

Final Report - June 2001
NATO Institutional research fellowship

The Military Cooperation of the CIS countries and NATO

Contributors :

CAPRI, University of Liège, Belgium – Prof. Simon PETERMANN

School of International Relations, St.Petersburg State University, Russian Federation -
Prof. Stanislav TKACHENKO

CONTENTS

1. Introduction.
2. The Tashkent Treaty (1992).
3. The main actors: Russia, NATO and