwest Black Sea and the East Carpathians and the Danube River strictly separate it from the Balkan Peninsula.

In fact, the Republic of Moldova is a Central European country situated at the crossroads of Central Europe, Balkan Peninsula and the CIS area.³ Moldova’s

¹ See Serebrian, Oleg, “Basarabia – o vagaboandă geopolitică ?,” *Jurnal de Chişinău*, No 17, 2000;

² Keay, Justin, “A Post-Communist Nation Loses Its Way,” *International Herald Tribune*, June 2000.

³ To L. M. Lysiakova the Republic of Moldova is located at crossroads of Balkans, Central Europe and Black Sea region and binds them with the CIS countries. See Lysiakova, L. M., “Economica Respubliki Moldova: Mejdu Rossiei i Evropoi,” *Novaia Rossia: Rossia i strany bližnego zarubežia, Sbornic statiei No 7*, (Moscv, 1998), p. 43.

territory, bordered by Romania in the West and Ukraine in the East, is located in the southeastern part of Central Europe, in the latitude of 48 30 North and the longitude of 30 10 East. The country's surface is 33,700 square kilometres, its dimensions being 350 kilometres from North to South and 150 kilometres from West to East. The southern locality Giurgiulești is the only republic's place bordering Danube.¹

The main geographical factors, which have determined Moldova's geopolitical fate during centuries, are the Carpathian Mountains, the Danube River and the Black Sea. Their combination in the South Moldova (historical or present-day Romanian) creates a unique geostrategic place - the Focshani Gate. The land place comprised between the East Carpathians and the Lower Danube's bend, having a breadth of 90 kilometres, constitutes a natural corridor that binds the southern steppes of the East Europe with the Balcan Peninsula. During centuries the Focshani Gate attracted as a magnet the nomadic populations on their way from Asia and Eastern Europe towards Balkans. Avoiding Eastern Carpathians and Black Sea, the barbarian tribes pointed this natural gate to invade the territories of the Roman Empire. Later, the Slavic colonisation of the Balkan Peninsula proceeded after the Slavs had passed through the Focshani Gate. Since the 18th century this corridor determined the direction of the Russian expansion towards Balkans and Constantinople.

After the 1877 proclamation of the independence of Romania, fortifications were built, aiming to transform the Focshani Gate into an element of the Romanian defensive system. To close this geostrategic corridor, the famous "Focșani-Nămoloasa-Galatsi fortification line" was built at the end of the 19th century.² After that, the English newspaper "Times" named Romania a formidable barrier in the way of the Russian eastern aspirations.³

According to the Soviet strategic plans the Focshani Gate was the most convenient passing through the South-Western Theatre of Military Operations' second alignment, including both Western and Eastern Carpathians, the rivers Tisza, Olt, Siret, Prut and the Lower Danube.⁴ The Soviet military strategists considered the Focshani Gate as the basic element of the Balcan Strategic Direction towards Balkans, Greece, Turkey, Cyprus, and both Aegean and Ionic seas.⁵

The Black Sea and the Lower Danube create another geostrategic element, which influenced considerably Moldova's history. Underlining the essential

¹ Republica Moldova / Respublica Moldova / The Republic of Moldova / La République de Moldavie, (Chișinău: Universitas, 1991), p.44.

² Ionescu, Mihail E., "The Development Process and the Search for Security: Past and Present in Romania's Case," *Central European Issues – Romanian Foreign Affairs Review*, Volume 1, Number 1, Bucharest, Autumn 1995, p.90.

³ See Prodan, Costică, "Aspecte privind alianțele politico-militare românești (1878-1814), II," *Institutul pentru Studii Politice de Apărare și Istorie Militară, Anuar: Studii de politică de apărare și istorie militară*, (București: Editura "Pro Transilvania", 1997), p.205.

⁴ Yugo-Zapadnyi Teatr Voennyh Deistvii: Obschii Obzor, (Moscv: Voennoe Izdatelstvo Ministerstva Oborony SSSR, 1981), pp.64-65.

⁵ Ibidem, p. 592.

importance of the Black Sea for the Moldovan State, the historian Ion Nistor wrote “Countries point sea like plants light”.¹ Since the 14th century, Cetatea Albă (White Fortress) at the Nistru’s mouth, and Chilia on the Danube constituted the main fortress-harbours of the Moldovan Principality. The Moldovan Ruler Ștefan cel Mare wrote that these two places mean whole Moldova and these two fortresses constitute a defensive wall for Hungarian and Polish countries.² Indeed, the Moldovan fortresses on the Danube River and the Black Sea side constituted a significant barrier on the way of the Ottoman expansion towards Central Europe. By the end of the 15th century, the Turkish Sultan Bayasid stressed the strategic importance of the concerning fortress, underlining that Chilia and Cetatea Albă are the key and the gate for Moldova, Walachia, Poland, Tartaria, as well as the Black Sea.³ Evidently, these fortresses have attracted not only the Ottoman Empire’s interest.

The strategic way from the northern Black Sea side steppes towards Balkans (Focshani Gate) and the other one from Middle Asia towards Central Europe (Lower Danube and the Black Sea’s northwestern side) transformed Moldova’s geographical location into crossroads of the foreign powers’ interests. As early as in 1412, Hungary and Poland concluded a secret agreement to divide Moldova and to distribute its eastern fortress-harbours between them, which remained unrealised.⁴ Since the conquest of Constantinople in 1453, when the Ottoman power moved towards Central Europe, the main external threat to Moldova’s security was coming from the East. In 1484, the Ottoman Empire conquered the Chilia and Cetatea-Albă fortresses and transformed them with the nearby lands into Turkish “raya”.⁵ During the 16th - 17th centuries, Moldova’s territory constituted a cause for permanent dispute between the Sublime Porte and Poland. There were cases that they acted together against Moldovans, like in 1538,⁶ when Moldova was really transformed into Turkey’s vassal state.

In the 18th century, the Polish-Ottoman antagonist axis was replaced by the Russian-Austrian-Turkish geopolitical triangle. The unfortunate location of the Moldovan State in the centre of this aggressive triangle, or in other words - at the crossroads of the great imperial powers of Russia, Austria and Turkey, involved in a struggle for supremacy in the southeastern Europe, caused essential infringements on its territorial integrity.

At the crossroads of the 18th and 19th centuries a new factor arose for Moldova’s geopolitical situation - France’s implication in the settlement of the

¹ Nistor, Ion, *Istoria Basarabiei*, (Chișinău: Cartea Moldovenească, 1991), p. 35.

² Nistor, Ion, *Quoted work*, p. 63.

³ *Ibidem*, p. 66.

⁴ *Ibidem*, pp. 40-41.

⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 66.

Raya mean a territory forming the hinterland of a fortress occupied by the Ottoman Empire.

⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 75.

Eastern issue.¹ The intention of Russia to counteract the growing French influence in southeastern Europe determined the outbreak of a new Russian-Turkish war in 1806 and the subsequent occupation of the Danubian principalities.² In 1807 France and Russia divided Europe into spheres of influences by the Tilsit Treaty, which stipulated the evacuation of Principalities' territory by both Russian and Ottoman armies. But the unsuccessful Napoleon's campaign in Spain and the peril of a new war with Austria determined the conclusion of the French-Russian 1808 Erfurt Treaty, by which France recognised Russia's right to annex Moldova and Walachia. The division of Europe into spheres of influence by French and Russian empires favoured the forceful territorial disintegration of the Moldovan State in 1812.³ Though Russia had had much more expansionist plans, it annexed only Bessarabia with Northeast Black Sea side and the Lower Danube and moved considerably this way towards Balkan Peninsula.

Since 1812, the Tsarist government saw Bessarabia as a bridgehead for its farther expansion towards Balkans.⁴

The Soviet leadership inherited the Tsarism's geopolitical interests in southeastern Europe and continued to see Bessarabia as a strategic bridgehead towards this area. Hence, it would not recognise Romania's sovereignty over Bessarabian province since 1918. After the conclusion of the 23 August 1939 bestial Pact dividing Europe in spheres of influence, the annexation of Bessarabia was repeated. The territorial dismemberment of Bessarabia in 1940 diminished essentially its strategic importance. In particular, by the amputation of the southern lands and their incorporation into Ukraine, the newly created MSSR has lost the access to the Black Sea and the Danube River. As some authors consider Moscow would in such a way preserve these important strategic places under the Soviet power even in case of an eventual territorial yielding in this zone.⁵ But with the 1991 unexpected historical events that have ironically determined the fall of the Soviet system itself, Moscow has lost much more territories, including Ukraine and consequently - the concerned lands, too.

In spite of the dramatic geopolitical changes of the last decade, Russia did not lose its strategic interest vis-à-vis the Balkans. On the contrary, with the NATO expansion towards Eastern Europe, Russia counteracts to re-establish its former influence in southeastern Europe. For the time being, Russia has only two support points – Serbia and Moldova - to preserve its active presence in the Balkan area.

Indeed, the Republic of Moldova remains even within its current borders a land where the Balkan Peninsula and the CIS area meet. Today, the overwhelming

¹ Dragnev, Demir și Varta, Ion, "Istoria Românilor. Epoca modernă (a doua jumătate a secolului al XVIII-lea - 1918)," Chișinău: Civitas, 2000, p.21.

Grosul, G. S., *Dunaiskie Kneajestva b politike Rossii, 1774 – 1806*, Chișinău: Știința, 1975, p.106.

² Dragnev, Demir și Varta, Ion, Quoted work, p. 21.

³ Ibidem, pp.22 – 24.

⁴ Berg, L. S., Quoted work, p. 45; Climov, Evgeniy, Quoted work, p.188.

⁵ See Șișcanu, Elena, *Basarabia sub regimul bolșevic. 1940-1952*. București, 1998, p. 52.

part of both rail and road transport from Russia and other CIS' countries towards their Balcan economic partners may be realised only via Moldova's territory. Taking into consideration the Moldovan territory' strategic importance in the framework of the perennial Russian bent towards the Balkans, it is not difficult to forecast the further intensification of Russia's efforts to enhance its presence in the Republic of Moldova. In this context also the real causes of the Transnistrian strife are clear.¹

In connection with the above-mentioned, the issue of the neutrality historical experience in this part of Europe arises. The analysis of historical data shows that neutrality played a major role in Romania's history. As early as at the end of the 18th century, Russia proposed to Austria to unite Walachia and Moldova and create an independent state under the ancient name Dacia, which would have been located between and never be annexed by Russia, Austria and Turkey. According to this plan the new state would serve as some kind of buffer zone or neutral area at the crossroads of these three empires.² It is known, the concerned plan remained unrealised because of the international relations at the crossroads of the 18th-19th centuries. After the 1856 Paris Congress and the union of the Romanian principalities in 1859, the new Romanian State sought a neutral course. At least, since 1875, neutrality became the official policy of the Romanian Government. At that time, the idea to transform Romania into "Eastern Belgium* arose."³ Except the 1877-1878 War period, Romania promoted the neutrality policy until 1883, when it adhered to the Alliance of the Central Powers.⁴ Nevertheless, on the eve of the World War I, Romania proclaimed its neutrality, but abandoned it on August 14/17, 1916, when entered into war on the part of the Triple Alliance.⁵ On September 6, 1939, Romania proclaimed its neutrality again⁶ and attempted even to create a Balkan bloc of neutral states,⁷ but as the remarkable diplomat Nicolae

¹ Some annalists have stressed the interdependence between Balkan direction of Russian foreign policy and the Transnistrian dispute. For instance see Chinn, Jef, "Republica Moldova. O privire de peste ocean," *Arena politicii*, Anul I, iulie 1996, p.30.

² For more information see Cliucevskii, V.O., *Socineniya v deveati tomah.Curs Russcoi istorii. Ciasti V, Moscva: Mysli*, 1989, p.45.

Semenova, I. V., *Rossia i osvoboditelnaia boriba moldavscogo naroda protiv ottomanscogo iga v contse XVIII v.*, (Chişinău: Ştiinţa, 1976), p.148.

Grosul, G. S., Quoted work, pp.70, 93, 106.

* The Great Powers proclaimed the permanent neutrality of Belgium in 1831.

³ For more information see Zalyshkin, M. M., *Vneshneia politika Rumynii i rumyno-russkie otnoshenia 1875-1878*, (Moscva: Izdatelistvo "Nauca", 1974).

⁴ Prodan, Costică, Aspecte privind alianţele politico-militare româneşti (1878-1814), I, *Institutul de Studii Operativ-strategice şi Istorie Militară, Anuar 1996: Studii de politică de apărare, teorie, doctrină, artă şi istorie militară*, (Bucureşti: Editura "Vasile Cârlova", 1996), pp. 87-88.

⁵ România în anii primului război mondial, Volumul I, Bucureşti: Editura militară, 1987, p.78-82, 149, 258.

⁶ România în anii celui de-al doilea război mondial, Volumul I, Bucureşti: Editura militară, 1989, p.242.

Otu, Petre, Planurile de operaţii ale Armatei Române în perioada 1 septembrie 1939 – 26 iunie 1940, *Gândirea Militară Românească*, 4/1996, p.106-107.

⁷ Muşat, Mircea şi Ardeleanu, Ion, România după Marea Unire, Vol. II, Partea a II-a, noiembrie 1933-septembrie 1940, Bucureşti: Editura ştiinţifică şi enciclopedică, 1988, p.1521.

Titulescu foresaw as early as in 1937¹, Romania's neutrality was impossible because of its geographic location and the then international situation. Indeed, the Soviet-Nazi Pact's provisions and the neutrality in southeastern Europe proved to be incompatible. The Cold War's realities erased the neutrality idea in Eastern Europe for 50 years.

Since its independence, Moldova has had three security solutions: the integration in the CIS's military-political bloc, the membership of the North Atlantic Alliance and the neutrality status. In 1994, Moldova chose the neutrality idea. Anyhow, a reasonable alternative did not exist. It seems that the West has already adopted a decision concerning the eastern extremity of its institutions' enlargement as well as has a priory agreed Moldova's remaining out of the respective borders. However, it is strange the West has long refused to admit the Republic of Moldova into the Pact of Stability for Southeast Europe, which could allow the start of the process on it's association to EU. Unlike the Baltic States, the Republic of Moldova has never constituted any great interest for Western countries since 1940. Despite being geographically a Central European country, Moldova faces the peril to remain forever out of the common European economic, political and security space. Even such formal resolutions, like the June 1992 WEU Petersberg Declaration and the 1994 US State Department decision on the Central Europe's notion, let the Republic of Moldova out of this region. It is a grim fact that Moldova's geopolitical fate has been always realised with the accord of one or another Western Great Power.

As The Economist journal has indifferently remarked exactly two years ago, Moldova is a country "not so much forgotten as never remembered".

No, Moldova is not a geopolitical tramp, but an ostracised land.

¹ Titulescu, Nicolae, *Politica externă a României* (1937), (București: Editura enciclopedică), 1994, p.323.

III.3. National Identity

Passing from geopolitics to ethnology, it should be remarked that the present-day Moldova's territory has been for many centuries the land where western Latinity and eastern Slavic world met and this fact has had a determinant impact on Moldovans' national identity.

The 1859 union of Moldova and Walachia and the foundation of Romanian State were a result of the Romanian national awakening in the 19th century and have proved the national unity of the people of both principalities. This national unity was an evident fact for themselves as well as for neighbouring peoples, including the Russian one. Thus, the famous Russian historian V. Cliuchevskiy named the inhabitants of both Walachia and Moldova Romanians.¹ Also, nobody had any doubt concerning the nationality of Bessarabian autochthonous population. For instance, the Russian scholar (Bessarabian native), L. Berg stressed "Moldovans are Romanians, living in Moldova, Bessarabia and the neighbouring parts of Podolia and Herson gubernias".²

The Moldovans' national identity became a matter, after the Soviet leadership had contested the union of Bessarabia with Romania. There was worked out a so-called theory on two distinct languages and nations. Soviet propagandists and scholars have always asserted that the Moldovans formed a separate, non-Romanian nation.³ The main product of this theory is the Artiom Lazarev's quoted monograph "Moldovan Soviet Statehood and the Bessarabian Question," issued on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the Moldovan SSR in 1974, when the Soviet-Romanian relations on Bessarabia and North Bucovina had deteriorated considerably. To impartial linguists, the theory of two distinct languages has served to counteract both the nationalism within the Republic of Moldova and the irredentism within Romania.⁴ In this respect it should be noted the German philosopher Fichte (1762-1814) declared: "Wherever a separate language is found, there is also a separate nation which has the right to manage its affairs... and to rule itself."⁵

In the late 80s, there was ardent public debate, followed by massive demonstrations, on the language and national identity. As a result, on 31 August 1989, the MSSR Supreme Soviet declared Moldovan as state language and

¹ Cliucevskiy, V.O., Quoted work, Ciasti V, p.45.

² Berg, L. S., Quoted work, p. 79.

³ For more information see Grosul, V.Ia., Zelenciuc, V.S., Kozlov, V.I., Lazarev, A.M., Mohov H.A., Formirovanie moldavscoi burjuaznoi natsii, (Chişinău, Ştiinţa, 1978).

Grecul, A., Rastevet moldavscoi sotsialistichescoi natsii, (Chişinău, Cartea Moldovenească, 1974).

⁴ See Heitmann, Klaus, Limbă şi politică în Republica Moldova, (Chişinău: Editura ARC, 1998), p.72.

⁵ Quoted in – Waters, Trevor, Language and National Identity: A Source of Conflict in Post-Communist Europe, G64, CSRC, June 1998.

decided its transition to the Latin alphabet, recognising the Moldovan-Romanian linguistic unity. Concerning the State language of the Republic of Moldova the 1991 Declaration on Independence used the term Romanian.¹ Later, Article 13 of the new 1994 constitution stated that “The state language of the Republic of Moldova is the Moldovan language and functions on the basis of the Latin alphabet.”² Today, the Moldovan-Romanian linguistic unity is recognised even by most proponents of the “Moldovanism”, who insist, however, to maintain the term “Moldovan” referring to the Republic of Moldova’s area.³ . The high role of the national identity issue within the recent history of the Republic of Moldova determined some annalists to write that the Moldovan national liberation movement “was not for the national sovereignty, but for national identity”.⁴

In spite of the national liberation movement’s achievements, there is a national identity crisis in the Republic of Moldova. Perhaps this is the central problem of the new Moldovan State. The very notion of a distinct Moldovan political and cultural identity – cultivated in the communist period to buttress Soviet territorial acquisitions in 1940 – has remained a divisive issue among political groupings inside Moldova, as well as between Moldova and its former Romanian motherland.⁵ In this respect, the Moldovan society is divided into two political-cultural groupings, labelled by the well connoisseur of the Moldovan realities, researcher Charles King, “pan-Romanianists” and “Moldovanists”.⁶ To the first grouping, Moldovans are Romanians and the logical end of the national liberation movement of the late 1980s should be not the creation of an independent Moldovan State in August 1991, but the reunion with the Romanian motherland. The latter one pleaded for distinct Moldovan language, nation and state.

The dispute has not remained unnoticed by western mass media. In June 1999, *The Economist* journal mentioned somehow ironically that “With a language and culture similar to those of their big brothers from Romania, Moldovans seem half-hearted patriots – though few yearn for their country to be knitted back into Romania itself. Even the dapper Mr Lucinschi (the then President of the Republic of Moldova) is hard put to say what it means to be

¹ Legea privind Declarația de Independență a Republicii Moldova, *Legi, hotărâri și alte acte, adoptate la Sesiunea a șasea a Parlamentului Republicii Moldova de legislatura a douăsprezecea*, Volumul 2, (Chișinău, Universitas, 1991), p. 14.

² Constituția Republicii Moldova, adoptată la 29 iulie 1994, (Chișinău: Direcția de Stat pentru Asigurarea Informațională Moldpress, 1994).

³ See Moldovan, Petre P., *Moldovenii în istorie*, (Chișinău: Poligraf-Service, 1993), p.145.

There was remarked that the author signed his work by a pseudonym.

⁴ Serebrian, Oleg, *Politosfera*, p.141-142.

⁵ King, Charles, *Post – Soviet Moldova: A Borderland in Transition / Moldova post – sovietică: un ținut de hotar în tranziție*, p. 17.

⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 24.

Moldovan.”¹ After one year, the same journal mentioned once more Moldova’s “weak national identity”.²

Moldovans are historically, ethnically, linguistically and culturally Romanians, without doubt. At the same time, their national consciousness is, somehow, different from that of their western brothers. Unfortunately, it is not a simple result of the named two nations’ theory, but a logical consequence of their long-term separated historical development. Apart from 1918-1940 period, Bessarabians/Moldovans were absent during the crucial period of Romanian national awakening and development during the 19th-20th centuries: the rebellion against Ottomans in 1821, the standardisation of the Romanian language and the adoption of the Latin alphabet, the creation of a unified Romanian state in 1859, the creation of a Romanian dynastic house in 1866 and 1881, the achievement of independence from the Porte in 1877-1878, the defence of Romania’s territory in the World War II etc.³

The long political and cultural isolation could not pass without consequences for Moldovans’ national consciousness.

In the 19th century, Bessarabia knew very little of the main process on the establishment of the Romanian national theatre, press and literature.⁴ The Tsarist regime prohibited the creation of the typographies of Latin script, the publication of the Romanian textbooks and newspapers in Bessarabia.⁵ The use of Moldovan/Romanian was purged from the province’s school after mid-century, and Romanian books from west of the Prut were prohibited. In 1899, no Romanian book was in the Chisinau public library.⁶ At that time, even the performance of Romanian songs could serve as motive for the expelling from Bessarabia.⁷ A study entitled “The military-geographical description of the Odessa Military District,” worked out within the General Staff of the Russian Army at the beginning of the 20th century, stressed the necessity of “counteracting the Romanian influence in Bessarabia by a systematic Russification policy of Moldovans.”⁸

The situation has not changed much during Soviet period. In 1990, only 10 per cent of books in the public libraries of the Republic of Moldova were in Romanian.⁹ The situation was and continues to be even worse in the

¹ The Economist, June 1999.

² Ibidem, July 2000.

³ See King, Charles, *The Moldovans. Romania, Russia, and the politics of Culture*, p. 49. Serebrian, Oleg, *Va exploda Estul? Geopolitica spațiului pontic*, 118.

⁴ Negru, Gheorghe, *Quoted work*, p.11.

⁵ Ibidem, p.14 -15.

⁶ Nistor, Ion, *Quoted work*, p.257.

⁷ Ciobanu, Ștefan, *Cultura românească în Basarabia sub stăpânirea rusă*, p. 145-46.

⁸ See *Voenno-geograficescoe i statisticescoe opisanie Odessogo voennogo ocruga. Sostavleno ofitserami generalinogo staba Parmskim, Vosresenskim, ceremisovzm, Vyp. I, Odessa, 1905, p.283-284.* - Quoted in Negru, Gheorghe, *Țarismul și mișcarea națională a românilor din Basarabia*, Chișinău: Prut Internațional, 2000, p.45.

⁹ Chilworth, Lord Lucas of, “Les minorites nqtionqles en Europe Centrale et Orientale,” *Assemblée de l’Atlantique Nord, Commission de Affaires Civiles, Rapports 1992*, Bruxelles: Novembre 1992, p.8.

Transnistrian region. In the late 30s, almost all RASSM Romanian speaking writers were eradicated. Today, the persecution of both Latin alphabet and Moldovan/ Romanian language continues there. In particular the use of the Latin Script in Transnistrian schools is officially forbidden by the Tiraspol authorities.¹

Of course, the denationalisation policy that both Tsarist and Soviet regimes have promoted in Bessarabia/Moldova did not attain its main aim: a new nation was not built. The Moldovan national liberation movement at both beginning and end of the 20th century has proved that Moldovans survived the atrocities of the foreign domination. They have preserved their basic national values and have never forgotten their Latin origin and language, forefathers' history and national customs.

But it is hopeless to assert that the long-term forceful policy, accompanied by the strong political and cultural border along the River Prut, have not had any impact on the Moldovans' national consciousness. Otherwise it is difficult to explain the national identity crisis that Moldovans have been facing in their current history.

Perhaps, the Huntington's theory on the clash of civilisations is true. If it is, the case of the Moldovans' national identity seems to be an argument in its favour.

Moldova's present territory has been the eastern extremity of Latinity for many centuries and there is a miracle it still is.

¹ OSCE Mission to Moldova, 1995-1996 Mission Reports, Special Report on 9 October 1996 – Moldovan "Schools in Transnistria"

CHAPTER IV MOLDOVAN NEUTRALITY EXPERIMENT

1. Reasons for Moldovan Neutrality

In 1990, the Republic of Moldova had a population of 4,366,300 inhabitants.¹ According to the 1989 census, the majority Moldovan/Romanian-speaking population constituted 64.5 percent of the total, followed by the representatives of other nationalities: Ukrainians (13.8 percent), Russians (13.0 percent), Gagauz Turks (3.5 percent), Bulgarians (2.0 percent), Jews (1.5), and other smaller minorities.²

The dilemma “West or East” has constituted the central security issue within the post-Soviet Moldova. The country had faced the dispute between differently oriented cultural-political movements as early as in 1989-1990. Even the Moldova’s independence gained in 1991 was the result of a painful compromise on behalf of both pro-Romanian and pro-Russian forces.³ The pan-Romanianists - Moldovanists divide within Moldovans was accompanied by the centrifugal tendencies of the national minorities, for which an eventual union of Moldova with Romania means peril for their statute because of virtual diminishing of their both proportion and position within a Romanian united nation.⁴

On one side, the right wing political forces campaign for Moldova’s rapprochement and even reunification with Romania and support its integration into Western structures, including the Atlantic Alliance.⁵ The Christian-Democratic Popular Front (CDPF later has renamed itself in Christian-Democratic Popular Party (CDPP) was the most ardent supporter of this political goal. In February 1992, the Popular Front included an overt commitment to Moldovan-Romanian union in its statutes: “The Christian Democratic Popular Front maintains its status as a national, unionist movement, whose major objective is the reintegration of the Unitary Romanian State.”⁶ The

¹ Republica Moldova / Respublica Moldova / The Republic of Moldova / La République de Moldavie, (Chişinău: Universitas, 1991), p. 45.

² Ibidem

* The region East of the Dnestr River is referred to by its Romanian name, Transnistria. Latin-Slavic hybrids such as Trans-Dniester and Transdnietria have become common in English, but Transnistria is both more accurate and more easily pronounceable. - See King, Charles. *The Moldovans. Romania, Russia, and the politics of Culture*, p. 19-20.

³ Nedelciuc, Vasile, “O neutralitate incertă: impactul ei asupra securităţii Republicii Moldova,” *Arena Politicii*, Anul II, nr.2 (14), Octombrie 1997, p. 8

⁴ Chinn, Jeff, “Patriile naţionale externe şi politica externă a Republicii Moldova,” *Politica Externă a Republicii Moldova: aspecte ale securităţii şi colaborării regionale* (Materiale ale Simpoziului ştiinţific internaţional, Chişinău, 16-17 octombrie 1997), Chişinău, 1998, 23 –28.

⁵ For more information see Shilova, R. A., “Politicheskie partii Respubliki Moldova,” *Novaia Rossia: Rossia i strany bližnego zarubejia, Sbornic statiei No 7*, (Moscvă, 1998), p.49-79.

⁶ Programul Frontului Popular Creştin Democrat, (Chişinău, FPCD, 1992), p.8.

former Prime minister and leader of the CDPF, Mircea Druc stated on December 1, 1991: “Reunion! Another solution does not exist!”¹ Yet the current CDPP leader, Iurie Roșca explained in 1993 that “Frontist, Unionist and Romanian have become synonyms.”² The CDPP has also stated that the integration of the Republic of Moldova into the North Atlantic Alliance remains its irrevocable strategic aim.³

On the other side, the pro-Soviet/Russian political forces rejected the Moldovan sovereignty and independence and voiced for preservation of the Soviet Union. They pleaded against the reunion of the Republic of Moldova with Romania and its integration into Euro-Atlantic institutions. The separatist leaders welcomed the August 1991 putsch and declared that “the measures taken by putschistes are justified and necessary.”⁴

The arising of the separatism issue has constituted the most dangerous consequence of the East-West political confrontation within the Republic of Moldova. Transnistrian territorial separatism, although normally portrayed by outside observers as the result of ethnic discord between Moldovans and Russians or Russian speaking population,⁵ has been more difficult in its origin. The USA senator Gerald B. Solomon has stressed that, despite its ethnic connotations, the conflict in the Transnistrian region is primarily “a political and ideological one between a breakaway minority of unreformed communists in Tiraspol, whose mind is set on reconstituting the Soviet Empire, and the Government in Chisinau which is making sincere efforts to steer its country towards democracy, a market economy and ethnic harmony”.⁶ Other authors take into consideration also the geographic importance, which Russia assigns to this border zone, concluding that the conflict is a ethno – geo-political one, which has involved Russia, Romania, Ukraine and the new state Moldova.⁷

Transnistria* was one of the most highly sovietised territories within the Soviet Union. Most local Transnistrians were employed directly in the defense system of the former Soviet Union. By 1990, the number of military, KGB and internal bodies’ pensioners for 1,000 inhabitants constitutes 4.4 persons in the Republic of Moldova, but - 23.0 in Tiraspol.⁸ There is no question that Moscow leadership played a key role in encouraging the Transnistrian separatist movement in 1991 and 1992. For instance, in May 1992, the then vice-president Alexandr Rutskoi described the PMR as “a small part of Russia” and

¹ See Patrichi, Viorel, *Mircea Druc sau lupta cu ultimul imperiu*, București: Zamolxe, 1998, p.464.

² See “Țara”, 27 iulie, 1993 – Quoted in Roșca, Iurie, *Exerciții de luciditate*. Chișinău: Civitas, 2000, p.13.

³ Creștinism și democrație. Raport prezentat la Congresul VI al PPCD, “Țara”, 14 decembrie, 1999 - Quoted in Roșca, Iurie. *Exerciții de luciditate*. Chișinău: Civitas, 2000, p.193.

⁴ Cojocaru, Gheorghe E., *Separatismul în slujba Imperiului*. Chișinău: Civitas, 2000, p.134.

⁵ For instance, see Lamont, Neil V., “Territorial dimensions of ethnic conflict: The Moldovan case,” *Foreign Military Studies Office*, 604 Lowe Drive, Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027-2322, or a version of this article entitled “Ethnic Conflict in the Transdnierster” and appeared in *Military Review*, December-February 1995.

⁶ Solomon, Gerald B., “Peacekeeping in the Transdnierster Region: a test case for the CSCE,” *North Atlantic Assembly, Report of the Political Committee*, AL 228, PC (94) 6, November 1994, p.4.

⁷ Dima, Nicholas, Quoted work, p.190.

⁸ See Nedelciuc, Vasile, *The Republic of Moldova*, Chișinău, July 1992, p. 79.

condemned Moldovans for attempting to “wipe their feet on Russia and on its citizens.” Smirnov and other PMR officials have consistently been supported by the most unreconstructed figures on the Russian political scene, like the ultranationalist Vladimir Zhirinovskiy and other members of the “red brown” alliance.¹

In September-December 1991, Transnistrian insurgents formed paramilitary forces, which used violence to take control over the territorial constitutional structures.² In March 1992, an armed conflict broke out between Moldovan constitutional forces and separatist paramilitary units, supported by the former Soviet 14th Army.³ It should be noted the Western support to cease the armed conflict. Thus, on June 22, 1992 the USA Administration, accepting Yeltsin’s anxiety concerning the fate of ethnic Russians, called the Russian leader to respect his previous commitment on the withdrawal of the 14th Army from the Republic of Moldova.⁴ Also the Pressler’s Amendment, approved by the US Senate on July 1, 1992 noted the negative impact of the 14 Army on the sovereignty of the Republic of Moldova.⁵ On July 21, 1992, a Moldovan-Russian Agreement was concluded and after that the armed conflict in the Transnistrian region ceased.⁶

The proclamation of the permanent neutrality status of the Republic of Moldova in 1994 has had its main goal the neutralisation of the pro-Russian/Eastern and pro-Romanian/Western centrifugal forces, their reconciliation on the basis of Moldova’s independence and neutrality and the maintenance of the country’s internal stability.

The outbreak of the 1992 Transnistrian armed conflict was undoubtedly favoured by the presence of the Soviet troops in this region. The former Soviet 14th Army had been created for possible action in the Balkan Peninsula in 1945, under the command of the South-Western Theatre of Military Operations.⁷ On

¹ King, Charles, “Eurasia letter: Moldova with a Russian face,” *Foreign Policy*, Washington, Winter 1994, Issue 97.

<http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?TS=989219891&Did=000000008734214&Mtd=2&Fmt=3&ScQ=000023173>

² Cojocaru, Gheorghe E., *Separatismul*, pp. 162-164.

See also Pântea, Iurie, *Aspectul militar în soluționarea conflictului din zona de Est a Republicii Moldova*, (Draft) Chișinău, 2001.

³ For more information see Bârsan, Victor, “Masacrul inocenților: Războiul din Moldova, 1 martie – 29 iulie 1992,” *București: Editura fundației culturale române*, 1993;

Bowers, Stephen, “The crisis in Moldova,” *Jane’s Intelligence Review*, November 1992.

The Moldovan/Trans-Dniester Conflict, Russia and the Commonwealth of Independent States: documents, data, and analysis / edited by Zbigniew Brzezinski and Paige Sullivan, (New York: Center for Strategic and International Studies, 1997), p. 624-629.

⁴ *Moldova Suverană*, No 88 (17958), 25 iunie 1992.

⁵ *Moldova Suverană*, No 92(17962), 4 iulie 1992.

⁶ See Soglashenie o printsipah mirnogo uregulirovaniya voorugennogo conflicta v Pridnestrovskom regione Respubliki Moldova, *Diplomaticheskii Vestnik*, No 15-16, 15-31 avgusta 1992 g., MID Rossiiskoi Federatsii, 1992.

⁷ For more information see Gribincea, Mihai, “Challenging Moscow’s Doctrine On Military Bases”, *Transition*, Vol. 1, No. 19, 20 October 1995;

Gribincea, Mihai. *Trupele Ruse în Republica Moldova: factor stabilizator sau sursă de pericol ?*, (Chișinău: Civitas, 1998); Gribincea, Mihai. *Politica rusă a bazelor militare în Moldova și Georgia*, (Chișinău: Civitas, 1999).

April 1, 1992, the Russian President Yeltsin decreed the Russian jurisdiction over the 14th Army, later, on July 1, 1995 – its reorganisation into the so-called Operational Group of Russian Forces (OGRF).¹ According to the official information on Armed Forces of Russian Federation, in 1995, the OGRF was armed with 120 main battle tanks, 166 armoured combat vehicles, 129 artillery systems, 9 combat support helicopters.² Moreover, it possesses a major depot located in the town of Kolbasna that contains a huge stockpile of approximately 40,000 tonnes of all kinds of ammunition varying from small arms rounds to aircraft bombs.³

In 1989-1991, the former 14th Army played a key political and military role in the insurgency movement. It openly supported the secessionist movement and participated in equipping and instructing its illegal paramilitary structures. There were many cases of illegal handing of armament and ammunition (120-mm calibre mortar projectiles, including 122-mm and 100-mm calibre artillery projectiles, as well as different ammunition for light weapons) to the separatist military units. During the military conflict in 1992, some military units of the 14th Army have been directly involved in military operations.⁴ Since 1992, the Russian 14th Army under General Lebed has played a leading role in supporting the independence of the ‘Dniestr Republic’.⁵

The vital necessity of the withdrawal of foreign military troops from Moldovan sovereign territory constituted an essential reason for the proclamation of the permanent neutrality status of the Republic of Moldova.

In connection with the paragraph on the geostrategic significance of Moldova’s territory, it should be additionally remarked that there were also geopolitical reasons for Moldovan neutrality. According to the Soviet strategic plans the territory of Moldova would have been mobilised to provide support for a strategic offensive operation on the Balkan direction of the South-Western Theatre of Military Operations. It should be noted the headquarters for this strategic direction was located in Chişinău. Though, since the end of the Cold War and the demise of the Soviet Union, this strategic significance was lost, however, Moldova remains a strategic area because it controls the access to the Balkan region. In this respect General Alexandr Lebed has described the Dniestr (Nistru) area as “the key to the Balkans”, remarking that “if Russia withdraws

¹ Gribincea, Mihai. *Politica rusă a bazelor militare în Moldova și Georgia*, p.14.

² Information on Conventional Forces of Russian Federation, valid as of January 1, 1995 according to CFE Treaty.

³ Gerald B. Solomon, *Peacekeeping in the Transdnister Region: a test case for the CSCE*, North Atlantic Assembly, Report of the Political Committee, AL 228, PC (94) 6, November 1994, p.5; *Sambuliskii Sammit i sudiba Rossiiskoi voennoi gruppirovki v Pridnestrovie*, *Sbornic informatsionno-analiticheskikh materialov*, No.2 (6), December 1999, Kyiv, p. 9.

⁴ For more information see Gribincea, Mihai, *Trupele Ruse în Republica Moldova*, pp. 24 -35.

⁵ Lepingwell, John W. R., “The Russian Military and Security Policy in the ‘Near Abroad’,” *Survival*, The IISS Quarterly, Autumn 1994, Volume 36/No 3, pp. 80-81.

from this little piece of land, it will lose that key and its influence in the region”.¹

The geopolitical significance of the Moldovan neutrality became evident after the North Atlantic Alliance’s decisions on its enlargement towards Eastern Europe. For Romania and Bulgaria, who seek NATO membership, Moldova’s genuine neutrality status, followed by the withdrawal of the foreign troops from its sovereign territory, is surely more acceptable than its integration into the CIS military structures.² Taking into account an eventual use of the 14th Army/OGRF, western oriented Ukraine has also supported the Moldovan neutrality.³ In addition, the “defensive” neutrality of the Republic of Moldova is more convenient than its eastern security alternative for such countries as Hungary, Greece and Turkey, too.⁴

Therefore, the proclamation of the permanent neutrality status of the Republic of Moldova in 1994 was motivated by both internal and external reasons. In addition to finding an acceptable solution for reconciliation of the pro-Eastern and pro-Western opposing domestic forces and the maintenance of the country’s stability, the Moldovan neutrality has also taken into consideration the external security realities.

The intention to proclaim Moldova’s neutrality was first expressed on December 28, 1991, when the meeting of the Moldovan President Mircea Snegur with the commanders of the Soviet military units stationed on the country’s territory took place. The first Moldovan president stated that “the National Army should be created through the prospect of assuming the status of a neutral state”.⁵

Taking into consideration this intention as well as the CIS basic documents’ provisions regarding the right of parties “to attain the status of a non-nuclear and (or) neutral status”⁶, it could be asserted the Republic of Moldova joined the CIS as a neutral state.

The main barrier on Moldova’s way to real neutrality and independence has been the stationing of foreign troops on its territory. On August 27, 1991, the Declaration on Independence of the Republic of Moldova requested “the USSR to begin negotiations with the government of the Republic of Moldova on

¹ Quoted in “Instabilities in Post-Communist Europe: Moldova,” paper presented by Trevor Waters at the Conflict Studies Research Center, Royal Military Academy at Sandhurst, January 1995 – see Gribincea, Mihai, “Challenging Moscow’s Doctrine on Military Bases,” *Transition*, Vol. 1, No. 19, 20 October 1995, p.6.

² Nedelciuc, Vasile, “O neutralitate incertă: impactul ei asupra securității Republicii Moldova,” *Arena Politicii*, Anul II, nr.2 (14), Octombrie 1997, p. 8

³ *Ibidem*

⁴ *Ibidem*

⁵ Cojocaru, Gheorghe E., *Politica externă a Republicii Moldova*, Studii, Ediția a doua revăzută și adăugită, pp. 75-76.

⁶ Soglashenie o sozdaniu Sodrujestva Nezavisimih Gosudarstv. (Podpisano 8 decabrea 1991 v Belovejscoi pușce, pravitelistvennaia rezidenția Visculi, Brestcaia oblasti, Belarusi); Alma-Atinscaia Declaratsia ot 21 decabrea 1991 goda, *SODRUJESTVO: Informaționni vestnic Soveta glav gosudarstv i pravitelistv SNG*, Vîpusc pervii, Minsk 1992, p.7, p.15. See also The Minsk (Belovezh Forest) Agreement on Creation of the Commonwealth, 8 December 1991 (FBIS Translation); The Alma-Ata Declaration 21 December 1991 (FBIS Translation), *Russia and the Commonwealth of Independent States: documents, data, and analysis*, pp. 43, 47.

ceasing the illegal state of its occupation and the withdrawal of Soviet troops from the national territory of the Republic of Moldova.¹ Also on September 10, 1991, the national Parliament stated the “withdrawal of the military forces of the URSS from the territory of the Republic of Moldova shall be total.”² The negative impact of these military troops on the national state building process was stressed on the occasion of Moldova’s adhering to the CSCE on February 26, 1992. When the Republic of Moldova was admitted into UNO on March 2, 1992, the Moldovan President remarked that by virtue of its geopolitical situation, “the Republic of Moldova is available to establish relations with all the countries, without adhering to any bloc or alliance.” At the same time, the Moldovan chief of state underlined the necessity of the foreign military troops’ withdrawal from the country’s territory.³

The national referendum on March 6, 1994 showed that the majority of the population of the Republic of Moldova was in favour of neutrality.⁴

Moldova’s will “to promote a neutrality policy” was officially expressed on March 16, 1994, when the country adhered to the NATO PfP Programme.

Finally, on July 29, 1994, the permanent neutrality status of the Republic of Moldova was proclaimed in the new constitution.

Despite the declared neutrality of the Republic of Moldova, since 1994 Russia has protracted the withdrawal of its troops from Moldova’s territory. In this context the September 1997 Moscow’s neutrality proposal to the three Baltic States should be remarked. So, after the Madrid official invitation to the three former Warsaw Pact members to join NATO, Russia accepts the Baltics’ eventual neutrality and does not do Moldova’s constitutionally proclaimed neutrality status. Is it a paradox of the Russian foreign policy, or something worse?

It seems the main battle of the next NATO enlargement wave will unfold on the southern flank.

¹ Declarația de Independență a Republicii Moldova, *Legi, Hotărîri și alte Acte, adoptate la Sesiunea a șasea a Parlamentului Republicii Moldova de legislatura a douăsprezecea*, Volumul 2, Ediție a Parlamentului Republicii Moldova, Chișinău, 1991, p.15.

² Declarația Parlamentului Republicii Moldova privind aspecte ale securității și dezarmării, nr. 708-XII din 10 septembrie 1991, in *Legi, Hotărîri și alte Acte, adoptate la Sesiunea a șasea a Parlamentului Republicii Moldova de legislatura a douăsprezecea*, Volumul 2, Ediție a Parlamentului Republicii Moldova, Chișinău, 1991, p.25.

³ Moldova Suverană, No 33 (17 903), 5 martie 1992.

⁴ Moșneaga, V., Dăniș, T., Țurcanu, V., “Obsestvennoe mnenie Respubliki Moldova o vnesnei politiki strany,” *Politica Externă a Republicii Moldova: aspecte ale securității și colaborării regionale (Materiale ale Simpoziului științific internațional, Chișinău, 16-17 octombrie 1997)*, Chișinău, 1998, p. 221.

IV.2. Legal Status of Moldovan Neutrality

In a Europe which, after decades of East-West confrontation, is increasingly characterised by a growing number of constitutional democracies, the status of neutrality is changing.

**Swiss Security Policy in Times of Change:
Report 90 on Switzerland's Security Policy**

The author of the first book on the system of international law, Hugo Grotius, calls the chapter of his book dealing with neutrality *De his qui in bello medii sunt* (Of Those Who in War are Between the Belligerents) and he says in his text that neutral nations are those who are outside the hostilities (*qui extra bellum sunt*).¹ According to Encyclopaedia Britannica neutrality is the legal status arising from the abstention of a state from all participation in a war between other states, the maintenance of an attitude of impartiality toward the belligerents, and the recognition by the belligerents of this abstention and impartiality.² A difference must be drawn between ordinary and permanent neutrality. Ordinary neutrality comprehends the legal status of a country that does not participate in a war, which is being waged between other countries. Permanent neutrality consists of a country pledging itself to remain permanently neutral.³

The neutral state's rights and duties are set down in the Hague "Convention Respecting Rights and Duties of Neutral Powers and Persons in Case of War on Land"⁴ and "Convention Concerning Rights and Duties of Neutral Powers in Naval War",⁵ as well as in international customary law. According to the Hague Conventions, which govern essentially the behaviour of neutral states in armed conflicts between states, a neutral Power is not allowed to participate in such international armed conflicts or to militarily support one of the belligerent parties. In particular, a neutral Power must not allow to move belligerents' troops or convoys of either munitions of war or supplies across its territory or to form or to recruit corps of combatants in war purposes.⁶ It should

¹ Quoted in - Verdross, Alfred, *The Permanent Neutrality of Austria*, p. 9.

² Quoted in - Swedish security in the 1990's: the implications for neutrality, <http://rubiin.physic.ut.ee/~toomasr/swedsecur.html>, p.1 of 5.

³ The neutrality Guide -Lines of the Swiss Ministry for Foreign Affairs, 26 November 1954, *Quoted in Verdross, Alfred, The Permanent Neutrality of Austria*, p.36.

⁴ Rights and Duties of Neutral Powers and Persons in Case of War on Land (Hague V); October 18, 1907, *The Avalon Project at the Yale Law School, Laws of War*, <http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/lawofwar/hague05.htm>

⁵ Rights and Duties of Neutral Powers in Naval War (Hague XIII); October 18, 1907, *The Avalon Project at the Yale Law School, Laws of War*, <http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/lawofwar/hague13.htm>

⁶ Rights and Duties of Neutral Powers and Persons in Case of War on Land, <http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/lawofwar/hague05.htm>, p. 2 of 7.

be remarked that according to Article 10 of the 1907 5th Hague Convention regarding ground war, the neutral state has both obligation and right to repel, even by force, the attempts against its neutrality.¹

On the other hand, the provisions of the international law on neutrality settle the legal obligations of foreign states to comply with the status of the neutral country. The most important of the rights that result from a state of neutrality is the right of territorial integrity. Thus, Article 1 of the 1907 5th Hague Convention stresses distinctly that “the territory of neutral Powers is inviolable”.² There is ban for foreign states to pass the troops, ammunitions or provisions through the territory of a neutral country in the time of war.³ Also Article 1 of the 1907 13th Hague Convention regarding naval war states: “Belligerents are bound to respect the sovereign rights of neutral Powers and to abstain, in neutral territory or neutral waters, from any act which would, if knowingly permitted by any Power, constitute a violation of neutrality”.⁴

Only for a permanent neutral country do rights and duties already arise in peacetime. Originally, the most significant restriction for a permanently neutral state was to renounce in advance war as a means for the pursuit of its political objectives.⁵ Since 1945, the UN Charter applied this prohibition on the use of force to all states”.⁶ Also it should be noted that on a strict reading the UN Charter, Neutrality and the United Nations are incompatible, but a more flexible interpretation allows that the Charter admits neutrality by implication.

The Neutrality Guide-Lines of the Swiss Ministry for Foreign Affairs, 26 November 1954, which has summarised the Swiss concept on the neutrality, defined the main duties of a neutral country in peacetime as follows:

- An obligation to begin no war;
- An obligation to defend its neutrality and/or independence;
- The so-called secondary duties or antecedent effects of permanent neutrality.⁷

According to the 1999 Report on the Security Policy of Switzerland the permanent neutral country’s two basic secondary duties prescribe that foreign

¹ Ibidem, p.3 of 7.

² Ibidem, p. 2 of 7.

³ Ibidem, Articles 2 - 4.

⁴ Rights and Duties of Neutral Powers in Naval War (Hague XIII); October 18, 1907, *The Avalon Project at the Yale Law School, Laws of War*, <http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/lawofwar/hague13.htm> , p. 2 of 9.

⁵ Security through Cooperation: Report of the Federal Council to the Federal Assembly on the Security Policy of Switzerland, p. 33.

⁶ The Article 2 of the Charter of the United Nations stipulates expressively:

- All members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice are not endangered.
- All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations.

⁷ The neutrality Guide -Lines of the Swiss Ministry for Foreign Affairs, 26 November 1954, *Verdross, Alfred, The Permanent Neutrality of Austria*, p.36.

military bases may not be established on neutral territory and that a neutral state may not join a military alliance.¹

These obligations are expressly stipulated in the 1955 Federal Constitutional Law on the Neutrality of Austria: “Austria will never in the future accede to any military alliances nor permit the establishment of military bases of foreign States on her territory”.² Defining the official Austrian Conception of neutrality, the then Austrian State Secretary for Foreign Affairs, Dr Bruno Kreisky, wrote for *Foreign Affairs* that a neutral country:

- cannot join a military alliance in time of peace because in so doing it would destroy its ability to remain neutral in time of war;
- must bar foreign military bases from its territory, since they would diminish its former freedom of action – or rather non-action – in time of war;
- must not accept any obligations – political, economic or other – which would tend to impair its neutrality in wartime.³

The permanent neutrality of Turkmenistan, recognised by the United Nations in 1995, constitutes the most recent experience on the rights and duties of a neutral state in peacetime. In this respect Turkmenistan’s Constitutional Law stipulates that a permanent neutral country:

- shall pursue a peaceful foreign policy;
- shall be involved in no military blocs, alliances or interstate associations either committed to abide by rigid obligations or tailored to have shared responsibility;
- pledges not to unleash a war or military conflict, be involved in any of these (except for exercising the right to self-defense), undertake any political, diplomatic or any other moves that might escalate into a war or armed conflict;
- shall not possess, produce or transfer nuclear, chemical, bacteriological or any other kinds of mass destruction weapons, or lease out its territory to accommodate foreign military bases.⁴

The legal status of the neutrality of the Republic of Moldova has been defined in the 1994 new Constitution. Article 11 of the Constitution stipulates that: “(1) The Republic of Moldova proclaims her permanent neutrality.

(2) The Republic of Moldova will not admit the stationing of any foreign military troops on its territory.”¹

¹ Security through Cooperation: Report of the Federal Council to the Federal Assembly on the Security Policy of Switzerland, p. 33.

² *Federal Constitutional Law of 26 October 1955 on the Neutrality of Austria*, Austrian Federal Constitutional Laws (selection), p. 174.

³ Bruno Kreisky, “Austria Draws the Balance,” *Foreign Affairs*, January 1959, Quoted in Ogleby, Roderick, *The theory and Practice of Neutrality in the Twentieth Century*, p. 184.

⁴ The Permanent neutrality of Turkmenistan: Collection of political and legal documents, p.21.

Given the importance of the neutrality provisions, also Article 142 states that “the permanent neutrality of the State may be revised only by referendum based on a majority vote of registered voting citizens”.²

By declaring itself neutral in time of peace and defining its neutrality as permanent, the Republic of Moldova has made a commitment to fulfil the requirements for permanently neutral states. Consequently, it has assumed a number of legal rights and obligations arising from this status, which shall be observed in both wartime and peacetime.

These rights and duties are enshrined in the 1997 Concept-Draft on the permanent neutrality of the Republic of Moldova, worked out within the national Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The Draft also examines the Moldovan neutrality’s main features, the regional security context for its maintaining, as well as the measures to be taken for its strengthening. Though the 1997 Draft was not approved because of uncertain considerations,³ the legal status of the permanent neutrality of the Republic of Moldova has been examined in other several national acts concerning its foreign and security policy.

Thus, the Foreign Policy Concept states, “The Republic of Moldova is pursuing a policy of permanent neutrality, engaging itself to be involved in no armed conflicts, to take part to no political, military or economic alliances having as goal of preparing for war.”⁴ The document stipulates yet that Moldova “shall not allow the use of its territory for the stationing of foreign military bases,”⁵ specifying by this the respective constitutional provisions. In this context, it should be taken into account that Moldova, unlike the Western neutral states, is a part of the CFE Treaty, which does not allow the stationing of foreign conventional forces on the territory of other states without their agreement.

Also, both National Security Concept⁶ and Military Doctrine⁷ are based on the constitutional neutrality stipulations. When the Moldovan Parliament adopted the Military Doctrine on 6 June 1995, the then Parliamentary Speaker, Petru Lucinschi, pointed out that “the document confirmed the republic’s determination to conduct a policy of neutrality.”⁸ Indeed, the Military Doctrine stipulates that it “is determined by foreign and domestic policy, by the constitutional declaration of permanent neutrality, has an exclusively defensive

¹ Constituția Republicii Moldova adoptată la 29 iulie 1994, Editor – Direcția de Stat pentru Asigurarea Informațională, Chișinău, 1994 / The Constitution of the Republic of Moldova adopted on 29 July 1994, Editor - The State Direction for Information Assurance MOLDPRESS, Chișinău, 1994, p.6.

² Ibidem, p.45.

³ One copy of the mentioned draft could be found at the Ministry of Defense of the Republic of Moldova.

⁴ Concepția Politicii Externe a Republicii Moldova, *Monitorul Oficial al Republicii Moldova*, Nr.20, 6 aprilie 1995.

⁵ Ibidem

⁶ Concepția Securității Naționale a Republicii Moldova, *Monitorul Oficial al Republicii Moldova*, Nr. 35-XIII, 29 iunie 1995.

⁷ Doctrina Militară a Republicii Moldova, *Monitorul Oficial al Republicii Moldova*, Nr.38-39, 14 iulie 1995.

⁸ See Waters, Trevor, Moldova: Armed Forces and Military Doctrine, K23, CSRC, January 1998, p.8.

character...”¹ The Military Doctrine has stressed the Republic of Moldova “does not permit the use of its territory for aggressive actions against other countries, or for the stationing of troops of foreign states, with the exception of those cases which are envisaged in international agreements regarding the deployment of peacekeeping contingents.”² The Military Doctrine has also stipulated that Moldova will not produce, store or obtain weapons of mass destruction, and will not permit the deployment, transport or storage on her territory of weapons of mass destruction belonging to other states.³ According to the Doctrine’s text the Republic of Moldova “will not be the first to initiate hostilities.”⁴ Of course, Moldova, like any other UN member, has the right of self-defence if an armed attack occurs against it.⁵ In this respect the Military Doctrine includes the principle of defensive sufficiency, which stipulates “the maintenance of the defensive capability of the state at a level which guarantees its military security.”⁶ As the researcher Iurie Pântea has underlined, since 1994, the Republic of Moldova has assumed the obligation to protect its permanent neutrality by all available means including maintaining of its armed forces at the level able to provide the national security.⁷

In addition, there are other several acts, which determine some special obligations of the Republic of Moldova as a permanently neutral state. Thus, the Law on the participation of the Republic of Moldova in international peacekeeping operations states that the country shall participate in such operations in strict accord with the United Nations Charter and only in those cases when does exist a clear and applicable UN or OSCE mandate.⁸ Yet the law bans the country’s participation in the peaceenforcing operations.⁹

Due to the lack of the neutrality traditions the above-mentioned documents contain some uncertainties.¹⁰ Nevertheless, they provide a sure basis to promote a foreign and security policy in accordance with the constitutional neutrality status of the country.

¹ Doctrina Militară a Republicii Moldova, *Monitorul Oficial al Republicii Moldova*, Nr.38-39, 14 iulie 1995.

² Ibidem

³ Doctrina Militară a Republicii Moldova, *Monitorul Oficial al Republicii Moldova*, Nr.38-39, 14 iulie 1995.

⁴ Ibidem

⁵ The Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations stresses expressly, “Nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations, until the security council has taken measures necessary to maintain international peace and security.”

⁶ Doctrina Militară a Republicii Moldova, *Monitorul Oficial al Republicii Moldova*, Nr.38-39, 14 iulie 1995.

⁷ Pântea, Iurie Vladimir, “The Reform of the Armed Forces of the Republic of Moldova,” *International Seminar: Rebuilding the Armed Forces for the XXIst Century*, Editors: Jeffrey Simon, Nicolae Uscoi and Constantin Moștofleu, (Bucharest, 1999), p.109.

⁸ Lege cu privire la participarea Republicii Moldova la operațiunile internaționale de menținere a păcii, Nr. 1156-XIV, 26 iulie 2000, *Monitorul Oficial al Republicii Moldova*, Anul VII, Nr.149-151 (696-699), Editor: Agenția Națională de presă Moldpres, 30 noiembrie 2000, p.2.

⁹ Ibidem

¹⁰ For more information on this question see Moșanu, Viorel, “The Neutrality Policy of the Republic of Moldova. A Case Study,” *Central European issues*, Volume 5, No.2, 1999/2000, pp. 70-72.

Summarising the above-mentioned data on the legal status of the permanently neutral countries and taking into consideration the respective Moldovan legislation, which enshrined the main duties, arising from Moldova's permanent neutrality status, the Republic of Moldova shall:

- begin no war;
- participate in no war or military conflict (except for exercising the right to self-defense in accordance with the UN Charter);
- defend its neutrality and/or independence by all available means, even by force;
- pursue a peaceful foreign policy;
- support, on the principle of solidarity, the peaceful measures taken by the United Nations Organisation;
- be involved in no bloc, alliance or any other political-military organisation;
- not admit the establishment of foreign military bases and/or the stationing of any foreign military troops on its territory;
- not accept political, military, economic as well as any other obligations, which would tend to impair its neutrality in wartime;
- not possess, produce or experiment nuclear or any other kinds of mass destruction weapons and not allow their storage or transit on/through its territory.

The 1997 opinion poll on the political-military orientation of the Republic of Moldova has showed that the majority of the population - about 60 per cent - is in favour of the maintenance of the status of the permanent neutrality of the country.¹

Given the sensitive regional security situation, keeping the legal status of the permanent neutrality of the Republic depends very much on the external factors. For the time being, the Moldovan neutrality remains to be based only on its unilateral constitutional declaration and it is not yet recognised and approved by any agreement or other international documents. Neither international organisations nor foreign states have made any clear statements in terms of ensuring the neutrality status of the Republic of Moldova that means the lack of international guarantees for it.

¹ Moşneaga, V., Danii, T., Ţurcanu, V., "Obsestvennoe mnenie Respubliki Moldova o vnesnei politiki strany," *Politica Externă a Republicii Moldova: aspecte ale securităţii și colaborării regionale (Materiale ale Simpoziului științific internațional, Chișinău, 16-17 octombrie 1997)*, Chișinău, 1998, p. 221.

IV.3. Moldovan Neutrality Policy

If the neutral law is for all members the same, the neutral policy is governed by the factors conditioning each nation and the state of international politics.¹ Neutrality policy is a means for protecting national interests, not an end in itself.² The cornerstone of the neutrality policy of a permanent neutral country is limited to not entering into any irreversible commitments that would make it impossible to honour its obligations of neutrality in case of armed conflict.³ In other words, the neutral state shall do everything so as not to be drawn into a war and to abstain from all that could draw it into a war. The implementation of this neutrality policy is a matter of its free discretion.⁴

In connection with the regional security situation there are three countries – Romania, Ukraine and Russia, - which have an overwhelming impact on Moldova's independence and neutrality.

Given their common historic and cultural inheritance and taking into consideration the geopolitical changes in Eastern Europe, too, Romania was the first country, which recognised the independence of the Republic of Moldova on August 27, 1991 and since then has been its one of the most important external partners. Unlike Moldova, which proclaimed her permanent neutrality, Romania officially asked to become a NATO member, was the first country, which signed the PfP Framework Document and has had the largest participation in Joint PfP Operations.⁵ On February 15, 2000, Romania started officially negotiations with the European Union.⁶ Romania's eventual NATO membership and its accession to the EU, could bring the Euro-Atlantic structures to the Moldovan western border.

In spite of an intensive discussion that the development of Moldovan-Romanian relations could lead to the reunification of the two countries similar to the "German model," their union was never seriously supported within Moldova. Moldovans rejected the notion of reunification with Romania in a March 1994 referendum. As it was remarked, Romania, however, is clearly not West Germany and, more importantly, Moldova is not East Germany.⁷ Nevertheless, in the context of EU enlargement, this issue has taken on renewed importance. In the first quarter of 2000, the Romanian embassy in Chisinau was

¹ Verdross, Alfred, *The Permanent Neutrality of Austria*, p.11.

² See Ganiuskin, B. V., *Neytralitet i neprisoedinenie*, Moscva: Mejdunarodnye otnosenia, 1965, str.109; Report of the Study Commission on the Strategic Studies, Issued in Bern, on 26 February 1998, p.20.

³ *Security through Cooperation: Report of the Federal Council to the Federal Assembly on the Security Policy of Switzerland*, p. 33.

⁴ The neutrality Guide-Lines of the Swiss Ministry for Foreign Affairs, 26 November 1954, *Verdross, Alfred, The Permanent Neutrality of Austria*, p.36.

⁵ Maties, Mihai, "Prospects And Challenges To Romanian Foreign Policy In The Near Future," *Cummings, Sally, Dr (Ed), War & Peace in Post-Soviet Eastern Europe* G81, CSRC, March 2000, p.80.

⁶ *Ibidem*, p.79.

⁷ See King, Charles, *Post – Soviet Moldova: A Borderland in Transition / Moldova post – sovietică: un ținut de hotar în tranziție*, p.114.

flooded with applicants seeking Romanian citizenship, following the EU's decision to begin accession negotiations with Romania.¹ Although the speed with which new divisions will arise in the region has been exaggerated in this instance, the EU's eastward enlargement has certainly increased fears within Moldova of being shut out of the common European area.

The Ukraine's «non-bloc country status» and its geographical location, which separates Moldova from Russia and other CIS countries, favour undoubtedly the maintaining of the neutrality status of the Republic of Moldova. As yearly as in 1992, the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine concluded a Treaty of friendship and co-operation. Both Moldova and Ukraine promote an almost similar security policy within the CIS, rejecting the participation in its military-political bodies. Also both countries seek European integration.

The former Ukrainian President Kravciuk has made the most relevant statement concerning the Ukraine's support of Moldova's independence: "I would like to say that Ukraine supported, supports, and will continue to support the state unity of Moldova. This is a matter of principle. It is the concern of the Moldovan people to resolve their internal affairs regarding the status of their regions, including the Trans-Dniester. However, we are for oneness, for unity of the state, for its sovereignty, and for its independent development. We have declared it previously, and we declare it today – Ukraine will follow such a policy."² Some authors consider that Ukraine has been a strong and consistent supporter of Moldovan independence because of its opposition to the notion of a reconstituted Greater Romania. In the event of a break-up of the Moldovan State, the thorny problems of the Transnistria region, which belonged to Ukraine between the two world wars, and the Northern and Southern Bessarabia that were transferred from Romania to Ukraine in 1940 would undoubtedly be placed on the agenda.³

The last events on the Ukraine's political scene show that a new, pro-Eastern course of this country can not be excluded.

On 4 July 1997 the three presidents of Moldova, Romania, and Ukraine signed a trilateral co-operation agreement which stated the means of co-operation at political, economic and cross-border levels.⁴

One cannot analyse the present and the future of the Moldovan neutrality without taking into consideration the Moldovan-Russian relations.

In 1990, the Moldovan-Russian Treaty of friendship and co-operation was concluded, but the Russian State Duma has not ratified it.

¹ EIU Country Report: Belarus, Moldova, 1st quarter 2000, The Economist Intelligence Unit, 15 Regent St, London SW1Y 4LR, United Kingdom, p.34.

² Kravciuk and Moldova's Snegur Hold a New Conference, *Russia and the Commonwealth of Independent States: documents, data, and analysis*, p.249.

³ See King, Charles, Post – Soviet Moldova: A Borderland in Transition / Moldova post – sovietică: un ținut de hotar în tranziție, p. 58;

Serebrian, Oleg, Va exploda Estul? Geopolitica Spațiului Pontic, pp. 122-123.

⁴ Baleanu, V.G., Romania At A Historic Crossroads G65, CSRC, June 1998, p.36.

On a number of occasions Moscow has raised the issue of establishing a military base in the Republic of Moldova, like in Armenia and Georgia.¹ The Republic of Moldova has rejected this proposal in accordance with the constitutional neutrality provisions. As a result of the bilateral negotiations the Moldovan-Russian “Agreement on the legal status, procedure and timetable of the withdrawal of Russian military units temporarily located on the territory of Moldova” was concluded on October 21, 1994.² This document has provided for the full withdrawal of the Russian forces and their equipment from Moldovan territory within three years of its entry into force. Before that, the December 1993 Ministerial Council of the OSCE had concluded, “progress on the withdrawal of the troops cannot be linked to any other question”. In spite of this, Moldova accepted the principle of “synchronisation” of the army’s withdrawal with the settlement of the conflict in Transnistria that favoured implicitly a Russian military presence on its soil for many years to come.³ When Russia was admitted to the Council of Europe in January 1996, it undertook to ratify within six months the withdrawal agreement. In December 1998, Russia reiterated the commitment to withdraw its troops from Moldova at the Oslo Council of Foreign Ministers of the OSCE countries.⁴ Finally, at the November 1999 Istanbul OSCE Summit, Russia agreed to withdraw all Operational Group’s arms from Transnistria by the end of 2001 and all its troops (currently around 2,500) by the end of 2002.⁵ But even after the OSCE Istanbul Summit, the Russian official statements are confused and the troops’ withdrawal from Transnistrian region remains a contentious issue. However, it is likely that Russia will delay its redeployment beyond these deadlines on the basis of time-tested arguments that financial and logistical hurdles stand in the new way of quicker implementation.⁶

Meantime, the stationing of the OGRF on the territory of the Republic of Moldova against its neutrality status and the rules of international law constitutes a direct threat to both national and regional stability and security. It is not mistaken to wary about the possibility of arms proliferation from Transnistria. Neither official representatives of Moldova, nor international observers conducted a thorough inspection of Kolbasna military storage.

¹ For more information on the Russian military bases in Armenia and Georgia see - Gribincea, Mihai, “Challenging Moscow’s Doctrine On Military Bases”, *Transition*, Vol. 1, No. 19, 20 October 1995, pp.5-6.

Gribincea, Mihai. *Politica rusă a bazelor militare în Moldova și Georgia*, pp. 34-113.

² For more information on the bilateral negotiations see - Gribincea, Mihai. *Trupele Ruse în Republica Moldova factor stabilizator sau sursă de pericol ?*, pp.35-51.

³ Gribincea, Mihai, “Challenging Moscow’s Doctrine On Military Bases”, *Transition*, Vol. 1, No. 19, 20 October 1995, p 7.

⁴ *Stambuliskii Sammit i sudiba Rossiiskoi voennoi gruppirovki v Pridnestrovie*, *Sbornic informatsionno-analiticheskikh materialov*, No. 2 (6), Kiev, December 1999, p. 10.

⁵ See the paragraph 19 of the OSCE Summit Declaration, issued on November 19, 1999, at Istanbul.

⁶ EIU Country Report: Belarus, Moldova, 4th quarter 1999, The Economist Intelligence Unit, 15 Regent St, London SW1Y 4LR, United Kingdom, p.32.

Some authors have expressed the strange opinion that the renunciation of the neutrality status could favour the exit from the oppressive Russian tutelage.¹

It is well known that the Republic of Moldova joined the CIS first of all because of the economic considerations. Perhaps, Moldova's CIS membership was yet the price for the recognition of the Moldovan independence.² Also, it is not very clear what are the external implications on the establishment of the foreign strategic course of the country.³ However, as it has been mentioned above, given the neutrality provisions of the CIS foundation documents,⁴ the Republic of Moldova has not signed the Decision on creation of the Council of Ministers of Defence of the CIS Member States and joined CIS as a real neutral country. Moldova has abstained from entering into the CIS' Collective Security Treaty, signed in Tashkent on May 15, 1992 and has not been participating in the political military integration within this organisation.⁵ In fact, the Tashkent Treaty can be considered a military-political pact. Thus, the Treaty's Article 4 states that "if one of the participating states is subjected to aggression by any state or groups of states, this will be perceived as aggression against all participating states, to this treaty."⁶ It also stipulates that "in the event of an act of aggression being committed against any of participating states it will give it the necessary assistance, including military assistance, and will also give support with the means at their disposal by way of exercising the right to collective defence in accordance with Article 51 of the UN Charter."⁷

¹ See Gribincea, Mihai. *Politica rusă a bazelor militare*, p.203.

² See Cojocaru, Gheorghe, *Politica externă a Republicii Moldova: Studii*, Ediția a doua revăzută și adăugită, p.36-37.

³ For instance, during his February 1992 visit in Moldova, the then US Secretary of State, James Baker said "We all want to see the Republic of Moldova as member of the Commonwealth of the Independent States. - See *Moldova Suverană*, nr. 28 (17889), 12 februarie 1992.

⁴ The Belovezh Agreement on Creation of the Commonwealth (8 December 1991) and the Alma-Ata Declaration (21 December 1991) stipulate: "In order to ensure international strategic stability and security ... the sides will respect one another's desire to attain the status of a non-nuclear and (or) neutral states."

See *Soglaşenie o sozdanii Sodrujestva Nezavisimih Gosudarstv*. (Podpisano 8 decabrea 1991 v Belovejscoi pușce, pravitelistvennaia rezidenția Visculi, Brestcaia oblasti, Belarusi); *Alma-Atinscaia Declaratsia ot 21 decabrea 1991 goda*, *SODRUJESTVO*, Minsk, 1992, p.7, p.15.

The Minsk (Belovezh Forest) Agreement on Creation of the Commonwealth, 8 December 1991 (FBIS Translation); The Alma-Ata Declaration 21 December 1991 (FBIS Translation). *Russia and the Commonwealth of Independent States: documents, data, and analysis*, pp. 43, 47.

⁵ The Collective Security Treaty came into force in 1995 after its ratification by all participating states. - See *SODRUJESTVO*, N 2 (19) Minsk 1995, p.87.

⁶ *SODRUJESTVO*, *Vîpuse piatyi*, Minsk 1992, p.9.

CIS Treaty on Collective Security, 15 May 1992, *Russia and the Commonwealth of Independent States: documents, data, and analysis* p. 540.

⁷ *Ibidem*

Moldova has officially joined the CIS on 15 April 1994.¹ Signing the CIS Charter the Moldovan President made a reservation on its abstaining from the participation in the collective security issues and the military-political co-operation.²

Since the proclamation of the permanent neutrality status of the country on 29 August 1994 the Republic of Moldova has continued to abstain itself from the integration into the CIS military-political structures. Thus, Moldova has not signed the agreements on the Integrated Air Defense System, 10 February 1995,³ on military security Conception of the CIS States,⁴ on the protection of CIS external borders, 26 May 1995, as well as other CIS military accords.

Moldova has rejected the provisions of the Russian President Boris Yeltsin's edict on Russia's strategic policy towards CIS countries and has confirmed the country's neutrality policy.⁵

Coming to power in 1997, the new President Petru Lucinschi stated that the external policy of the Republic of Moldova as a sovereign, independent and neutral state will remain unchanged.⁶

Of course, pro-Eastern political forces attempt to engage Moldova into the CIS military-political co-operation. Thus, on December 25, 1997, 22 deputies proposed a law draft on the ratification of the CIS Charter' military articles, but the Parliament rejected it.⁷

Moldova has demonstrated its will to promote a neutrality policy also within the alternative grouping of CIS member states without Russia, such as Georgia, Ukraine, Uzbekistan, Azerbaijan and Moldova (GUUAM).⁸ Its participation in this under-regional organisation seeks closer political and economic links with other CIS states without engaging in any common defence commitments.

The most difficult issue on the fate of the permanent neutrality status of the Republic of Moldova constitutes its eventual adhering to the Russian-Belorussian Union. This question has arisen especially with the astonishing victory of the Moldovan Communist Party in the February 2001 parliamentary elections.⁹ Before then, the Communist Party had supported the country's

¹ SODRUJESTVO, N 1 (14), Minsk 1994, p.171.

² The reservation's contents is following: "According to the Article of the Charter of the Commonwealth of the Independent States the Republic of Moldova, as member of the Commonwealth, abstains from the participation in the collective security issues and the military-political co-operation (the paragraph 9 of the article 4 and the articles 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 30 and 31 of the Charter of the CIS)". – See SODRUJESTVO, N 1 (14) Minsk, 1994, p.174.

³ SODRUJESTVO, Vîpuse sestoî, Minsk, 1992, p.68.

⁴ SODRUJESTVO, Vîpuse sedimoî, Minsk, 1992, p.32.

⁵ Russia and the Commonwealth of Independent States: documents, data, and analysis, p.252.

⁶ See Pămînt și Oameni, No 3 (245), 18 ianuarie 1997.

⁷ Gribincea, Mihai. Trupele Ruse în Republica Moldova factor stabilizator sau sursă de pericol ?, p.130.

⁸ GUAM emerged on May 15, 1997, at the Vienna summit, when the group's participants found common positions regarding CFE Treaty flank limits. Somewhat later Uzbekistan became the fifth country to join the group.

⁹ According to the official data the Communist Party has won 71 mandates, the centrist bloc "Braghis' Alliance" – 19 mandates and the right wing PCDP – 11 mandates of total 101. See - Hotărîrea Curții Constituționale a

neutrality status.¹ The Communist leader Vladimir Voronin, who was also elected as President of the Republic of Moldova, had even remarked the infringements, in his opinion, of the Moldovan neutrality in the favour of Western orientation.² The Communists' electoral programme included a combination of external goals, including strengthening Moldova's and its international authority, the development of relations with all the countries and firstly – with those of the CIS and the examination of the question concerning its adhering to the State Union of Russia and Belarus.³

The electoral results in Moldova have generated a large debate in Europe, where many analysts consider that the PCM's victory has contributed to the improvement of Romania's prospects of being admitted to an expanded NATO in 2002 and to the consequent redrawing of the region's strategic map.⁴ Nevertheless, as the winner Vladimir Voronin has explained after the elections, Moldova's entering into the Union of Russia and Belarus is not a territorial union's issue, but rather an economic integration one - like EU.⁵ Moreover, he has remarked that the respective decision can be taken only according to a national referendum, which is not probable in the near future.⁶ In addition, the Communist Leader stated that the NATO membership is excluded for the Republic of Moldova because it is a neutral state,⁷(!) but Moldova will continue the integration into European structures⁸(!) Yet the leader of the Communists' parliamentary group, Stepaniuc told BBC that Moldova remains a neutral state.⁹ Also the Moldovan Prime Minister, Vasile Tarlev has recently underlined at the Reunion of the Moldovan-EU council that the new Moldovan government considers the integration into EU as a main strategic goal of the Republic of Moldova* and will act consequently to provide all conditions for its integration into the European space.¹⁰ Therefore, the question of the abandonment of the Moldovan neutrality in favour of the Russian-Belorussian Union's membership is still premature.

Republicii Moldova, nr. 15 din 13 martie 2001, "Cu privire la validarea mandatelor deputaților aleși în cadrul scrutinului parlamentar din 25 februarie 2001", *Monitorul Oficial al Republicii Moldova*, Anul VIII, nr. 29-30 (753-754), Chișinău: Editor: Agenția Națională de Presă Moldpress, 15 martie 2001.

¹ See Conferința I a Partidului comunistilor din Republica Moldova la 18 decembrie 1999. Chișinău, 2000, p.8.

² See Expres-Ancheta "AP", *Arena Politicii*, Anul II, No 2(14), octombrie 1997, p.18.

³ *Comunistul*, nr.1 (217), 12 ianuarie 2001.

⁴ See - Shafir, M., "Moldova's Elections Redrawing Regional Map?", RFE/RL Newslines, 13 March 2001; Ballantine, V.G., "Moldova's Relations with Romania in the Aftermath of their Elections," p.7.

⁵ See *Nezavisimaia Moldova*, No 39(2482), 28 fevralea 2001 goda.

⁶ *Ibidem*

⁷ See *Moldova Suverană*, No 49 (19 738), 28 februarie 2001; *Nezavisimaia Moldova*, No 72 (2515), 18 aprellea 2001 goda.

⁸ See *Moldova Suverană*, No 78-79 (19 767-19768), 5 aprilie 2001.

⁹ Quoted in Ballantine, V. G., "Moldova's Relations with Romania in the Aftermath of their Elections," presented at the *International Conference "Highway or Barrier?: The Republic of Moldova's Integration into the Euro-Atlantic Structures"*, 26-27 April 2001, Chisinau, Republic of Moldova, p.5.

* Perhaps on 30 June, the Republic of Moldova will be finally admitted into the Pact of Stability for Southeast Europe, by which the process on its accession to EU could start.

¹⁰ *Moldova Suverană*, Nr.109 (19798), 17 mai 2001.

Since 1994 the Republic of Moldova has also not voiced any intention to join the North Atlantic Alliance. Nevertheless, Moldova considers its neutrality compatible with the co-operation within the EAPC and the NATO PfP Programme. On 16 March 1994, when the Moldovan President signed the PfP Framework Document, he remarked the role of the North Atlantic Alliance as the main guarantor of the security of European states and the confident defender of democratic values. At the same time, he pointed out that Moldova wishes to promote a neutrality policy. On November 30, 1995, Moldova's chief of state stated expressly that seeking integration into European union structures, "Moldova nevertheless cannot become a NATO member, as its constitution proclaimed Moldova as a neutral country that shall not join any military blocs".¹ Some time later in the same year, he has even more explicitly stressed that the "participation in the PfP Programme does not mean that Moldova is planning to join the North Atlantic Alliance, as claimed by separatist Dniester leaders. As stipulated by the constitution, Moldova as a neutral state, shall allow no foreign troops to be deployed on its territory and cannot enter any military bloc or unions."²

Yet Moldova does not see NATO enlargement as a threat to its national security, it has adopted a neutral position on NATO's expansion into Central Europe and as well considers the enlargement strategy should necessarily take into consideration all possible factors and consequences, including the impact of the Russian factor. An opinion poll, realised before the July 1997 Madrid Summit has showed that the majority of the population of the Republic of Moldova agrees to NATO enlargement towards Eastern Europe, including entering the Alliance of its neighbours.³ At the same time, the population rejects both NATO membership and entering into the CIS military-political structures in favour of maintaining the neutrality status of the country. The detailed data on the political-military orientation of the Republic of Moldova in 1997 are shown in the following Table.

The opinion poll data on the political-military orientation of the Republic of Moldova
(Summer and Autumn of 1997)*

Answer Variant	Opinion poll data Summer1997	Opinion poll data Autumn 1997
Republic of Moldova's	NATO	Membership
Yes	38.3	20.2
Rather Yes than No	-	10.3

¹ Russia and the Commonwealth of Independent States: documents, data, and analysis, p.501.

² Ibidem, p.500-501

³ See Moşneaga, V., Danii, T., Ţurcanu, V., Quoted work, p. 221.

Rather No than Yes	-	6.7
No	27.4	22.6
It is difficult to answer	33.7	29.5
No answer	0.6	1.2
Republic of Moldova's	Membership in CIS	Political-Military Structures
Yes	28.4	20.2
Rather Yes than No	-	10.5
Rather No than Yes	-	8.8
No	41.1	35.7
It is difficult to answer	29.5	23.7
No answer	1.0	1.1
Republic of Moldova –	Neutral	State
Yes	60.2	48.7
Rather Yes than No	-	11.0
Rather No than Yes	-	7.3
No	20.4	16.6
It is difficult to answer	18.7	15.2
No answer	0.7	1.2

* Source: Moşneaga, V., Danii, T., Țurcanu, V., “Obsestvennoe mnenie Respubliki Moldova o vneshnei politiki strany,” *Politica Externă a Republicii Moldova: aspecte ale securității și colaborării regionale (Materiale ale Simpoziului științific internațional, Chișinău, 16-17 octombrie 1997)*, Chișinău, 1998, p. 221.

As early as in 1991, the Moldovan Parliament had approved the Declaration on the security and disarmament, by which the Republic of Moldova recognised totally the goals and the principles enshrined in the CFE Treaty and the Vienna Document.¹ On 15 May 1992 the Republic of Moldova together with other seven former Soviet republics – Azerbaijan, Armenia, Belarus, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Russia, and Ukraine – signed a joint statement reaffirming their adherence to the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE). At the same time, the Moldovan President made a reservation to the signed agreement, which regards the withdrawal of the Russian Army's military units from the territory of the Republic of Moldova.² Under these accords the quotas for armament and hardware were divided up between Moldova and the Transcaucasian states as follows:

¹ Declarația Parlamentului Republicii Moldova privind aspecte ale securității și dezarmării, nr. 708-XII din 10 septembrie 1991, *Legi, Hotărâri și alte Acte, adoptive la Sesiunea a șasea a Parlamentului Republicii Moldova de legislatura a douăsprezecea*, Volumul 2, Ediție a Parlamentului Republicii Moldova, Chișinău, 1991, p.25.

² SODRUJESTVO, Vîpusc piaty, Minsk 1992, p.40.

The quotas for armament and hardware for Transcaucasian states and Moldova
under CFE Treaty*

Type of armament	Azerbaijan	Armenia	Georgia	Moldova
Tanks	220	220	220	210
Armoured fighting vehicles	220	220	220	210
Artillery systems	285	285	285	250
Combat aircraft	100	100	100	50
Attack helicopters	50	50	50	50

* Source: Russia and the Commonwealth of Independent States: documents, data, and analysis / edited by Zbigniew Brzezinski and Paige Sullivan, New York: Center for Strategic and International Studies, 1997, p.461.

In connection with the ratification of the Document on the adjustment of the CFE Treaty to the new military-political realities, the Republic of Moldova stated on May 15, 1997 once more that this ratification does not mean acceptance of the foreign conventional armed forces stationing on its territory.¹ Since 1992 Moldova has fulfilled all its obligations under the CFE Treaty and the Vienna Document.²

The military issue was analysed for the first time in the Republic of Moldova on September 4, 1990, when the Parliament approved the Resolution on the military service of the Moldovan citizens.³ The Moldovan President decreed the creation of the Armed Forces of the Republic of Moldova on September 3, 1991,⁴ and the establishment of the Ministry of Defence on February 5, 1992.⁵ At present, the Moldovan National Army consists of regular troops and a reserve. The regular troops are based on ground units and air defense forces. The army aviation was eliminated in 1997, when the MIG 29

¹ Hotărîrea Parlamentului Republicii Moldova nr. 1186-XIII din 15 mai 1997, Cu privire la ratificarea Documentului convenit între statele-părți la Tratatul cu privire la forțele armate convenționale în Europa, din 19 noiembrie 1990, *Monitorul Oficial al Republicii Moldova*.

² See Information on Conventional Forces of the Republic of Moldova, valid as of January 1, 1995 - January 1, 2001 according to CFE Treaty.

Information on Conventional Forces of the Republic of Moldova, valid as of January 1, 1995 - January 1, 2001 according to the 1994 Vienna Document.

³ Hotărîrea Sovietului Suprem al RSS Moldova No. 254-XII din 4 septembrie 1990 "Cu privire la serviciul militar al cetățenilor RSS Moldova", Legi și Hotărîri adoptate la Sesiunea a doua Extraordinară a Sovietului Suprem al RSS Moldova de legislatura a douăsprezecea, Ediție a Sovietului Suprem al RSS Moldova, (Chișinău, Cartea Moldovenească, 1990), p.22.

⁴ Arhiva Guvernului Republicii Moldova, Fondul "Decrete și Ordonanțe ale Președintelui Republicii Moldova", Decretul Președintelui Republicii Moldova nr. 193 din 3 septembrie 1991 "Cu privire la crearea Forțelor Armate ale Republicii Moldova".

⁵ Ibidem, Decretul Președintelui Republicii Moldova nr. 19 din 5 februarie 1992 "Cu privire la reorganizarea Departamentului de Stat pentru problemele militare al Republicii Moldova în Ministerul Apărării al Republicii Moldova".

fighter jets were sold. The republic has no tanks and combat helicopters. The total strength of the regular units of the National Army is 8,600 men. It was remarked that Moldova's defence expenses per capita compared with those of model-states in the field of the "armed neutrality", are at an embarrassing low level.¹ The above mentioned data seem to argue that Moldovan neutrality is not an "armed" yet, but rather a "demilitarised" one.

Seeking the preservation of its independence and neutrality the Republic of Moldova co-operates with the OSCE. In 1992, Moldovan government requested peacekeeping forces from the CSCE, but the July 1992 CSCE Summit in Helsinki did not agree to the Moldovan request.² On April 25, 1993 the OSCE Mission to Moldova started its activity. Its mandate is to facilitate the establishment of a comprehensive political framework for dialogue and negotiations, to gather and provide information on the situation, investigating specific incidents, to provide legal advice and expertise, and to initiate a visible OSCE presence in the region.³ The situation in Moldova has been examined at the OSCE summits as well as within its Permanent Council. Thus, in connection with the decision taken on 17 November 1995 by the Russian State Duma, the OSCE Permanent Council issued a statement, which reiterates the unvarying support of the OSCE for Moldova's sovereignty and territorial integrity within its internationally recognised borders.⁴

Of course, the Transnistrian dispute and the withdrawal of the Russian troops from Moldova's territory constitute two main issues being discussed in the framework of OSCE. At the November 1999 Istanbul OSCE Summit Russia agreed to withdraw all arms from Transnistria by the end of 2001 and all of its troops (currently around 2,500) by the end of 2002.⁵ As the Summit Declaration stresses the participating states reiterate their "expectation of an early, orderly and complete withdrawal of Russian troops from Moldova as an important step towards a political settlement."⁶

The Eight Ministerial Council of OSCE held in Vienna in November 2000 expressed concerns on the lack of movement in the withdrawal of Russian forces from Moldovan territory. The Russian Federation was called upon to exert its influence on the local authorities in the Trans-Dniestrian region of that State to peacefully remove the obstacles posed to the withdrawal and the visit of an assessment mission. In the resolution of this problem, there was reaffirmed

¹ For instance in 1996, military expenses per capita were the following (in \$US): Switzerland, - 558, Sweden - 647, Ireland - 185, Finland - 450, Austria - 201, but Republic of Moldova - 4. See Moşanu, Viorel, "The Neutrality Policy of the Republic of Moldova. A Case Study," *Central European issues*, Volume 5, No.2, 1999/2000, p. 76.

² Shashenkov, M., "Russian Peacekeeping in the 'Near Abroad,'" *Survival*, The IISS Quarterly, Autumn 1994, p.53.

³ See Vetschera, Heinz, *Instruments of Cooperation Security in the CSCE Framework: Confidence-Building Measures, Emergency Mechanisms and Conflict Prevention*, Vienna, October 1994, p.29.

⁴ Permanent Council Chairman Issues Statement on Moldova, *OSCE Newsletter*, Vol. 2/No.11, November 1995, p.2.

⁵ See the paragraph 19 of the OSCE Summit Declaration, issued at Istanbul on November 19, 1999.

⁶ *Ibidem*

Minister's insistence that the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Moldova should be ensured.¹

Moldova was the first of the CIS countries admitted into the Council of Europe (13 July 1995)² and the third one - after both Ukraine and Russia, which signed the Agreement of Co-operation with EU.³ Many opinion polls have showed that the majority of the population of the Republic of Moldova is constantly in favour of joining EU.⁴ It was mentioned that in spite of Maastricht Treaty stipulations on the common foreign and security policy, Austria, Finland and Sweden joined EU in 1995 as neutral countries. The question on the compatibility of neutrality with the EU membership arose again after the EU Helsinki Summit of December 1999, when the decision has been made to develop a new Common European Security and Defense Policy (CESDP), i.e. to create a common European credible military force.⁵ Nevertheless, for the time being, the CESDP is not a matter for the Moldovan policy aiming at European integration. Moreover, it is very important the intensive development of EU/WEU's military dimension and its process of enlargement have never provoked a negative reaction in Russia. For instance, when WEU decided in May 1994 to offer Central European countries (including the three Baltic States) the status of Associate Partner, Russian Foreign Minister stated that Russia has no objections to this move.⁶ Most Russian official statements and publications on West European defense and politico-military co-operation are set in a positive tone, quite unlike the Russian debate over NATO and its enlargement process.⁷

Political analysts have stressed that a clearly defined line does not exist in the Moldovan foreign policy.⁸ Indeed, it is very difficult to promote simultaneously the course of integration into two different structures: CIS and

¹ See OSCE Newsletter, Vol. VII/No.12, December 2000, p.3.

² Shilova, R. A., "Otnoshenia Moldovy so stranami Zapadnoi Evropy," *Novaia Rossia: Rossia i strany blizhnego zarubejia*, Sbornic statiei No 9, (Moscvă, 1999), p.72

³ Ibidem, p.75.

⁴ Atitudinea populației privind aderarea Republicii Moldova la Uniunea Europeană, *Moldova Suverană*, No 121 (19,546), 31 mai 2000, p.3

Barometrul de opinie publică – 2000, Sondaj de opinie realizat de Institutul de Marketing și Sondaje (IMAS) la solicitarea Institutului de Politici Publice (IPP), (Chișinău, August 2000), p.53.

Barometrul de opinie publică: Republica Moldova – ianuarie 2001, Sondaj de opinie realizat de Centrul pentru Studierea Opiniei și Pieței (CSOP) la solicitarea Institutului de Politici Publice, (Chișinău, Ianuarie 2001), p.29.

⁵ EU Member States committed to a number of military "headline goals": by the year 2003, the EU should be able to deploy up to 15 brigades (or 50,000-60,00 troops) for Petersberg missions. The brigades should be militarily self-sustaining and be comprised of the necessary command, control, and intelligence capabilities; logistics, and other infrastructures, to include about 500 aircraft and 15 ships. These new EU troops should be rapidly deployable – within 60 days – and be able to sustain such a deployment for at least 1-year. Around 150,000 troops will be required for rotation purposes. - See Ham, Peter van, *Europe's New Defense Ambitions: Implications for NATO, the US, and Russia*, The Marshall Center Papers, No.1, April 2000, p.11.

⁶ Ham, Peter van, *Europe's New Defense Ambitions: Implications for NATO, the US, and Russia*, The Marshall Center Papers, No.1, April 2000, p.26.

⁷ There was remarked that encouraging West European military co-operation, Moscow would to weak the transatlantic link and to "decouple" the US from its European allies. – See Ham, Peter van, Quoted work, p.27.

⁸ For instance see Negru, Nicolae, "Politica externă a Republicii Moldova: intenții și intenții, *Arena Politicii*, Anul II, nr.2 (14), Octombrie 1997, p. 3.

EU. Furthermore, since 1994 there were a number of cases of the non-observance of neutrality rules by the Moldovan authorities. For instance, it was mentioned the sale of 4 MIG29 fighter jets to Yemen – a country devastated by a civil war at that time.¹ Yet the bilateral Moldovan-Russian applications, especially after the Madrid Summit's decision on the NATO enlargement seem to not confirm Moldova's commitments to not participate in the mechanisms of military co-operation.² Foreign analysts have remarked the incompatibility of other several external actions of the Ministry of Defence with the neutrality status of the Republic of Moldova.³

But the most evident infringement of the permanent neutrality status of the Republic of Moldova is considered the 10 February 1995 Additional Protocol to the 1990 Moldovan-Russian Treaty of friendship and co-operation.⁴ According to the Protocol's text each of the signing states assumes the commitment to abstain from "the participation in actions, which are oriented against the interests of other Part or would cause the prejudices to it, as well as from supporting of such actions. "In the event of a situation, which, in the opinion of one of the Parts, endangers peace or their national security interests, the sovereignty and the territorial integrity, It can address to the other Part the proposal to realise without delay the corresponding consultations. According to Article 3 "The Parts will make the exchange of information and, in event of necessity, will undertake the co-ordinated actions to surpass such situation, including mutual help in order to push back an aggression against one or both Parts." As it was remarked "even if the bilateral treaty is not in force today, since it has not been ratified by the State Duma, by the very signing of this document, Chişinău placed itself, under international law, into a position of incompatibility with the status of a neutral state".⁵ Yet Russia is the single state, with which the Republic of Moldova signed such document, making questionable its own neutrality status.⁶

Without doubt, the non-observance of neutrality rules has contributed to the undermining of the Moldovan neutrality policy, but this could not serve as a motive to abandon the country's neutrality status at all, as some authors have suggested.⁷ It is not the permanent neutrality status of the Republic of Moldova

¹ See Moşanu, Viorel, Quoted work, p. 69.

² See Munteanu, Igor, "Moldova şi CSI: o alianţă fragilă," *Arena Politicii*, Anul II, nr.2 (14), Octombrie 1997, p.7

³ See Baleanu, V.G., Republic of Moldova's Acrobatic Diplomacy, F 61, CSRC, September 1997; Waters, T., "Tactica "canatohodtsa" moldabscoi voennoi diplomatii v natovscom "tsirke," (Acrobat tactic of the Moldovan military diplomacy in NATO circus), *Politica Externă a Republicii Moldova: aspecte ale securităţii şi colaborării regionale (Materiale ale Simpoziului ştiinţific internaţional, Chişinău, 16-17 octombrie 1997)*, Chişinău, 1998.

⁴ Cojocaru, Gheorghe E., *Politica externă a Republicii Moldova: Studii*, Ediţia a doua revăzută şi adăugită, p. 141.

⁵ See Moşanu, Viorel, Quoted work, p.70.

⁶ Cojocaru, Gheorghe E., *Politica externă a Republicii Moldova: Studii*, Ediţia a doua revăzută şi adăugită, p. 141.

⁷ Gribincea, Mihai. *Politica rusă a bazelor militare*, p.203. Moşanu, Viorel, Quoted work, p.75;

that has caused Moldova's external dependence, but rather its non-observance and/or poor promotion.

In spite of the internal contradictions and the external barriers, the Republic of Moldova moves, however, towards European integration. Since 1994, Moldova has not participated in the creation of the military alliances within the CIS, maintaining an equal distance between East and West. In February 1997 the former NATO Secretary General, Javier Solana, confirmed that "in becoming a Partner for Peace in March 1994, Moldova demonstrated that its policy of strict neutrality is compatible with seeking friendly ties with other countries and organisations."¹ Western analysts have confirmed that even after the Madrid and Washington summits Moldova has pursued neutrality.²

¹ Moldova Suverană, February 1997.

² For instance see Simon, Jeffrey, "Partnership for Peace (PfP): After the Washington Summit and Kosovo," *Strategic Forum*—National Defense University, Institute for National strategic Studies, Number 167, August 1999, p.4.

CHAPTER V NATO ENLARGEMENT AND MOLDOVAN NEUTRALITY'S PROSPECTS

V.1. Russian Factor and Yalta Syndrome

Russia is never as strong – or as weak – as it appears.

**Otto fon Bismarck (1815-1898)
Chancellor of Germany**

We can say that we are not going to divide Europe, but if you bring other members into NATO and leave other countries out, what is it but a division?

**Lee H. Hamilton,
Congressman of Indiana, USA**

As Chapter 2 of this study concludes, NATO enlargement constitutes the central element of the geopolitical process in the post-Cold War Europe. It leads to the extension of the European area of security and stability and this positive impact is in Moldova's interests, too. At the same time, a real difference does exist between the security of the NATO's future members, which will benefit from a common defence, and those European countries, which will remain out of NATO's area of responsibility. The unpredictable character of the security of the last group of states is more than evident. However, the consultations with NATO "in case of perceiving a direct threat to their territorial integrity, political independence, or security"¹ do not mean any real security guarantees for them. This situation regards especially the countries, which risk being a borderland between NATO area and Russia's sphere of influence, when the confrontation on the Alliance expansion issue could be very detrimental to their security.

Of course, a second Cold War between Russia and the West is not possible. Post-Communist Russia is not in a position to engage another East-West global confrontation. Russia has still to devote much of its energy to redefining its identity. It has also to surpass the internal instability and the centrifugal tendencies inside the Federation. Russia finds itself within borders, which reflect no historical precedent. If the Soviet Union had occupied a sixth of the earth's land surface, Russia occupies 17 million square kilometres instead

¹ Partnership for Peace: Invitation, *NATO Review*, No.1 – February 1994, Volume 42, p. 28. The Alliance Strategic Concept, *The Reader's Guide to the NATO Summit in Washington*, 23-25 April 1999, p. 53.

of 22 million.¹ Russia's Gross Domestic Product was reduced. In 1992, Russia's GNP was about \$400 billion-40 percent of the United Kingdom's and a third of that of France. By 1996-97 the economy had recovered somewhat, to a GDP of \$1.1 trillion, a little below that of the UK and France, but only just over half that of Germany and a quarter that of Japan.² In 1990, the Soviet Union's population was about 270 million. That of the present-day Russia is about 145 million and President Putin has said it may fall to 123 million by 2015, when Iran will have as many people. Russians are today outnumbered by Chinese 9 to 1. East of the Aral Sea, the ratio is closer to 50 to 1.³

Analysts have remarked at least five factors that prevent Russia from setting out on the path of a new Cold War. These include:

- its present economic weakness;
- its dependence on western financial sources and investments;
- the necessity to integrate in the world economy and to become part of international economic and financial institutions;
- the desire to be part of the global decision-making (G-7);
- the weakness of its military and the absence of belligerent attitudes in the society.⁴

But in spite of this economic weakness and its dependence on Western financial sources Russia remains a military superpower with still around 25,000 nuclear warheads,⁵ with the enormous chemical and bacteriological weapon stocks and with the largest conventional forces. This huge concentration of military power dwarfs any other European military capability. The most visible instances of the risks and dangers confronting the European security are the Russian strategic command and staff exercises. Thus, the code-named exercise Zapad-99 (The West-99), which took place in June 1999, included a massive air and cruise missile attack on Russian forces deployed in Kaliningrad area as well as on targets on Belorussian soil. In order to prevent the further escalation of armed hostilities, Moscow announced openly that strategic nuclear weapons would be used. Russia's long-range Aviation fulfilled the so-called demonstrative nuclear strike, and, faced with the prospect of total nuclear war, the adversary stopped fighting and began negotiations.⁶

¹ See - Bellamy, Christopher, "Russia & Post-Soviet Security – Does Russia Still Matter?", *Cummings, Sally, (Ed), War & Peace in Post-Soviet Eastern Europe* G81, CSRC, March 2000.

² Ibidem

³ Buchanan, Pat, "Washington Shouldn't Be Antagonising Moscow, a natural Ally," *International Herald Tribune*, Thursday, April 12, 2001, p.4.

⁴ See - Pushkov, Alexei, A view from Russia, *NATO Enlargement: Opinions and Options*, Edited by J. Simon, Washington D.C., 1995, p.135.

⁵ Rodman, Peter W., "America Adrift. A Strategic Assessment," *Central European Issues – Romanian Foreign Affairs Review*, Volume 3, Number 1, Bucharest, 1997, p.52.

⁶ See - Nezavisimaya Gazeta, 24 June 1999. - Quoted in Fedorov, Yuri, "Baltic security in the regional and the wider European context," *Security in the Northern European Region*, 1999 PfP International Research Seminar, Stockholm, 8-11 December 1999, Editors: Samuel Grier, Manuel Almeida, Nils Förander, (Rome: NDC Monograph series, Spring 2000), p. 31.

The bloody Balkan and Caucasus conflicts provide a strong body of evidence that the use of military force has not yet lost its importance in some European regions.

After NATO's air campaign against Yugoslavia and the first wave of the Alliance's enlargement, Russian President approved the National Security Concept (January 10, 2000)¹ and the Military Doctrine (April 21, 2000)² of the Russian Federation, which includes some new provisions. The main provision of the National Security Concept regards increasing of Western military threats to Russia's security. Thus, the Concept states that NATO's actions by force (military) out of the bloc's area of responsibility without the sanction of the Security Council of the UNO leads to the destabilisation of the strategic situation in the world.³ According to the Military Doctrine, the external threat to Russia's military security manifests itself in a wide variety of ways, in particular:

- the existence of military conflicts near the state border of the Russian Federation and allies;
- the emergence of groupings of troops (forces) in the immediate proximity of Russian borders;
- the enlargement of the military blocs and alliances in the detriment of the Russian Federation;
- the discrimination of the Russian citizens in the foreign states, from Russia's viewpoint.⁴

The new Military Doctrine says nuclear weapons are a deterrent against aggression, a factor in providing the military security of the Russian Federation and its allies and in maintaining international stability and peace. In terms of the exact wording used in the Military Doctrine, the Russian nuclear weapon can be used in response even to "the large-scale conventional aggression, in situations critical to the national security of the Russian Federation".⁵

It should be concluded the future steps of the NATO enlargement and its activity out of its area of responsibility would be followed by adequate Russia's counteractions. In this respect, it was clear that NATO's military action in Yugoslavia inspired the Russian military campaign in Chechnya.⁶

Therefore, whatever its weaknesses and its problems, Russia still matters. Russia will always be essential to the world order and, in the event of

¹ Contseptsia natsionalnoi bezopasnosti Rossiisoi Federatsii, Utverjdena Ucazom Prezidenta Rossiisoi Federatsii ot 10 ianvarea 2000 goda, *Nezavisimoe voennoe obozrenie*, No 1 (174), 14 ianvarea 2000 goda.

² Voennaia Doctrina Rossiisoi Federatsii, Utverjdena Ucazom Prezidenta Rossiisoi Federatsii ot 21 aprelea 2000 goda, No. 706, *Krasnaia Zvezda*, 12 maia 2000 goda.

³ Contseptsia natsionalnoi bezopasnosti Rossiisoi Federatsii, *Nezavisimoe voennoe obozrenie*, No 1 (174), 14 ianvarea 2000 goda.

⁴ Voennaia Doctrina Rossiisoi Federatsii, *Krasnaia Zvezda*, 12 maia 2000 goda.

⁵ Ibidem

⁶ For more information see Arbatov, Alexei, Transformatsia rossiiskoi voennoi doctriiny – uroki Kosovo i Chechni, The Marshall Center Papers, No. 2, pp. 26-31.

attempting the restoration of the lost empire, a potential menace to it.¹ Russia plays a unique role in Euro-Atlantic security² and the new European security system is not possible without Russia. Hence, it is very important the definition of a comprehensive approach to European security system, which would consider the Russian factor without “limiting the sovereignty of any state”.³

As the former Moldovan President Mircea Snegur has stated in an interview with the German newspaper *Handelsblatt* in November 1995, “when NATO begins the expansion, it should necessarily consider all factors, all possible consequences, first and foremost – the Russian factor.”⁴

Given the development by Moscow of “special” relationship with the former Soviet Republics (The doctrine of “near abroad”), the transition from a former empire (Soviet Union) to an informal sphere of influence is possible. Because of Moscow’s special interests in the near abroad area the security of every state in Russia’s vicinity is decisively shaped by its external policy. Russia is vigorously opposing against the Alliance’s enlargement into the near abroad area. According to the Strategic Policy of Russian Federation toward CIS Member States, approved by the Russian President’s edict No. 940, on 14 September 1995, “if NATO accepts the Baltic republics as members, Russian Federation’s armed forces should be sent to the territory of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia”.⁵ The edict considers the opposition by force to NATO’s eastward expansion as an extremely urgent task and consequently stipulates the creation of a military bloc of the CIS countries, the deployment of tactical nuclear weapons on the territory of Belarus, in Kaliningrad, and on naval vessels of the Baltic fleet. Later in 1998, the Russian Foreign Minister Igor Ivanov has explained “There is the red line that should not be crossed in the process of NATO expansion. This red line goes along the borders of the CIS and the Baltic States. If this line is crossed then a new situation will emerge. And Russia’s decisions will be formulated and made in accordance with this situation.”⁶ As it was above mentioned Moldova has rejected the named edict in particular its provision on creating a military bloc of the CIS countries as a means of counteracting the NATO enlargement and has confirmed the course of the country’s neutrality policy. Thus the then Moldovan Foreign Minister Popov has stated: “In our participation in the CIS we focus on economic co-operation. The military and political aspects of the CIS are likely to be put in place without us. We do not intend to take part in military-political unions.”⁷

¹ See Kissinger, Henry, Quoted work, p. 25.

² The Alliance Strategic Concept, *The Reader’s Guide to the NATO Summit in Washington*, 23-25 April 1999, p.53.

³ Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security between NATO and the Russian Federation, *NATO Review*, No.4, July-August 1997-Volume 45, p.7.

⁴ Russia and the Commonwealth of Independent States: documents, data, and analysis, p.501.

⁵ Ibidem, p. 495.

⁶ See Igor Ivanov, “We will do our best not to let the Country down,” *Nezavisimaia Gazeta*, 30 August 1998, - Quoted in Fedorov, Yuri, Quoted work, p.30.

⁷ Russia and the Commonwealth of Independent States: documents, data, and analysis, p.252.

Some authors consider that if Russia can not yet answer adequately to the West's "challenges", when the uninterrupted "front" line is not possible, Russia shall preserve the important strategic bridge heads – Kaliningrad - Belarus – Moldova - Crimea – Yugoslavia.¹ Yet in the event of increasing of the Russian-Western variances Moscow could attempt establishing a buffer security zone, which would include Belarus, Ukraine and Moldova.²

NATO extension towards Eastern Europe has become an argument used by both Moscow and Tiraspol to sustain the Russian troops' stationing in Transnistria. Thus, Russian State Duma has rejected the ratification of the 1990 Moldovan-Russian Treaty of friendship and co-operation and pleaded against the Russian troops' withdrawal from Moldova, because, in its opinion, these are necessary to counteract the NATO expansion towards East.³

Therefore, it should be stressed that a peaceful NATO enlargement, without confrontation with Russia, is an indispensable condition for maintaining the neutrality status of the Republic of Moldova.

Also it is important that understanding between NATO and Russia on the Alliance's enlargement does not affect the security of third countries, including the Republic of Moldova, by dividing Europe into new spheres of influence. It is a certain fact that during the 19th – 20th centuries, Russia has decided Moldova's fate with the accord of one Western Great Power or another. The Soviet-Nazi Pact is the most famous but not single example. It was remarked in Chapter III of this study that the May 1942 Soviet-British Treaty contained a secret clause, by which Great Britain would recognise the Soviet Union's "right" over Bessarabia and Northern Bucovina. Also the US agreed with the respective Soviet demands in the summer of the same year.

Concerning the fate of the whole of Eastern Europe one should mention the summit conferences of the World War II coalition allies (Teheran, 1943, Yalta, February 1945 and Potsdam, July-August 1945), at which the Great Powers, i.e. Soviet Union, United States and Great Britain divided Europe in spheres of influence. In fact, Europe's division was decided in the so-called "Percentage Agreement", concluded by British Premier Winston S. Churchill and Soviet Leader Iosif Stalin in October 1944. Churchill himself describes the details of the spheres-of-influence arrangement in his memories *The Second World War*.⁴ In terms of percentages, Eastern Europe's division envisaged: in Romania and Bulgaria, Soviet Union obtained 90 percent and 75 percent influence, the West – 10 percent and 25 percent; in Greece, 90 percent Western

¹ Climov, Evgeniy, "Moldova v contexte geopoliticheskikh interessov Rossii v Yugo-Zapadnoi Evrope: istoria, sovremennosti i perspectiva," in *Politica Externă a Republicii Moldova: aspecte ale securității și colaborării regionale* (Materiale ale Simpoziului științific internațional, Chișinău, 16-17 octombrie 1997), Chișinău, p. 197.

² See - Serebrian, Oleg, *Va exploda Estul? Geopolitica spațiului pontic*, p. 31.

³ See - Gribincea, Mihai. *Trupele Ruse în Republica Moldova: factor stabilizator sau sursă de pericol?*, p.129-130.

⁴ There was used - Churchill, Winston S., *The Second World War* (Russian edition), (Moskva: Voennoe izdatelystvo, 1991).

influence and 10 percent Soviet; Hungary and Yugoslavia were divided according to a 50-50 basis.¹ The effective realisation of the named agreement is certified by the letter on 23 June 1945 addressed by Premier Churchill to marshal Stalin² as well as the contents of the conversation between them on the eve of the Potsdam Conference.³

Though the Eastern Europe's fate during Cold War had been decided earlier, the Yalta conference (February 1945) is frequently painted as the summit at which the Great Powers divided Europe in spheres of influence. According to George Konrad, "it was at Yalta that helpless Eastern Europe was divided; it was there that agreements were reached for military zones of occupation that would become political spheres of interest as well. Yalta gave birth to a system of international relations based upon a state of rivalry and equilibrium between the Soviet Union and the United States. Whether the three old gentlemen who met there knew it or not, the idea of the Iron Curtain was born at Yalta, a symbol of great-power logic".⁴

Dissatisfaction with the results of the Yalta conference over the years has led to repeated and periodic demands for what former French President Mitterrand called *sortir de Yalta*.⁵

In the post-Cold War era, the so-called "Yalta syndrome" has arisen in Central and Eastern Europe. In Baltic opinion, it means the fear that a too cautious and pragmatic attitude towards Russia assumed by the Western allies may lead to the falling of some East-European countries into the new sphere of Russian influence again.⁶ The Yalta syndrome has been common in the whole of Central and Eastern Europe. Thus "fears of the creation of new dividing lines among the countries in Central and southern Central Europe, which share the same legacy and do not differ dramatically in their post-communist development, increased, and the internal political dimension of the Yalta syndrome began to dominate the political agenda."⁷ A Polish author writes, "Through Polish eyes, Europe continues to be divided".⁸ A Romanian one specifies, "Though the "Iron Curtain," described by Churchill does not exist yet, there is a clear new dividing line between an institutional and a non-institutional

¹ See - Churchill, Winston S., *The Second World War, Volume VI Triumph and Tragedy* (Russian edition), p. 449.

² *Ibidem*, p. 627-628.

³ *Ibidem*, p. 660-662.

⁴ Konrad, G., *Antipolitics*, London: Quarted Boocs, 1984, p.1, - Quoted in *Baleanu, V.G., Nationalism and Security in Post-Communist East Central Europe* G48, CSRC, September 1995, p.9.

⁵ Baleanu, V.G., *Nationalism and Security in Post-Communist East Central Europe*, p.9.

⁶ See - Vitkus, Gediminas: *At the crossroad of alternatives: Lithuanian security policies in 1995-1997*, *Baltic Security: Looking towards the 21th century*, Edited by Gunnars Artéus & Atis Lejiuns. Riga: Latvian Institute of International affairs & Försvarshögskolan, 1997, p. 67.

⁷ See - Ratchev, Valeri, *The Balkan View, Consequences of the Madrid Summit on security and stability in Europe*, Edited by NATO Defense College, Rome, 1998, p.63.

⁸ See - Karkoska, Andrzy, "A view from Poland," *NATO Enlargement: Opinions and Options*, Edited by J. Simon, Washington D.C., 1995.

Europe”.¹ Another, Western explains, “We want to avoid creating new divisions in Europe but forget that membership of any organisation creates divisions among those who belong and those who do not”.² The Yalta syndrome became a discussing issue even on the other side of the Atlantic Ocean. As the former Senior Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of European and Canadian Affairs, Department of State and current US Ambassador in Moldova, Rudolf V. Perina has stated before the Committee on International Relations, House of Representatives, “Russia has an important role to play in the new Europe. At this point, let me state definitively: our comprehensive approach to enlargement does not – I repeat, does not – include any sort of secret deal with Russians, period.”³

To prevent new dividing lines in Europe, the provisions of the Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Co-operation and Security between NATO and the Russian Federation on 27 May 1997 are very important. It expressly stipulates that NATO and Russia seek “creating in Europe a common space of security and stability, without dividing lines or spheres of influence limiting the sovereignty of any state” and “will co-operate to prevent any possibility of returning to a Europe of division and confrontation, or the isolation of any state”.⁴ The NATO-Russian commitment to base their relations according to the UN Charter and the Helsinki Final Act is also welcomed. In particular the following principles of their co-operation should be noted:

- Refraining from the threat or use of force against each other as well as against any other state, its sovereignty, territorial integrity or political independence in any manner inconsistent with the United Nations Charter and with the Declaration of Principles Guiding Relations Between Participating States contained in the Helsinki Final Act;
- Respect for sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of all states and their inherent right to choose the means to ensure their own security, the inviolability of borders and peoples’ rights of self-determination as enshrined in the Helsinki Final Act and other OSCE documents”.⁵

NATO has reaffirmed its goal to create a common European space of security and stability, without dividing lines or spheres of influence limiting the sovereignty of particular states in Madrid Declaration on Euro-Atlantic Security and Co-operation⁶ and other important documents.

¹ See - Paşcu, Mircea Ioan, “Securitatea europeană și extinderea NATO,” *România-NATO – Parteneriat și Cooperare*, București: Editura militară, 1999, p.36.

² See - Eekelen, Willen van, “Paradox and Practice in European Integration,” *Central European Issues-Romanian Foreign Affairs Review*, Volume 3, Number 1, Bucharest, 1997, p. 11.

³ See - Hearing before the Committee on International Relations, House of Representatives One Hundred Fourth Congress, Second Session, June 20, 1996, Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1996, p.7.

⁴ Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security between NATO and the Russian Federation, *NATO Review*, No.4, July-August 1997-Volume 45, Special insert, p.7.

⁵ Ibidem, pp. 7-8.

⁶ Madrid Declaration on Euro-Atlantic Security and Co-operation, Issued by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Madrid on 8 July 1997, *NATO Review*, No.4, July-August 1997-Volume 45, Special insert, p. 3.

Nevertheless, the Yalta syndrome is deeply founded and it persists in the foreign and security policy's activities of the Republic of Moldova. For instance, in welcoming the NATO Secretary General NATO Javier Solana in February 1997, the Moldovan President Petru Lucinschi stressed, "it is important that the NATO enlargement process does not create tensions and division lines in Europe which could lead to the emergence of confrontation alliances."¹

In conclusion, two main conditions are vitally important for Moldova's neutrality survival: the peaceful Alliance's enlargement, without NATO-Russian confrontation and understanding between NATO and Russia on the Alliance's enlargement, without dividing Europe into new spheres of influence.

¹ OSCE Mission to Moldova, 1997-1998 Mission Reports, Report No. 5/97 on 28 February 1997: Monthly Report: February 1997 "Visit in Moldova by NATO Secretary General Javier Solana (10-11 February)".

V.2. Second Wave of the NATO Enlargement and Moldovan Neutrality's Fate: Virtual Scenarios

“Enlargement will have implications for all European nations, including states which do not join NATO early or at all.”

**Study of NATO Enlargement
September 1995**

The first wave of the NATO enlargement unfolded in the Central European area and finished with Visegrad countries' adhering to the North Atlantic Alliance. At the July 1997 Madrid Summit it was decided to review the enlargement process in 1999. Romania and Slovenia in southeastern part of Central Europe and Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania in its northern part were recognised as possible candidates for NATO membership during the second wave of enlargement. Though the April 1999 Washington Summit did not invite Romania, Slovenia and the three Baltic States to begin accession talks, it has recognised the continuing efforts and progress in all these countries. Moreover NAC has welcomed the positive developments in both Bulgaria and Slovakia and has also encouraged the reform efforts in both Macedonia and Albania. The Washington Summit took no decision on Alliance enlargement perhaps because of its coincidence with the air campaign in Yugoslavia and the consequent deterioration of NATO-Russian relations.

Nevertheless, it is certain that the North Atlantic Alliance's enlargement process will continue. Slovenia and Romania, joined later by Bulgaria in the southern Europe and the three Baltic States, constitute two groups of real candidates for the next wave.

At the same time, Russia's counteraction against NATO extension towards its borders remains on the security agenda, too. Given the current security situation and the perennial Russian interests in the Balkan area, the main events of the second wave of the Alliance's enlargement seem to be enfolded on the southern flank. In this respect it was mentioned that since the Madrid Summit, Moscow has been tempted to overact and Sofia and Bucharest to overreact, with Russia regarding the non-invited states as “an area for manoeuvre.”¹

Taking into consideration the strategic location of the Republic of Moldova, it could not avoid its involvement concerning the next wave of the North Atlantic Alliance's enlargement. Thus, the initially uncertain Moldovan

¹ Ratchev, Valeri, The Balkan View, in *Consequences of the Madrid Summit on security and stability in Europe*, Edited by NATO Defense College, Rome, 1998, p.56.

neutrality has transformed itself from an internal question into an issue with implications on regional and geopolitical interests.¹

The Republic of Moldova could also not avoid the impact on its security and neutrality of the West-Russian geo-political interests' concussion. This study describes some virtual scenarios regarding the fate of the Moldovan neutrality in the framework of the NATO enlargement process. Obviously, the character of the relations between NATO and Russia constitutes the basic determinant for Moldova's neutrality evolution. Other important preconditions are the EU extending towards East and both internal and external situations in Romania and Ukraine.

If the southern group of candidates – Romania, Slovenia and Bulgaria join NATO, without worsening of the NATO-Russian relations there are possible two main scenarios on the evolution of the Neutrality status of the Republic of Moldova.

Scenario No 1 is named "The survival of the Republic of Moldova as an independent and neutral state". The major precondition for its realisation is Moldova's accession and adherence to the EU.

The majority of the population constantly agrees this strategic course of its foreign policy. The idea of European integration is largely supported by the political parties, too, especially after the financial crisis in Russia in August 1998. In short, this idea was expressed by the former Parliament deputy Vladimir Solonari, who remarked: "The society has realised that the long-term character of the Russian crisis makes it impossible for Moldova to orient itself towards East. Its reorientation towards West is not a matter of ideological or cultural preferences, it is an imperative".² Most political parties (except communist) have signed a declaration supporting Moldova's adherence to the EU. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs has prepared the Draft of the National Strategy of the Republic of Moldova's association with the EU, which was not yet examined by the Parliament.

In the near future, the adoption of this strategy and its implementation will largely depend on the ruling party. The post-electoral declarations of President Vladimir Voronin and Premier Vasile Tarlev show that European integration will remain a strategic course of the foreign policy under the Communist Government.

The Communists' victory in the recent parliamentary elections seems to draw the attention of Brussels, which until now had a careless attitude toward the integration intentions of Chisinau. Anyway, Moldova seems to finally be accepted into the Stability Pact for the South-Eastern Europe, which will allow

¹ Nedelciuc, Vasile, "O neutralitate incertă: impactul ei asupra securității Republicii Moldova," in *Arena Politicii*, Anul II, nr.2 (14), Octombrie 1997, p.8.

² See – *Nezavisimaia Moldova*, 20 noiabrea 1998.

Shilova, R. A., "Otnoshenia Moldovy so stranami Zapadnoi Evropy," *Novaia Rossia: Rossia i strany bližnego zarubejia*, *Sbornic statiei No 9*, (Moscv, 1999), p. 108.

the beginning of the association process to the EU. Being a small country, Moldova will not constitute a social-economic burden for Western countries. It is true that for now the country does not meet the criteria set for the association and adherence to the EU. It is also true that being continuously isolated, Moldova will not be able to meet these criteria soon.

It is very important that Moldova's adherence to the EU does not generate protests externally, on the part of Russia. Unlike NATO enlargement to the East, the EU expansion was never opposed by Russia. As it was mentioned, not even the possible adherence of the Baltic States to the EU rose any suspicions on the part of Moscow. Given the neutrality status of the Republic of Moldova, Moscow's attitude towards its possible adherence to the EU must be benevolent.

EU membership will positively influence the social-economic situation within the country. Furthermore, it will indispensably bring to the resolution of the Transnistrian conflict and the consolidation of the independence and neutrality of this country.

Scenario No 2 could be entitled "The abandonment of the neutrality of the Republic of Moldova as a result of its integration with Romania". Though this scenario is hardly possible in the near and medium future it should be considered, too. Its main preconditions are the enlargement of both NATO and EU until the River Prut and the independent, West-oriented Ukraine' survival.

According to the former Speaker of the House of Deputies in the Romanian Parliament Ion Diaconescu the reunification between Romania and Moldova will be possible only when Romania is "economically attractive" for the Moldovans.¹ Also Western analysts have noted, "The peaceful re-unification between Romania and Moldova cannot take place, as only a democratic, economically successful Romania could persuade Moldova into such a re-unification".²

Romania's adherence to the EU, leaving Moldova out of the European area, will inevitably lead to a bigger gap in the economic development and standard of living in the two countries, which will make Romania more attractive for the population of the Republic of Moldova. In this respect it should be mentioned the flooding of the Romanian embassy in Chisinau in 2000 with Moldovan applicants seeking Romanian citizenship, following the EU's decision to begin accession negotiations with Romania. This has showed that Moldova's citizens fear of being shut out of the common European area. Nevertheless there is a difference between seeking Romanian citizenship by Moldovan applicants and the union of the two states.

It should also be pointed out that Romania's adherence to the EU would most probably be preceded by its admittance to NATO. Certainly, Moscow will not accept in any case Moldova's unification with Romania – a NATO member

¹ Baleanu, V.G., Romania At A Historic Crossroads G65, CSRC, June 1998, p.36.

² Ibidem, p.75.

– and will not accept NATO’s expansion in the post-Soviet area according to the German model.

If the North Atlantic Alliance’s moving into southern Europe is followed by worsening of the NATO-Russian relations, the following two scenarios on the Moldovan Neutrality’s prospects would be possible.

Scenario No 3 is entitled “Losing the neutrality of the Republic of Moldova as result of its adhering to Union of Russia and Belarus”. The main precondition of this Scenario could be the reorientation of the Ukraine’s strategic course towards East.

An opinion poll shows that about one third of Moldova’s population agreed to the Russia-Belarus Union in 1997 (See the following Table).

The opinion poll data on adhering of the Republic of Moldova to Union of Russia and Belarus*

Answer Variant	Opinion poll data Summer1997	Opinion poll data Autumn 1997
Yes	35,3	19,8
Rather Yes than No	-	10,5
Rather No than Yes	-	6,9
No	35,5	35,6
It is difficult to answer	28,1	25,5
No answer	1,1	1,1

* Source: Moşneaga, V., Danii, T., Ţurcanu, V., “Obsestvennoe mnenie Respubliki Moldova o vneshnei politiki strany,” *Politica Externă a Republicii Moldova: aspecte ale securităţii și colaborării regionale (Materiale ale Simpoziului științific internațional, Chișinău, 16-17 octombrie 1997)*, Chișinău, 1998, p. 223.

Since 1997 the number of the proponents of this Union has increased and the February 2001 parliamentary elections have showed that about 50 per cent of the voters agreed it.

The electoral program of the current ruling party included the examination of the issue of adherence of the Republic of Moldova to this Union. After the elections Voronin has repeatedly declared that he wants Moldova to join the Russia- Belarus Union and he would do it submitting the proposal to a referendum.

It is obvious that the chances to realise this scenario will significantly depend on the future status of Ukraine. For the moment, Moldova’s joining the Russia – Belarus Union cannot be viable as long as Ukraine will be out of this Union. The fall of the Yushchenko Government has brought up more weaknesses of the Ukrainian State. Anyway, foreign and security policies of Ukraine do not yet have an irreversible character. No doubt, Moscow understands quite well that a new Eastern Union is not real without Ukraine,

therefore, it makes a lot of effort to ensure its adherence to the Russia – Belarus union.

The deputy chief of the Russian State Duma's Committee for CIS issues, Viacheslav Igrunov has stressed that Russia and Belarus are interested in Moldova's entering into their Union from the ideological point of view, because this could favour the further union with Ukraine and encumber the NATO expansion.¹

The Republic of Moldova's joining the Union of Russia and Belarus will result into its inclusion into the common state structures, including the military-political one that would mean the automatic lose of the neutrality status of the country. Furthermore entering into the Russia-Belarus Union would be really followed by losing State independence of the Republic of Moldova, which will be transformed from a state into a province (gubernia) of this new Eastern State Union.

Scenario 4 "Losing Moldovan Neutrality as a result of joining together with Romania a new eastern political-military Bloc". The main preconditions of this Scenario could be Ukraine's joining the Russia-Belarus Union and delaying Romania's joining both NATO and EU.

Although, at the first sight, this scenario seems unreal, in case all the above conditions exist, it could become real. The delay of Romania's adherence to the Euro-Atlantic structures could lead to the total failure of reforms in this country, followed by the aggravation of the internal social and political tensions. Because of this, one can see growing tendencies for Transylvania's autonomy, supported from the outside as well. The use of military force to resolve this rising conflict could be counterproductive, and Belgrade's actions in Kosovo are an eloquent example in this regard. Moreover, the Western message is in favour of observing human rights, including those of national minorities and the settlement of the Transylvania issue exclusively by political means.

This state of danger for Romania's national security is extensively exploited by Moscow, which offers Bucharest guarantees for ensuring the territorial integrity in exchange to Romania's adherence to the new political-military Eastern Bloc. In Moscow's opinion, Romania's geopolitical role is to ensure the connection of the Eastern Slavs with Yugoslavia and the isolation of Bulgaria on the West with a follow on inclusion of it in the new Eastern Bloc. The realisation of this scenario will ensure the Eastern Bloc not only the restoration of the southern borders of the former Warsaw Pact, but also its advancement into a new area – Yugoslavia – a non-aligned country during the Cold War. The key-role Romania could play in fulfilling this geopolitical counteroffensive of Russia is indisputable. Therefore, Moscow's offer should be equal. Beside ensuring the inviolability of Romania's borders on the West, Russia will have to use for the first time ever the Bessarabia/Moldova trump. The permission to re-establish the territorial unity and of the people of Romania

¹ Moldavskie vedomosti, No 15 (360), 3 marta 2001 goda.

and the Republic of Moldova, contributing even to the realisation of this unification – this is the trump Russia could use to restore its geopolitical position in the Balkans.

How could Romania react?

On the one hand, it should be noted that the European vocation of Romania is indisputable. Although, throughout its agitated history, Romania (until 1859-1862, the principalities of Moldova and Walachia) was dominated both militarily and politically by eastern empires, the Latin origin, Christian belief and geographic situation have always maintained its sober pro-European mind.

On the other hand, the constant note of its century-old history was the unity of its people. Romanian foreign policy for the last 150 years was aimed at realising this national objective. The Independence War of 1877-1878, the adherence to the Central Powers Bloc in 1882, its involvement in the two world wars are the most eloquent examples in favour of the above. It should also be noted that Romania's strategic course to realise the national unity had not always had a democratic, western character. Thus, on the eve of the World War II Romania did not find a solution to the dilemma of security clearly expressed by the great diplomat Nicolae Titulescu.¹ Joining in 1940 the Axe countries and entering on June 22, 1941 World War II on the side of Germany, Romania was at war not only with the Soviet Union, but also with the western nations led by Great Britain and the USA.

At the beginning of the third millennium Romania could face a new difficult dilemma: the integration into Western security structures to the prejudice of the idea of national unity (abandoning the idea of unification with the Republic of Moldova and the threat of separatism in Transilvania), or the integration into a new Eastern political-military Bloc, thus ensuring the national unity.

Given the high economic dependence of the Republic of Moldova on Russia, Chişinău's stance would not vary much from that of Moscow, in any case, it would not be able to influence the realisation of such a huge geopolitical plan.

Regarding the Transnistrian separatism, Moscow could simply repeat the words of one of the classics of Russian literature: "I begot you and I will kill you".

There are arguments pleading in favour of some of Moscow's intentions, which perfectly fit into this scenario. Thus, after the Yeltsin-Snegur meeting in Moscow on 12 December 1991, President Yeltsin was highly impressed by the conversation with his Moldovan counterpart saying: Moldova is ready to join the CIS and bring Romania as well.² It is possible that the authors of the 21 December 1991 Declaration in Alma-Ata thought of Romania, when they

¹ See Titulescu, Nicolae, Quoted work, p.323.

² See - Cojocaru, Gheorghe E., Separatismul în slujba Imperiului, p.173.

included in the text of this document the provision on the possibility of joining the CIS of other states that were not part of the former Soviet Union.¹

After his visit in Moscow in September 1997, the ex-chairman of the House of Deputies in the Romanian Parliament Ion Diaconescu told journalists that the deputies of the Russian State Duma assured him Russia would not necessarily oppose the reunification of Moldova and Romania. They, however, conditioned it with a referendum to take place on both sides of the Nistru (Dniester) river.² At a higher geopolitical level, the Russian deputies advised the Romanians to avoid NATO integration, because “the Americans would cheat the Romanians anyway”, and said that Romania had no reason to be afraid of Russia.³ In this context it should be also noted the remarks made in Sofia that since the Madrid Summit, Moscow has been tempted to overact “regarding the non-invited states as “an area for manoeuvre”.⁴

Also it has been remarked that in order to consider herself secure against Hungary’s “revisionism”, Romania would be prepared to cement a military alliance with Serbia and Slovakia, which could end as a forward arm of Russia against NATO”.⁵ The possibility of uniting of the Republic of Moldova with Romania in a Russian manner has been mentioned, too.⁶

¹ The Alma-Ata Declaration on 21 December 1991 stipulates, “The Commonwealth of Independent States is open, with the agreement of all its participants, to states – members of the former USSR, as well as other states – that share the goals and principles of the Commonwealth”. See - Alma-Atinscaia Declaratsia ot 21 decabrea 1991 goda, *SODRUJESTVO*, Vipusc pervii, Minsk 1992, p.15;

See also - The Alma-Ata Declaration on 21 December 1991 (FBIS Translation), *Russia and the Commonwealth of Independent States: documents, data, and analysis*, p. 48.

² “Russian Legislators not Opposed to Romanian – Moldovan Reunification”, *RFE/RL Newslines*, part 2, 23 September 1997; Dima, Nicholas, Quoted work, p.204.

³ Ibidem.

⁴ Ratchev, Valeri, The Balkan View, in *Consequences of the Madrid Summit on security and stability in Europe*, Edited by NATO Defense College, Rome, 1998, p.56.

⁵ See - Baleanu, V.G., Romania At A Historic Crossroads G65, CSRC, June 1998, p.73-74.

⁶ See - Dima, Nicholas, Basarabia și Bucovina în jocul geopolitic al Rusiei, p.207.

Serebrian, Oleg, Va exploda Estul? Geopolitica spațiului pontic, p. 93.

V.3. Strengthening Moldovan Neutrality: Measures to Be Taken

Taking into account the current geopolitical situation in Europe, especially the NATO-Russia relations regarding the Alliance's enlargement to the East in the near and medium future, the Republic of Moldova can maintain its political independence only as a neutral state, having an equidistant position toward the political-military bodies of the West and the CIS. On the one hand, Moldova's adherence to NATO is not a real solution. Moreover, Chişinău's tentative to promote a course of integration into the Euro-Atlantic Alliance could justify Russia's pressure, including military, on the Moldovan State. On the other hand, Moldova's adherence to the Eastern political-military structures would finally lead to a voluntary renunciation of the state independence. Consequently, in the current security situation in Europe and especially in the Balkan region, Moldova's promotion of a policy of neutrality corresponds to its basic national interests and contributes to the consolidation of regional and European stability and security. Hence, one cannot talk about the abandonment of the permanent neutrality status of the Republic of Moldova, as some authors have been proposed.¹

On the contrary, the internal and external policy efforts should be aimed at a real insurance of the permanent neutrality status, proclaimed in the Constitution. For this, it is necessary to realise a complex program of activities both internal and external, which could include:

1. The finishing off and adoption of the Concept on the permanent neutrality of the Republic of Moldova, establishing the basic features of the Moldovan model of neutrality, serving as a basis for the elaboration and promotion of the foreign and security policy. This Concept should analyse the current European and regional security context, the evolution of European neutrality in the post-Cold War era, the contents of national security of the Republic of Moldova at a multidimensional level, the main features of the foreign policy to be promoted according to the neutrality status of the country.

2. The elaboration and adoption of the Law on permanent neutrality of the Republic of Moldova, which will ensure the legislative basis for the country's neutrality, revealing largely the respective stipulations in the Constitution.

3. The adoption of the national strategy on the Republic of Moldova's association and adherence to the EU. European integration is compatible with the neutrality status of the Republic of Moldova and constitutes, in the current security situation on the European continent, a chance for Moldova's survival as

¹ For instance Viorel Moşanu has wrote, "The abandonment of neutrality policy which does not provide effective solutions for challenges the Republic of Moldova faces could become a Gordian knot for Moldovan society in a near future", See - Moşanu, Viorel, "The Neutrality Policy of the Republic of Moldova. A Case Study," in *Central European issues*, Volume 5, No.2, 1999/2000, p.75.

See also Gribincea, Mihai, *Politica rusă a bazelor militare în Moldova și Georgia*, p. 203.

an independent and neutral state. Therefore, the Republic of Moldova's adherence to the EU should constitute the strategic objective of its foreign policy in the near and medium perspective.

4. The promotion within the country of the idea of neutrality of the Republic of Moldova, as a best solution in the current international relations framework and a solid basis for ensuring its national unity. Given the polarisation of the Moldovan society, regarding the strategic course of the foreign policy, people must be convinced that neutrality is the best solution for reconciliation and national unity. In this regard, the neutrality experience of Switzerland could serve as an example.

5. Increasing the efforts aimed at the withdrawal of the OGRF from the Transnistrian region of the Republic of Moldova, constituting at present the main barrier in the affirmation of Moldova's neutrality, because this idea is not credible as long as foreign troops are stationed on its territory. Because Russia's intentions to withdraw its troops from Moldova are just declarations it is necessary that Chisinau return to the idea of promoting a UNO resolution regarding the withdrawal of Russian troops from Moldova, an idea abandoned in 1993 under the pressure of Moscow.¹ The withdrawal of Russian troops and demilitarisation of Transnistria is imperative for the security and stability of the independent and neutral Moldova.

6. The orientation of the strategy of the social-economic development of the Republic of Moldova towards the diversification of energy resources and commodity markets. It was stressed that Moldova's survival depends on finding either alternative methods of financing (such as trading agricultural goods for energy supplies) or further potential economic partners outside the former Soviet republics.²

7. The promotion, externally, of the image of the Republic of Moldova as a permanently neutral state, which contributes to the strengthening of the regional and European stability and security. Indeed, Moldova's neutrality corresponds to the security interests of Ukraine, Romania, Bulgaria as well as other countries in the region. It also corresponds to Moscow's official policy towards NATO's enlargement to the East. The independent and neutral Moldova perfectly fits into the policy of the North Atlantic Alliance regarding non-admittance of a new division of Europe into spheres of influence.

8. Taking necessary measures to ensure support for the neutrality status of the Republic of Moldova on the part of foreign states, especially neutral countries. The principles of solidarity and co-operative security are not compatible with the indifferent attitude of the foreign states toward the neutrality and security of the Republic of Moldova. There is hope that the

¹ See - Gribincea, Mihai. *Politica rusă a bazelor militare în Moldova și Georgia*, pp.198-199.

² King, Charles, *Post – Soviet Moldova: A Borderland in Transition / Moldova post – sovietică: un ținut de hotar în tranziție*, p.104.

foreign states, especially Austria and Finland, which have resolved in the past similar security problems Moldova faces now, will take attitude.

9. Undertaking efforts to recognise the neutrality of the Republic of Moldova by:

- Commonwealth of Independent States;
- Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe;
- Non Alignment Movement;

10. Undertaking necessary efforts by the UNO General Assembly to adopt a resolution regarding the permanent neutrality of the Republic of Moldova and giving it international recognition. Adoption by the General Assembly of UNO of the resolution regarding the permanent neutrality of Turkmenistan created a very important precedent in the history of neutrality, which could be followed by Moldova as well.

Fulfilling the above program of activities will result in the implementation of the permanent neutrality of the Republic of Moldova and its international recognition, which will ensure support of the international law and justice.

CHAPTER VI CONCLUSIONS

The Republic of Moldova proclaimed her neutrality in conditions of fierce disputes on the neutrality meaning in post-Cold War era - the third discussion of this kind during the 20th century caused by the overcoming of the global East – West confrontation and beginning of the NATO enlargement towards Eastern Europe.

The foreign and security policy of Western Neutrals in the post-Cold War era testifies to the modification of the content of neutrality in accordance with the new security environment. Their Cold War restricted neutrality has been replaced by a more flexible and co-operative neutrality policy. Nevertheless, Western Neutrals' activism towards European integration and co-operation with NATO does not mean the abandonment of neutrality.

Moreover, after the fall of the Iron Curtain the neutrality idea – as a security solution – was largely debated by the Central and Eastern European countries, including the NIS countries of the former Soviet area. Though the Central European countries, including the Baltic States have abandoned this idea in the favour of the NATO membership, neutrality has gained positions in some CIS states, i.e. Moldova, Belarus, Ukraine and Turkmenistan. Consequently, neutrality took roots in the countries East of the possible eastern border of the North Atlantic Alliance and which will remain out of the future area of NATO responsibility. In a way, one could talk about the expansion of neutrality towards East, anticipating NATO enlargement in the same direction. In any case, the neutrality experience of these countries has proved the assertion about the neutrality's nonsense in the post Cold War era seem to be premature. Indeed, because of the lack of alternative solutions for security, neutrality cannot be considered senseless. In this respect the former President of the Swiss Confederation, Dr. Max Petitpierre mentioned once: "For as long as there is no efficacious, collective security system to assure world peace, neutrality remains useful, even necessary".¹

The Moldovan neutrality has been determined by internal and external reasons. The Republic of Moldova has never existed as an independent political entity within its present borders, but has been a classic borderland for centuries. With the proclamation of state independence in 1991 the security dilemma "East or West" has polarised the Moldovan society. The internal confrontation between opposing political forces culminated with the armed conflict in 1992, in which foreign troops stationing on the eastern territory of the country were involved. Therefore it is natural that the dilemma "East or West" was replaced

¹ Petitpierre, Max, "Is Swiss Neutrality Still Justified?", *Ogley, Roderick, The theory and Practice of Neutrality in the Twentieth Century*, p. 178.

by the third security solution – neutrality, which was seen first of all as a means of providing the national conciliation and cohesion within the Republic of Moldova. Indeed, main opinion polls have showed the majority of the population of the Republic of Moldova supports the country's permanent neutrality status.

The withdrawal of Russian troops from national territory has been one of the main issues of the Moldovan foreign policy. Nevertheless, the OGRF continues to station on the territory of the Republic of Moldova against its neutrality status and the rules of international law constituting a direct threat to both national and regional stability and security.

Taking into consideration the external security implications, Moldova has not joined the CIS' Collective Security Treaty abstaining itself from the military-political co-operation within this organisation. Since 1994 the Republic of Moldova has also not voiced any intention to join the North Atlantic Alliance. Nevertheless, Moldova considers its neutrality compatible with the PfP Programme. It has yet adopted a neutral position on NATO's expansion into Central Europe and considers the enlargement strategy should necessarily take into account all possible factors and consequences, including the Russian factor.

The enlargement of the North Atlantic Alliance towards Eastern Europe has emphasized the external significance of the neutrality status of the Republic of Moldova. The foregoing analysis of existing trends in both NATO enlargement process and the Russian opposition against it has led to the conclusion that the main events of the second wave of the Alliance's enlargement would be enfolded in southeastern Europe. Moldova's strategic location between the CIS area and the Balkan Peninsula has determined the transformation of its neutrality into an issue with implications on regional geopolitical interests. For West oriented Ukraine and for both Romania and Bulgaria, who seek North Atlantic Alliance membership, the permanent neutrality of Moldova, followed by the withdrawal of the foreign troops from its sovereign territory, is surely more acceptable than its integration into the CIS military-political structures. Yet taking into consideration the perennial Balkan interests of Russia, it would be impossible for Republic of Moldova to avoid the impact of the next wave of the NATO enlargement.

The eventual worsening of the NATO-Russian relations on the enlargement issue would be injurious for the Moldovan neutrality. Also it is important that understanding between NATO and Russia should not lead to dividing Europe into new spheres of influence, affecting this way the security of third countries without military-political arrangements. Therefore, two main conditions are vitally important for Moldova's neutrality survival: the peaceful Alliance's enlargement, without NATO-Russian confrontation and understanding between NATO and Russia on the Alliance's enlargement, without dividing Europe into new spheres of influence.

Hence, there is very necessary the definition of a comprehensive approach to the European security system, which would consider the Russian factor without limiting the sovereignty of any state. In other words, the Russian factor should be taken into consideration, without forgetting the Yalta syndrome.

Four main virtual scenarios regarding the fate of the Moldovan neutrality in the framework of the NATO enlargement process are entitled as it follows:

- The survival of the Republic of Moldova as an independent and neutral state;
- The abandonment of the neutrality of the Republic of Moldova as a result of its integration with Romania;
- Losing the neutrality of the Republic of Moldova as a result of its adhering to the Union of Russia and Belarus;
- Losing Moldovan Neutrality as a result of joining together with Romania a new eastern political-military Block.

The basic determinant for these scenarios could be the character of the NATO-Russian relations, the enlargement of the European Union towards Eastern Europe, the internal situation and the military-political status of Romania and Ukraine.

To provide the credibility of its permanent neutrality status the Moldovan State is obliged to take a number of measures, aiming at its recognising by the international community. This could surely favour removing the barriers on the way of strengthening Moldova's neutrality and independence, like illegal stationing of foreign military forces on its sovereign territory. Also its association and integration into the European Union it is in Moldova's strategic interests.

Finally, it is important to stress once more that neutrality should be seen as a security solution and not an end in itself. For the time being maintaining the neutrality status corresponds to an optimum safeguarding of the Moldovan national interests. National interests have always prevailed over neutrality. The former President of Finland Urho Kekkonen indicated to Finns in his political testament that if events will take such a turn that national interests will come in contradiction with neutrality policy, national interests must not be given up. It is an indisputable truth that this virtual security dilemma of neutral states has not yet become actual for the Republic of Moldova.

ABBREVIATIONS

ADP	Agrarian Democratic Party
CDPF	Christian-Democratic Popular Front
CDPP	Christian-Democratic Popular Party
CEE	Central and Eastern Europe
CFE	Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe
CESDP	Common European Security and Defense Policy (EU)
CFDP	Common Foreign and Defense Policy (EU)
CIS	Commonwealth of Independent States
CPRM	Communist Party of the Republic of Moldova
CRS	Congressional Research Service
CSRC	Conflict Studies Research Centre (UK)
EAPC	Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council
EEC	European Economic Community
ESDI	European Security and Defense Identity (EU)
EU	European Union
MASSR	Moldovan Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic
MSSR	Moldovan Soviet Socialist Republic
NACC	North Atlantic Co-operation Council
NAM	Non-Alignment Movement
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NIS	newly independent states
OSCE	Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe
PCA	Partnership and Cooperation Agreement (EU-Russia)
PFM	Popular Front of Moldova
RFE/RL	Radio Free Europe / Radio Liberty
TMR(PMR)	Transnistrian Moldovan Republic (Pridnestrovscaya Moldavscaya Respublica)
WEU	Western European Union

ANNEX 1

**THE CONSTITUTION OF THE REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA
ADOPTED ON 29TH JULY 1994.
(EXTRACT)**

**TITLE I
GENERAL PRINCIPLES**

Article 1. The State of the Republic of Moldova

- (1) The Republic of Moldova is a sovereign, independent, unitary and indivisible state.
- (2) The form of government of the State is the republic.
- (3) Governed by the rule of law, the Republic of Moldova is a democratic State in which the dignity of people, their rights and freedoms, the open development of human personality, justice and political pluralism represent supreme values, that shall be guaranteed.

Article 3. The Territory

- (1) The territory the Republic of Moldova is inalienable.
- (2) The frontiers of the country are sanctioned by an organic Law under the observance of unanimously recognized principles and norms of international law.

Article 8. Observance of International Law and International Treaties

- (1) The Republic of Moldova pledges to respect the Charter of the United Nations and the treaties to which she is a party, to observe in her relations with other states the unanimously recognized principles and norms of international law.
- (2) The coming into force of an international treaty containing provisions contrary to the Constitution shall be preceded by a revision of the latter.

Article 11. The Republic of Moldova is a Neutral State

- (1) The Republic of Moldova proclaims her permanent neutrality.
- (2) The Republic of Moldova will not admit the stationing of any foreign military troops on its territory.

TITLE VI
REVISING THE CONSTITUTION

Article 142. Limits of Revision

- (1) The provisions regarding the sovereignty, independence and unity of the State, as well as those regarding the permanent neutrality of the State may be revised only by referendum based on a majority vote of registered voting citizens.
- (2) No revision shall be allowed if it results in the suppression of the fundamental rights and freedoms of citizens, or of the guarantees of those rights and freedoms.
- (3) The Constitution may not be revised under a state of national emergency. Martial law or war.

ANNEX 2

**DECLARATION
OF INDEPENDENCE OF THE REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA**

THE PARLIAMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA, constituted after free and democratic elections,

taking into account the millenary history of our people and its uninterrupted statehood within its historical and ethnic area of its national making,

considering the acts of dismemberment of its national territory between 1775 and 1812 as being contradictory to the historical right of its people and the judicial stature of the principality of Moldova, acts recalled by the entire historical evolution and the free will of the population of Bassarabia and Bukovina,

underlining the existence of Moldavians in Transnistria, a component part of the historical and ethnic territory of our people,

acknowledging that declarations by many parliaments of many states consider the agreement of August 23, 1939 between the government of the USSR and the government of Germany null and void ab inilio and demand that the political and judicial consequences of the above be eliminated, a fact revealed also by the declaration of the international conference "The Molotov — Ribbentrop pact and its consequences for Bassarabia", adopted on 28 June 1991,

pointing out that, without the prior consultation of the population of Bassarabia, Northern Bukovina and Hertza District, occupied by force on June 28, 1940 as well as the Moldavian Soviet Socialist Autonomous Republic (Transnistria) established on Oct. 12, 1924, the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, by infringing its constitutional prerogatives, adopted the "Law of the USSR on the establishment of the Moldavian SSR" on August 2, 1940, and its Presidium issued "The Decree concerning the frontiers between the Ukrainian SSR and the Moldavian SSR", on November 4, 1940, judicial acts whereby, in the absence of any real legal basis, it was attempted to justify the dismantlement of those territories and the incorporation of the new republic into the USSR,

recalling that during the recent years the democratic national liberation movement of the population of the Republic of Moldova reaffirmed its aspirations for freedom, independence and national unity, expressed in final documents of the Great National Reunion of Chişinău on 27 August, 1989, 16 December, 1990 and 27 August, 1991, laws and decisions of the Parliament of the Republic of Moldova concerning the laws reintroducing Romanian as the state language and the Latin alphabet on August 31, 1989, the state flag on 27 April, 1990, the state emblem on November 3, 1990 and the change of the official name of the republic on May 23, 1991,

taking as a basis the declaration concerning State Sovereignty of the Republic of Moldova, adopted by the parliament on June 23, 1990, and the fact that the population of the Republic of Moldova, in its own right as a sovereign people, did not participate at the referendum on the preservation of the USSR, held on March 17, 1991, in spite of the pressures exercised by the state organs of the USSR,

taking into account the irreversible processes taking place in Europe and elsewhere in the world calling for democracy, freedom and national unity, for the establishment of a state of law and the transformation towards a free market,

reaffirming the equal rights of peoples and their right to self-determination as laid down in the UN Charter, the Helsinki Final Act and the norms of international law pertaining to the above,

considering, in view of all of the above, that the time has come for , the proclamation of a judicial act, in accordance with the history of our people and moral norms of international law,

PROCLAIMS SOLEMNLY,

in the virtue of the right of self-determination of peoples, in the name of the entire population of the Republic of Moldova, and in front of the whole world , that:

THE REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA IS A SOVEREIGN, INDEPENDENT AND DEMOCRATIC STATE, FREE TO DECIDE ITS PRESENT AND FUTURE, WITHOUT ANY EXTERNAL INTERFERENCE, KEEPING WITH THE IDEALS AND ASPIRATIONS OF THE PEOPLE WITHIN ITS HISTORICAL AND ETHNIC AREA OF ITS NATIONAL MAKING.

In its quality as a SOVEREIGN AND INDEPENDENT STATE, THE REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA, hereby

requests all states and world governments to recognize the independence of the Republic of Moldova, as proclaimed by the freely elected parliament of the republic and is willing to establish political, economic and cultural relations and any other relations of common interest with European countries and all other countries of the world, and is ready to establish diplomatic relations with the above, in accordance with the norms of international law and common practice on the above matter,

requests the United Nations to admit the Republic of Moldova as a full member of the world organization and its specialized agencies,

declares that is ready to adhere to the Helsinki Final Act and the Paris Charter for a new Europe, equally asking to be admitted to the CSCE and its mechanisms, with equal rights,

requests the USSR to begin negotiations with the government of the Republic of Moldova to terminate the illegal state of occupation and annexation and the withdrawal of Soviet troops from its national territory,

decides that no other laws should be respected on its territory but those that are in conformity with the republic's constitution, laws and all other legal acts adopted by the legally constituted organs of the Republic of Moldova,

guarantees the exercise of social, economic , cultural and political rights for all citizens of the Republic of Moldova, including those of national, ethnic, religious and linguistic groups, in conformity with the provisions of the Helsinki Final Act and documents adopted afterwards, as well as the Paris Charter for a new Europe.

SO HELP US GOD !

Adopted in Chisinau, by the Parliament of the Republic of Moldova on this day, the 27th of August, 1991.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Document sources

Documents on NATO Enlargement

The North Atlantic Treaty, Washington DC, 4th April 1949, *NATO Handbook – 50th Anniversary Edition*, Office of Information and Press, NATO, (Brussels, 1998).

The Declaration on a Transformed North Atlantic Alliance, Issued in London, UK, on 6 July 1990.

The Declaration on Peace and Cooperation, issued in Rome, Italy, on 8 November 1991, *NATO Handbook*, NATO Office of Information and Press, (Brussels, 1995).

The Alliance's Strategic Concept, agreed by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Rome on 7-8 November 1991, *NATO Handbook*, NATO Office of Information and Press, (Brussels, 1995).

Partnership for Peace: Invitation, Issued by Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council held on NATO Headquarters, Brussels, on 10-11 January 1994, *NATO Review*, No.1 – February 1994, Volume 42.

Partnership for Peace: Framework Document, *NATO Review*, No.1 – February 1994, Volume 42.

Declaration of the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council held at NATO Headquarters, Brussels, on 10-11 January 1994. *NATO Review*, No.1 – February 1994, Volume 42.

NATO Participation Act of 1994, *Morrison, James W., NATO Expansion and Alternative Future Security Alignments, McNair Paper 40, April 1995*, (Washington, DC, National Defense University).

NATO Security Revitalization Act of 1995, *Morrison, James W., NATO Expansion and Alternative Future Security Alignments, McNair Paper 40, April 1995*, (Washington, DC, National Defense University).

Study of NATO Enlargement, (Brussels: September 1995).

Hearing before the Committee on International Relations, House of Representatives, One Hundred Fourth Congress, Second Session, June 20, 1996, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington: 1996.

Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security between NATO and the Russian Federation, Issued in Paris, France, on 27 May 1997, *NATO Review*, No.4, July-August 1997-Volume 45.

Madrid Declaration on Euro-Atlantic Security and Cooperation, Issued by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Madrid on 8 July 1997, *NATO Review*, No.4, July-August 1997-Volume 45.

Charter on a Distinctive Partnership between the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation and Ukraine, Issued in Madrid, Spain, on 9 July 1997, *NATO Review*, No.4, July-August 1997-Volume 45.

The Washington Declaration, Signed and issued by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Washington D.C. on 23 and 24 April 1999, *The Reader's Guide to the NATO Summit in Washington, 23-25 April 1999*, NATO Office of Information and Press, (Brussels, Belgium).

Washington Summit Communiqué, Issued by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Washington D.C. on 24 April 1999, *The Reader's Guide to the NATO Summit in Washington, 23-25 April 1999*, NATO Office of Information and Press, (Brussels, Belgium).

The Alliance Strategic Concept, Approved by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Washington D.C. on 23 and 24 April 1999, *The Reader's Guide to the NATO Summit in Washington, 23-25 April 1999*, NATO Office of Information and Press, (Brussels, Belgium).

Documents and Data on the Republic of Moldova

Arhiva Guvernului Republicii Moldova, Fondul "Decrete și ordonanțe ale Președintelui Republicii Moldova".

Barometrul de opinie publică: Republica Moldova – ianuarie 2001, Sondaj de opinie realizat de Centrul pentru Studiarea Opiniei și Pieței (CSOP) la solicitarea Institutului de Politici Publice (IPP), (Chișinău, Ianuarie 2001).

Barometrul de opinie publică – 2000, Sondaj de opinie realizat de Institutul de Marketing și Sondaje (IMAS) la solicitarea Institutului de Politici Publice (IPP), (Chișinău, August 2000).

Bessarabia (Documentary Outline), The Institute of Military History and Theory, (Bucharest, 1992).

Ciobanu, Ștefan, Unirea Basarabiei: Studiu și documente cu privire la mișcarea națională din Basarabia în anii 1917-1918, (Chișinău: Editura "Universitas", 1993).

Communiqué issued by Ministerial meeting of the North Atlantic Council, NATO Headquarters, Brussels, 1 December 1994 - in *NATO Review*, No.6, December 1994 / No.1, January 1995, Volume 42.

Comunicat privind neutralitatea României (6 septembrie 1939), *Istoria României între anii 1918-1944: Culegere de documente*, Ioan Scurtu(ed.), București: (Editura didactică și pedagogică, 1982).

Comunicatul conferinței Înțelegerii Balcanice (Belgrad, 2-4 februarie 1940), *Istoria României între anii 1918-1944: Culegere de documente*, Ioan Scurtu (ed.), București: (Editura didactică și pedagogică, 1982).

Concepția despre neutralitatea permanentă a Republicii Moldova (Proiect), Ministerul Apărării al Republicii Moldova.

Concepția Politicii Externe a Republicii Moldova, *Monitorul Oficial al Republicii Moldova*, Nr.20, 6 aprilie 1995.

Concepția Securității Naționale a Republicii Moldova, *Monitorul Oficial al Republicii Moldova*, Nr. 35-XIII, 29 iunie 1995.

Constituția Republicii Moldova, Adoptată la 29 iulie 1994 / The Constitution of the Republic of Moldova, Adopted on 29th July 1994, Editor – the State Direction for Information Assurance MOLDPRES, (Chișinău, 1994).

Cu privire la Raportul politic al Comitetului Central al PCRML la congres și sarcinile imediate ale partidului, Hotărârea Congresului al IV-lea (al XXI-lea) al Partidului Comuniștilor din Republica Moldova, *Comunistul*, Nr. 19 (235), 4 mai 2001.

Declarația Parlamentului Republicii Moldova privind aspecte ale securității și dezarmării, Nr. 708-XII, 10 septembrie 1991, *Legi și Hotărâri adoptate la Sesiunea a șasea a Parlamentului Republicii Moldova de legislatura a douăsprezecea*, Volumul 2, (Chișinău: Cartea Moldovenească, 1991).

Doctrina Militară a Republicii Moldova, *Monitorul Oficial al Republicii Moldova*, Nr.38-39, 14 iulie 1995.

Economy & Reforms, Bulletin of Information and Analysis, No. 3(160), April 2000.

EIU Country Report: Belarus, Moldova, 1999 - 2000, The Economist Intelligence Unit, 15 Regent St, London SW1Y 4LR, United Kingdom.

Hotărârea Sovietului Suprem al RSS Moldova cu privire la serviciul militar al cetățenilor RSS Moldova, Nr. 254-XII, 4 septembrie 1990, *Legi și Hotărâri adoptate la Sesiunea a doua extraordinară a Sovietului Suprem al R.S.S. Moldova de legislatura a douăsprezecea*, (Chișinău: Cartea Moldovenească, 1990).

Hotărârea Sovietului Suprem al RSS Moldova privind Declarația cu privire la suveranitate, 23 iunie 1990, *Legi și Hotărâri adoptate la Sesiunea întâi a Sovietului Suprem al R.S.S. Moldova de legislatura a douăsprezecea*, (Chișinău: Cartea Moldovenească, 1990).

Informatsia ob obychnyh voorujennyh silah Respubliki Moldova, Dogovor ob Obychnyh Voorujennyh Silah v Evrope, Ejegodnyi obmen informatsiei, Deistvitelino po sostoianiu na 01.01.1995, Chișinău, 1995.

Informatsia ob obychnyh voorujennyh silah Respubliki Moldova, Venskii Document 1994 g., Ejegodnyi obmen informatsiei, Deistvitelino po sostoianiu na 01.01.1996, Chişinău, 1996.

Lege cu privire la participarea Republicii Moldova la operațiunile internaționale de menținere a păcii, Nr. 1156-XIV, 26 iulie 2000, *Monitorul Oficial al Republicii Moldova*, Anul VII, Nr.149-151 (696-699), Editor: Agenția Națională de presă Moldpres, 30 noiembrie 2000.

Legea privind Declarația de Independență a Republicii Moldova, Nr.691-XII, 27 august 1991, *Legi și Hotărâri adoptate la Sesiunea a șasea a Parlamentului Republicii Moldova de legislatura a douăsprezecea*, Volumul 2, (Chişinău: Cartea Moldovenească, 1991).

The Moldovan/Trans-Dniester Conflict, *Russia and the Commonwealth of Independent States: documents, data, and analysis* / edited by Zbigniew Brzezinski and Paige Sullivan, (New York: Center for Strategic and International Studies, 1997).

Nedelciuc, Vasile, The Republic of Moldova, (Chişinău, July 1992).

OSCE Mission to Moldova: Reports 1993-2001.

The Pact Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact and its consequences for Basarabia: Documents, (Chisinau, Publishing House “Universitas”, 1991).

The PfP Presentation Document of the Republic of Moldova on March 16, 1994;

Republica Moldova / Respublica Moldova / The Republic of Moldova / La République de Moldavie, (Chişinău: Universitas, 1991).

Sbornic informatsionno-analiticheskikh materialov, (Kiev: Blagotvoritelinyi Fond “Meridian” – Tsentri Issledovaniia Krizisnykh Obshestv, 1999-2000).

Soglashenie o printsipah mirnogo uregulirovania voorujennogo conflicta v Pridnevstrovskom regione Respubliki Moldova, *Diplomaticeskii Vestnic*, No. 15-16, 15-31 avgusta 1992 g., (MID RF (Rossii), 1992).

Statement issued at the meeting of the North Atlantic Cooperation Council, Istanbul, Turkey, 10 June 1994, *NATO Review*, No.3, June 1994, Volume 42.

Strategia dezvoltării social-economice a Republicii Moldova, Adoptată la Conferința I a Partidului Comuniștilor din Republica Moldova la 18 decembrie 1999. (Chişinău, 2000).

Documents on Neutrality and Security

Charter of the United Nations and Statute of the International Court of Justice, Published by the United Nations Department of Public Information, (New York, September 1993).

Contseptsia natsionalnoi bezopasnosti Rossiiskoi Federatsii, *Arbatov, Alexei, Transformatsia rossiiskoi voennoi doctryny – uroki Kosovo i Chechni*, The Marshall Center Papers, No 2.

Constitutsia Ukrainy, Priineata na piatoi sesii Verhivnoi Rady Ukrainy 28 cervnea 1996 roku, (Kiev, 1996).

Dogovor o drujbe, sotrudnicestve i vzaimnoi pomoshchi, 14 maia 1955, *Warshavskii dogovor: istoria i sovremennosti*, Pod redactsiei generala armii P.G.Lusheva, (Moscva: Voennoe izdatelistvo, 1990) / Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual assistance, May 14, 1955, *The Avalon Project at the Yale Law School, The Warsaw Security Pact: May 14, 1955*,

<http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avajon/intdip/soviet/warsaw.htm>

Estonian Neutrality Law of December 1st, 1938,

http://www.letton.ch/lvx_38.htm

The European Security Development and Finnish Defence, Report by the Council of State to Parliament on 17 March 1997 (Edita: Helsinki, 1997).

Federal Constitutional Law of 26 October 1955 on the Neutrality of Austria, *Austrian Federal Constitutional Laws (selection)*, Published by the Federal Press Service, (Vienna, 1995).

Informatsia ob obychnyh Voorujennyh Silah Rossiiskoi Federatsii, V sootvetstvii s Protocolim ob uvedomleniah i obmene informatsiei, Dogovor ob Obychnyh Voorujennyh Silah v Evrope, Deistvitelino po sostoianiu na 01.01.2000, (Moscva-2000 g.)

Informatsia ob obychnyh Voorujennyh Silah Rossiiskoi Federatsii, V sootvetstvii s Protocolim ob uvedomleniah i obmene informatsiei, Dogovor ob Obychnyh Voorujennyh Silah v Evrope, Deistvitelino po sostoianiu na 01.01.1995, (Moscva-1995 g.)

The Military Doctrine of Finland, Statement by the Commander-in-Chief of the Finnish Defense Forces Admiral Jan Klenberg, *Seminar on Military Doctrine*, (Vienna, 9 October 1991).

The Neutrality Act on May 1, 1937;

The Neutrality Act on November 4, 1939;

Osnovy Contseptsii Natsionalnoi Bezopasnosti Litvy (Draft), Departament po ohrane craia, (Vilnius, 1991).

Ot Pacta Molotova-Ribbentropa do Dogovora o Bazah: Dokumenty i Materially, (Tallinn, "Periodica", 1990).

O Voennoi doctrine gosudarstv – uchiastnicov Warshavscogo dogovora, Warshavskii dogovor: istoria i sovremennosti, *Pod redactsiei generala armii P.G.Lusheva*, (Moscva: Voennoe izdatelistvo, 1990).

The Permanent neutrality of Turkmenistan: Collection of political and legal documents, (Ashgabat, 2000).

Rapport annuel du Conseil Fédéral sur la Participation de la Suisse au Partenariat pour la Paix de l'OTAN en 1997 (du 18 mars 1998).

Report by the Council of State to the Parliament “Security in a Changing World”, Issued in Helsinki, on 6 June 1995.

Report of the Study Commission on the Strategic Studies, Issued in Bern, on 26 February 1998;

Rights and Duties of Neutral Powers and Persons in Case of War on Land (Hague V); October 18, 1907, *The Avalon Project at the Yale Law School, Laws of War*, <http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/lawofwar/hague05.htm>

Rights and Duties of Neutral Powers in Naval War (Hague XIII); October 18, 1907, *The Avalon Project at the Yale Law School, Laws of War*, <http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/lawofwar/hague13.htm>

Security in a Changing World: Guidelines for Finland’s Security Policy, Report by the Council of State to the Parliament 6 June 1995, (Helsinki: Publications of Ministry for Foreign Affairs, 1995).

Security through Cooperation: Report of the Federal Council to the Federal Assembly on the Security Policy of Switzerland, Issued in Bern, on 7 June 1999;

Sodrujestvo: Informaționnîi vestnic Soveta glav gosudarstv i pravitelstv SNG, (Minsk, 1992 – 1996).

State Treaty for the Re-establishment of an Independent and Democratic Austria, *Austrian Federal Constitutional Laws (selection)*, Published by the Federal Press Service, (Vienna, 1995).

Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance between the Republic of Finland and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, *Library of Congress / Federal research Division / Country Studies / Area Handbook Series / .../ Appendix* http://memory.loc.gov/frd/cs/finland/fi_appnb.html

Swiss Neutrality and Foreign Policy in the 90-s (Shveitsarskii Neitralitet i Vneshneiaia Politica v 90-e gody), *Shveitsarskii Vestnic (Russian edition)*, No.1, Issued in Bern, on 31 January 1994.

The Swiss Partnership for Peace Programme: Clusters of Competence, Federal Military Department, General Secretariat, Permanent PfP Office, February 1997.

Swiss Security in Times of Change: Report 90 of the Federal Council to the Federal Assembly on Switzerland’s Security Policy, Issued in Bern, on 1 October 1990.

Vneshneaya Politica Neytralinogo Turkmenistana: Rechi, Vystupleniya i Interviu Prezidenta Turkmenistana Saparmurada Turkmenbashi, (Ashgabat, 1997).

Voennaia doctrina Rossiiskoi Federatsii, Utverjdena Ucazom Prezidenta Rossiiskoi Federatsii ot 21 aprelea 2000 g. No. 706, *Krasnaia Zvezda*, 12 maia 2000 g.

Voenna Doctrina Ukrainy, approved by Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine on 18 October 1993.

Books and Articles

Moldovan / Romanian

Bârsan, Victor, Masacrul inocenților: Războiul din Moldova, 1 martie – 29 iulie 1992 (București: Editura Fundației Culturale Române, 1993).

Buscher, Klemens, "Punctele tari ale politicii externe," *Arena Politicii*, Anul II, nr.2 (14), Octombrie 1997.

Buzatu, Gheorghe, România și Războiul Mondial din 1939-1945, (Iași: Centrul de istorie și civilizație europeană, 1995).

Cernovodeanu, Paul, Drama unei provincii istorice românești în context politic internațional (1806-1920), (București: Editura Albatros, 1993).

Certan, E. E., Relațiile ruso-române în anii 1859-1863, (Chișinău: Cartea Moldovenească, 1969).

Chelaru, Mircea, O posibilă soluție... (București: Editura Balek, 1993).

Chinn, Jeff, "Patriile naționale externe și politica externă a Republicii Moldova," *Politica Externă a Republicii Moldova: aspecte ale securității și colaborării regionale (Materiale ale Simpoziului științific internațional, Chișinău, 16-17 octombrie 1997)*, (Chișinău, 1998).

Chirtoacă, Nicolae, "Parteneriatul cu NATO în contextul intereselor de lungă durată ale Republicii Moldova," *Politica Externă a Republicii Moldova: aspecte ale securității și colaborării regionale (Materiale ale Simpoziului științific internațional, Chișinău, 16-17 octombrie 1997)*, (Chișinău, 1998).

Ciobanu, Ștefan, Cultura românească în Basarabia sub stăpânirea rusă, (Chișinău: Editura enciclopedică "Gheorghe Asachi", 1992).

Cojocaru, Gheorghe E., Politica externă a Republicii Moldova (studii), (Chișinău: Civitas, 1999).

Cojocaru, Gheorghe E., Politica externă a Republicii Moldova (studii), Ediția a doua revăzută și adăugită, (Chișinău: Civitas, 2001).

Cojocaru, Gheorghe E., Separatismul în slujba Imperiului, (Chișinău: Civitas, 2000).

Cojocaru, Gheorghe E., Sfatul Țării Itinerar, (Chișinău: Civitas, 1998).

Dima, Nicholas, Basarabia și Bucovina în jocul geopolitic al Rusiei, (Chișinău: Editura Prometeu, 1998).

Dragnev, Demir și Varta, Ion, Istoria Românilor. Epoca modernă (a doua jumătate a secolului al XVIII-lea -1918), (Chișinău: Civitas, 2000).

Duțu, A., Botoran, C., Retegan, M., Transilvania în evoluția relațiilor româno-ungare, (București, 1993).

Economia Republicii Moldova în perioada de tranziție: evaluare și tendințe. (Chișinău: Cetini, 1998).

Expres-ancheta "AP", *Arena Politicii*, Anul II, nr.2 (14), Octombrie 1997.

Gribincea, Mihai, *Politica rusă a bazelor militare: Moldova și Georgia*, (Chișinău: Civitas, 1999).

Gribincea, Mihai, *Trupele Ruse în Republica Moldova: factor stabilizator sau sursă de pericol ?*, (Chișinău: Civitas, 1998).

Heitmann, Klaus, *Limbă și politică în Republica Moldova*, (Chișinău: Editura ARC, 1998).

Moldovan, Petre P., *Moldovenii în istorie*, (Chișinău: Poligraf-Service, 1993)

Munteanu, Igor, "Moldova și CSI: o alianță fragilă," *Arena Politicii*, Anul II, nr.2 (14), Octombrie 1997

Nedelciuc, Vasile, "O neutralitate incertă: impactul ei asupra securității Republicii Moldova," *Arena Politicii*, Anul II, nr.2 (14), Octombrie 1997.

Negru, Gheorghe, *Țarismul și mișcarea națională a românilor din Basarabia*, (Chișinău: Prut Internațional, 2000).

Negru, Nicolae, "Politica externă a Republicii Moldova: intenții și intenții, în *Arena Politicii*, Anul II, nr.2 (14), Octombrie 1997.

Nistor, Ion, *Istoria Basarabiei*, (Chișinău: Cartea Moldovenească, 1991).

Pașcu, Mircea Ioan, "Securitatea europeană și extinderea NATO," *România-NATO – Parteneriat și Cooperare*, (București: Editura militară, 1999).

Pântea, Iurie, *Aspectul militar în soluționarea conflictului din zona de Est a Republicii Moldova*, (Paper presented to the Institute of Public Politics, Chișinău, May 2001).

Pântea, Iurie, *Neutralitatea în lumea contemporană*, *Arena politicii*, Anul I, nr.10, iunie 1997.

Pâslaru, "Ștefan, *Evoluția relațiilor România – NATO*," *România-NATO – Parteneriat și Cooperare*, (București: Editura militară, 1999).

Petrencu, Anatol, *România și Basarabia în anii celui de-al doilea război mondial*, (Chișinău: Epigraf, 1999).

Postică, Elena, *Rezistența antisovietică în Basarabia, 1944-1950*, (Chișinău: Întreprinderea editorial-poligrafică "Știința", 1977).

Repida, A., *Formarea RSS Moldovenești*, (Chișinău: Cartea Moldovenească, 1977).

România în anii celui de-al doilea război mondial, Volumul I, (București: Editura militară, 1989).

România în anii primului război mondial, Volumul I, (București: Editura militară, 1987).

Roșca, Iurie, *Exerciții de luciditate*, (Chișinău: Civitas, 2000).

Scurtu, Ioan și Buzatu, Gheorghe, *Istoria Românilor în secolul XX (1918-1948)*, (București: Editura Paidea, 1999).

Serebrian, Oleg, *Politosfera*, (Chișinău: Editura Cartier, 2001).

Serebrian, Oleg, *Va exploda Estul? Geopolitica spațiului pontic*, (Cluj-Napoca: Editura Dacia, 1998).

Șișcanu, Ion, Împotmoliți în tranziție, (Chișinău: Civitas, 1999).

Șișcanu, Ion, “Un cap de pod rusesc în sud-estul Europei,” *Arena Politicii*, an.I, nr.8, Chișinău, februarie 1997.

Șofranksy, Octavian, Republica Moldova: capital geopolitic, (Chișinău: Editura Cartier, 1999).

Titulescu, Nicolae, Politica externă a României (1937), (București: Editura enciclopedică, 1994).

Russian

Arbatov, Alexei, Transformatsia Rossiiskoi voennoi doctriiny – uroki Kosovo i Chechni, Marshall Center Papers, No. 2.

Berg, L. S., *Bessarabia. Strana – Liudi – Xozaistvo*, (Chișinău: Universitas, 1993).

Climov, Evgeniy, “Moldova v contexte geopoliticescih interessov Rossii v Iugo-Zapadnoi Evrope: istoria, sovremennosti i perspectiva,” *Politica Externă a Republicii Moldova: aspecte ale securității și colaborării regionale (Materiale ale Simpoziului științific internațional, Chișinău, 16-17 octombrie 1997)*, (Chișinău, 1998).

Cliucevskiy, V.O., Socineniya v deveati tomah. Curs Russkoi istorii. Ciasti I, V, (Moscva: Mysli, 1987, 1989).

Ganiushkin, B. V., Neitralitet i neprisoedinenie, Moscva: Izdatelistvo “Mejdunarodnye otnoshenia”, 1965.

Grosul, G. S., Dunaiskie Kneajestva v politike Rossii 1774 – 1806, (Chișinău: Izdatelistvo “Știința”, 1975).

Istoria Vnesnei Politiki SSSR, Tom pervyi: 1917-1945g.g., pod redactsiei A.A.Gromyco, B.N.Ponomariova, (Moscva: Nauca, 1986).

Kepbanov, E.A., Postoyanniy neitralitet Turkmenistana: rogramma na XXI vec, (Ashabad, 1999).

Lazarev, A.M., Moldavscaia sovietscaia gosudarstvennosti i bessarabskii vopros, (Chișinău: Cartea Moldovenească, 1974).

Lysiakova, L. M., “Economoca Respubliki Moldova: Mejdu Rossiei i Evropoi,” *Novaia Rossia: Rossia i strany blijnogo zarubejia, Sbornic statiei No 7*, (Moscva, 1998).

Moșneaga, V., Danii, T., Țurcanu, V., “Obsestvennoe mnenie Respubliki Moldova o vneshnei politiki strany,” *Politica Externă a Republicii Moldova: aspecte ale securității și colaborării regionale (Materiale ale Simpoziului științific internațional, Chișinău, 16-17 octombrie 1997)*, (Chișinău, 1998).

Pasat, Valeriu, *Surovaya pravda istorii: Deportatsii s territorii Moldavskoi SSR 40-50 g.g.*, (Chișinău, Momentul, 1998).

Repida, A., Obrazovanie Moldavskoi ASSR, (Chișinău: Știința, 1974).

Russko-turetskaia voina 1877-1878, Pod redactsiei I. I. Rostunova, (Moscv, Voennoe izdatelstvo Ministerstva Oborony SSSR, 1977).

Semenova, I. V., Rossia i osvoboditelinaia boriba moldavscogo naroda protiv ottomanscogo iga v contse XVIII v., (Chişinău: Ştiinţa, 1976).

Seregin, A., "O problemah ucreplenia natsionalnoi i regionalnoi bezopasnosti Finleandii," *Zarubejnoe voennoe obozrenie*, No 11, (644) 2000.

Sheremet, V.I., Turtsia i Adrianopoliskii mir 1829 g., (Moskva: Izdatelstvo "Nauca", Glavnaia redactsia vostocinoi literatury, 1975).

Shilova, R. A., "Otnoshenia Moldovy so stranami Zapadnoi Evropy," *Novaia Rossia: Rossia i strany blijnogo zarubejia, Sbornic statiei No 9*, (Moscv, 1999).

Shilova, R. A., "Politicheskie partii Respubliki Moldova," *Novaia Rossia: Rossia i strany blijnogo zarubejia, Sbornic statiei No 7*, (Moscv, 1998).

Solonari, Vladimir, "Vnesneaea politika Moldovy: ogranicennye vozmojnosti i surovzâye realinosti vnesnego mira," *Politica Externă a Republicii Moldova: aspecte ale securităţii şi colaborării regionale (Materiale ale Simpoziului ştiinţific internaţional, Chişinău, 16-17 octombrie 1997)*, (Chişinău, 1998).

Type, Born, "Dobrososedscoe sotrudnicestvo," *Nezavisimoe Voennoe Obozrenie*, No. 32 (205), 1-7 senteabrea 2000.

Waters, T., "Tactica "canatohodtsa" moldabscoi voennoi diplomatii v natovscom "tsirke," *Politica Externă a Republicii Moldova: aspecte ale securităţii şi colaborării regionale (Materiale ale Simpoziului ştiinţific internaţional, Chişinău, 16-17 octombrie 1997)*, (Chişinău, 1998).

Yugo-Zapadnyi Teatr Voennyh Deistvii: Obschii Obzor, (Moscv: Voennoe izdatelstvo Ministerstva Oborony SSSR, 1981).

Zalzshkin, M. M., Vneshneaia politika Rumynii i rumyno-russkie otnoshenia 1875-1878, (Moscv, Izdatelstvo "Nauca", 1974).

English

Austin, Daniel F.C., NATO Expansion and the Baltic States, (Sandhurst: Conflict Studies Research Centre, Royal Military Academy, February 1999).

Bajarunas, Eitvydas, "Lithuania's security dilemma," in *Chaillot Paper 19: The Baltic States: security and defense after independence*, (Paris: Institute for Security Studies of Western European Union, June 1995).

Baleanu, V. G., Nationalism and Security in Post-Communist East Central Europe, G48, CSRC, September 1995.

Baleanu, V.G., Republic of Moldova's Acrobatic Diplomacy, F 61, CSRC, September 1997.

Baleanu, V.G., Romania At A Historic Crossroads, G 65, CSRC, June 1998.

Ballantine, V.G., "Moldova's Relations with Romania in the Aftermath of their Elections," presented at the *International Conference "Highway or Barrier?: The Republic of Moldova's Integration into the Euro-Atlantic Structures"*, (Chisinau, Republic of Moldova, 26-27 April 2001).

Bellamy, Christopher, "Russia & Post-Soviet Security – Does Russia Still Matter?" *War & Peace in Post-Soviet Eastern Europe*, Cummings, Sally, Dr (Ed), G81, CSRC, March 2000.

Birskavs, Valdis, "Baltic States and European security," *Cooperation and Partnership for Peace: a Contribution to Euro-Atlantic Security into the 21st Century*, (Editors: Carr, F. & Ifantis, K.).

Bowers, Stephen, "The crisis in Moldova," *Jane's Intelligence Review*, November 1992.

Brzezinski, Zbigniew, A geostrategy for Eurasia, *Foreign Affairs*, September / October 1997, Volume 76, Number 5.

Buzan, B., *People, States and Fear: An Agenda for International Securities Studies in the Post-Cold War Era* (Harvester Wheatsheaf: London, 1991).

Carrafiello, Lewis J. & Vertonen, Nico, "Removing the last wall: rethinking the Baltic security concept," *Baltic Security: Looking towards the 21st century*, Edited by Gunnars Artéus & Atis Lejiuns. (Riga: Latvian Institute of International affairs & Försvarshögskolan, 1997).

Churchill, Winston S., *The Second World War (Russian edition)*, (Moskva: Voennoe izdatelystvo, 1991).

Coh, Michael & MacGinty, Roger, "Farewell to a Beautiful Idea: The End of Neutrality in the Post-Cold World," *Small States and the Security Challenge in the New Europe*. Edited by Werner Bauwens, Armand Clesse and Olav F Knudsen, Luxembourg institute for European and International Studies, (London: Brassey's, 1996).

Cole, Roger, "Irish neutrality under threat from EU," *Irish Democrat*, Issue: Dec/Jan 1998, <http://www.midnet.ie/connolly/irishdem/irishneutralitydecjan.htm>

Dahinden, "Martin, Swiss security policy and partnership with NATO," *NATO Review*, No 4, Winter 1999, - Volume 47.

Dahl, Ann-Sofie, "Not if but how: Sweden's future relations with NATO," *NATO Review*, No 3, May-June 1997, Volume 45.

Danish Security Policy: A Survey by The Board of The Danish Commission on Security and Disarmament, (Copenhagen, 1993).

Dunn, John, The determinants and Future of Ukrainian Foreign and Security Policy, F45, CSRC, February 1995.

Eekelen, Willen van, "Paradox and Practice in European Integration," *Central European Issues – Romanian Foreign Affairs Review*, Volume 3, Number 1, Bucharest, 1997.

Forum, Volume I-II, (Chişinău: Copyright Viitorul Foundation, 2000-2001).

Frost, Howard E., "Eastern Europe's Search for Security," *Orbis*, (Winter 1993), (There was used the Russian reproduction for educational purposes by George C. Marshall European Center for Security Studies).

Gaddis, John Lewis, "History, Grand Strategy and NATO Enlargement," *Survival*, Vol. 40, no. I, Spring 1998.

Gribincea, Mihai, "Challenging Moscow's Doctrine On Military Bases", *Transition*, Vol. 1, No. 19, 20 October 1995.

Grove, Eric J., "A NATO view with comments on Dr. Knudsen's presentation," *Security in the Northern European Region: 1999 PfP International Seminar, Stockholm, 8 – 11 December 1999*, Editors: Samuel Grier, Manuel Almeida, Nils Förander, (Rome: NATO Defense College, Spring 2000).

Haab, Mare, Estonia and Europe: security and defense, *The Baltic States: security and defense after independence*, (Paris: Institute for Security Studies of Western European Union, June 1995).

Hägglund, Gustav, "Finnish defence policy aims to protect against external pressures," *NATO Review*, No 4 – July 1995, Volume 43.

Häikiö, Martti, "Changes in Finnish Security Policy: the Koivisto Presidency, 1981-1994," *Security and Insecurity: Perspectives on Finnish and Swedish defense and foreign policy*, Edited by Gunar Artéus & Jukka Nevakivi, Stockholm: Försvarshögskolan, 1997.

Ham, Peter van, Europe's New Defense Ambitions: Implications for NATO, the US, and Russia, *The Marshall Center Papers*, No.1, April 2000.

Holbrooke, Richard C., "United States relations with Romania," *Central European Issues – Romanian Foreign Affairs Review*, Volume 5, Number 1, Bucharest, 1999.

Horbulin, Volodymyr, "Ukraine's contribution to security and stability in Europe," *NATO Review*, No 3, Autumn 1998 –Volume 46.

Huldt, Bo, "Sweden and European Community-Building 1945-1992," *Neutral States and the European Community*, edited by Sheila Harden, (London: Brassey's, 1994), (There was used the reproduction in Russian for educational purposes by George C. Marshall European Center for Security Studies).

Hürner, R.G., "NATO Enlargement – A Survey of the Many-Faceted Russian Position," *Central European Issues – Romanian Foreign Affairs Review*, Volume 3, Number 2, Bucharest, 1997.

Ionescu, Mihai E., "The Development Process and the Search for Security: Past and Present in Romania's Case," *Central European Issues – Romanian Foreign Affairs Review*, Volume 1, Number 1, Bucharest, Autumn 1995.

Karatnycky, Adrian, "Meltdown in Ukraine," *Foreign Affairs*, New York, May/June 2001, Volume 80, Number 3.

Kharchenko, Ihor, "A view from Ukraine," *NATO Enlargement: Opinions and Options*, Edited by J. Simon, (Washington D.C., 1995).

King, Charles, "Eurasia letter: Moldova with a Russian face," *Foreign Policy*, Washington, Winter 1994, Issue No.97.

King, Charles, *Post – Soviet Moldova: A Borderland in Transition / Moldova post – sovietică: un ținut de hotar în tranziție*, (Iași: The Center for Romanian Studies, 1997).

King, Charles, *The Moldovans. Romania, Russia, and the Politics of Culture*, (Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 2000).

Kissinger, Henry, *Diplomacy*, (Simon & Schuster, New York, 1994).

Knudsen, Olav F., "Analysing the Security of Small State: The Role of External Factors," *Small States and the Security Challenge in the New Europe*. Edited by Werner Bauwens, Armand Clesse and Olav F Knudsen, Luxembourg Institute for European and International Studies, (London: Brassey's, 1996).

Knudsen, Olav F., "From national, via regional, to European security: Actors, challenges, and recommendations," *Security in the Northern European Region: 1999 Pfp International Seminar, Stockholm, 8 – 11 December 1999*, Editors: Samuel Grier, Manuel Almeida, Nils Förander, (Rome: NATO Defense College, Spring 2000).

Karkoska, Andrzy, "A view from Poland," *NATO Enlargement: Opinions and Options*, Edited by J. Simon, (Washington D.C., 1995).

Lahodynsky, Otmар, "The changing face of Austrian neutrality," *NATO Review*, No.6 – December 1992, Vol. 40 – pp.24-28, WEB Edition, A:\NATO Review 9206-5.htm

Lamont, Neil V., *Territorial Dimensions of Ethnic Conflict: the Moldovan Case*, *Foreign Military Studies Office*, 604 Lowe Drive, Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027-2322.

Larrabee, Stephen, "Security challenged on Europe's eastern periphery," *America and Europe*, (Cambridge University Press, 1997).

Latypov, Ural, *Belarussian Neutrality as a Factor of National and European Security*, *NATO-EAPC Fellowships*.

Lejins, Atis & Zaneta Ozolina, "Latvia – the Middle Baltic State," *Baltic Security: Looking towards the 21st century*, Edited by Gunnar Arteus & Atis Lejins, (Riga: Latvian Institute of International affairs & Försvarshögskolan, 1997).

Lepingwell, John W. R., "The Russian Military and Security Policy in the 'Near Abroad'," *Survival*, The IISS Quarterly, Autumn 1994, Volume 36/No 3.

Lyon, Peter, "Austria – A Neutralised State," *Ogley, Roderick, The theory and Practice of Neutrality in the Twentieth Century*, (London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1972).

The Military Doctrine of Finland: Statement by the Commander-in-Chief of the Finnish Defence Forces Admiral Jan Klenberg at the Seminar on Military Doctrine, (Vienna, 9 October 1991).

The Military Doctrine of Sweden: Statement by the Supreme Commander of Swedish Armed Forces General Bengt Gustafsson at the Seminar on Military Doctrine, (Vienna, 8 October 1991).

Mock, Alois, "Austria's role in the new Europe," *NATO Review*, No 2-March 1995, Volume 43.

Moşanu, Viorel, "The Neutrality Policy of the Republic of Moldova. A Case Study," *Central European issues– Romanian Foreign Affairs Review*, Volume 5, No.2, 1999/2000.

The NATO Secretary-General's Article in "Nezavisimaia Moldova," February 1997.

The NATO Secretary-General's Visit to Moldova, 28 to 29 September 1998, NATO Press Service, E:\Sections\Private.off\PRESS98\opemoldova.doc

The NATO Secretary-General's Article for the Moldovan Press, Date: 4 February 2000.

Nevakivi, Jukka, "Finnish Security Policy in a Geostrategic Perspective," *Security and Insecurity: Perspectives on Finnish and Swedish defence and foreign policy*, Edited by Gunar Artéus & Jukka Nevakivi, (Stockholm: Försvarshögskolan, 1997).

Norgaard, Ole, "Danish Policy in the Baltic Sea Area, 1945-1989: Looking at the Past through the Eyes of the Present," *German and Danish Security Policies towards the Baltic Sea Area: 1945 until Present*, Edited by Gunnar Artéus & Bertel Heurlin, (Copenhagen: Danish Institute of International Affairs, 1998).

Oldberg, Ingmar, "No love is lost – Russia's relations with the Baltic States," *Baltic Security: Looking towards the 21st century*, Edited by Gunnars Artéus & Atis Lejiuns. (Riga: Latvian Institute of International affairs & Försvarshögskolan, 1997).

Pânteia, Iurie Vladimir, "The Reform of the Armed Forces of the Republic of Moldova," *International Seminar: Rebuilding the Armed Forces for the XXIst Century*, Editors: Jeffrey Simon, Nicolae Uscoi and Constantin Moştofleii, (Bucharest, 1999).

Petitpierre, Max, "Is Swiss Neutrality Still Justified?," *Ogley, Roderick, The theory and Practice of Neutrality in the Twentieth Century*, (London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1972).

Pipes, Richard, "Is Russia Still an Enemy?," *Foreign Affairs*, New York, September/October 1997, Volume 76, Number 5.

Pop, Adrian, At the Crossroads of Interlocking Subregional Arrangements: Romania's Pivotal role in East Central Europe, Edited by NATO Defense College, (Rome, 1999).

Puşcaş, Vasile, "The New Political Geography of Post-Madrid Central Europe," *Central European Issues – Romanian Foreign Affairs Review*, Volume 5, Number 1, Bucharest, 1999.

Pushkov, Alexei, "A view from Russia," *NATO Enlargement: Opinions and Options*, Edited by J. Simon, (Washington D.C., 1995).

Ratchev, Valeri, "The Balkan View," *Consequences of the Madrid Summit on security and stability in Europe*, Edited by NATO Defense College, (Rome, 1998).

Rodman, Peter W., "America Adrift. A Strategic Assessment," *Central European Issues – Romanian Foreign Affairs Review*, Volume 3, Number 1, Bucharest, 1997.

Rosapepe, James C., "Romania and NATO: Knocking on an Open Door," *Central European Issues – Romanian Foreign Affairs Review*, Volume 5, Number 1, Bucharest, 1999.

Scheibner, Herbert, "The Jane's Interview," *Janes's Defence weekly*, Volume 33, 8 March 2000.

Shashenkov, Maxim, "Russian Peacekeeping in the 'Near Abroad,'" *Survival*, The IISS Quarterly, Autumn 1994.

Sherr, James, NATO's New Members: A Model for Ukraine? The Example of Hungary, G86, CSRC, September 2000.

Simon, Jeffrey, "Partnership for Peace (PfP): After the Washington Summit and Kosovo," *Strategic Forum*, National Defense University, Institute for National strategic Studies, Number 167, August 1999.

Sloan, Stanley R., "NATO Enlargement and the Former European Neutrals," *CRS Report for Congress, Library of Congress*, <http://www.fas.org/man/crs/crs2.htm>

Socor, Vladimir, Moldova Votes Red. Was It a Fluke, or Worse?, *The Wall Street Journal Europe*, <http://ptg.djnr.com/ccrroot/asp/publib/story.asp>

Solomon, Gerald B., The NATO Enlargement Debate, 1990-1997, Published with the Center for Strategic and International Studies, The Washington Papers / 174, (Washington D.C. 1998).

Solomon, Gerald B., Peacekeeping in the Transnistrian Region: a test case for the CSCE, AL 228 PC (94) 6, North Atlantic Assembly, November 1994.

Șofranksy, Octavian, Interethnic relations in Moldova: the impact of European Integration," presented at the *International Conference "Highway or Barrier?: The Republic of Moldova's Integration into the Euro-Atlantic Structures"*, 26-27 April 2001, (Chisinau, Republic of Moldova, 2001).

Taina, Annely, "The Jane's Interview," *Janes's Defence weekly*, 17 June 1995.

Taina, Annely, Security in a Changing Europe: A Finnish View, <http://www.cedr.org/96Book/Taina.htm>

Tinca, Gheorghe, "The Romanian View," *Consequences of the Madrid Summit on security and stability in Europe*, Edited by NATO Defense College, (Rome, 1998).

Udovenko, Hennadiy, "European stability and NATO enlargement: Ukraine's perspective," *NATO Review*, No 6 – November 1995-Volume 43.

Ugglas, Margaretha af, Old and New Pillars of Swedish Security In a Changing Europe, <http://www.csdr.org/94book/ugglas.htm>

Verdross, Alfred, The Permanent Neutrality of Austria, (Verlag für Geschichte und Politik Viena, 1978).

Vihavainen, Timo, After the war: Finland's relations with the Soviet Union 1944-1991, <http://virtual.finland.fi/finfo/english/after.html>

Viskene, Ilmars, "Latvia and Europe's security structures," *The Baltic States: security and defense after independence*, (Paris: Institute for Security Studies of Western European Union, June 1995).

Vitkus, Gediminas, "At the crossroad of alternatives: Lithuanian security policies in 1995-1997," *Baltic Security: Looking towards the 21th century*, Edited by Gunnars Artéus & Atis Lejiuns. (Riga: Latvian Institute of International Affairs & Försvarshögskolan, 1997).

Waters, Trevor, Language and National Identity: A source of Conflict in Post-Communist Europe, G64, CSRC, June 1998.

Waters, Trevor, Moldova: Armed Forces and Military Doctrine, K23, CSRC, January 1998.

Waters, Trevor, Moldova 1997, S 29, CSRC, September 1995.

Woehrel, Steven, Moldova Republic: Basic Facts, *CRS Report for Congress*, The Library of Congress, 95-403 F, March 17, 1995.

Järvenpää, Pauli, "What comes after Madrid? A view from Helsinki," *NATO Review*, No 5, September/October 1997 – Volume 45.

Zetterberg, Kent, "Swedish Security Policy 1945 – 1953: Finland in the Soviet Shadow," *Security and Insecurity: Perspectives on Finnish and Swedish defense and foreign policy*, Edited by Gunar Artéus & Jukka Nevakivi, (Stockholm: Försvarshögskolan, 1997).

Other languages

Cartou, Alain, Les neutres, la neutralité en Europe, Fondation pour les études de defence nationale, (Paris, 1991).

Chilworth, Lord Lucas of, "Les minorites nationales en Europe Centrale et Orientale," *Assemblée de l'Atlantique Nord, Commission de Affaires Civiles, Rapports 1992*, (Bruxelles: Novembre 1992).

Rapport annuel du Conseil fédéral sur la Participation de la Suisse au Partenariat pour la Paix de l'OTAN en 1997 (du 18 mars 1998).

Riols, Yves-Michel, Chatelot, Christophe, Moldavie: l'impossible indépendance, *Le Monde*, 29 octobre 1994.

Rösh, Manfred, L'évolution de la politique de sécurité de la Suisse, *Revue de l'OTAN*, No 6 – Decembre 1993.

Serano, Andres S., Ruiz, Rosa, "Moldavia, entre dos mundos," *Revista Espanola de Defensa*, No. 81, Noviembre 1994.

Newspapers

Moldovan/Romanian

Comunistul, (Moldovan/Romanian edition, Chişinău, Republic of Moldova)
 Flux, (Chişinău, Republic of Moldova)
 Jurnal de Chişinău, (Chişinău, Republic of Moldova)
 Literatura şi arta, (Chişinău, Republic of Moldova)
 Moldova Suverană, (Chişinău, Republic of Moldova)
 Oastea Moldovei, (Chişinău, Republic of Moldova)
 Pământ şi Oameni, (Chişinău, Republic of Moldova)
 Săptămîna, (Chişinău, Republic of Moldova)
 Sfatul Ţării (Chişinău, Republic of Moldova)
 Ţara, (Chişinău, Republic of Moldova)

Russian

Argumenty i Facty (Moscv, Russian Federation)
 Dnestrovscaia Pravda (Tiraspol, Republic of Moldova)
 Communist (Russian edition, Chişinău, Republic of Moldova)
 Izvestia, (Moscv, Russian Federation)
 Krasnaya Zvezda, (Moscv, Russian Federation)
 Moldavskie Vedomosti (Chişinău, Republic of Moldova)
 Nezavisimaya Gazeta, (Moscv, Russian Federation)
 Nezavisimaya Moldova, (Chişinău, Republic of Moldova)
 Neyavisimoe Voennoe Obozrenie, (Moscv, Russian Federation)
 Pravda, (Moscv, Russian Federation)
 Pridnestrovie, (Tiraspol, Republic of Moldova)

English

The Independent
 The International Herald Tribune
 The Irish Times
 The New York Times
 The Times
 The Washington Post

French

Le Monde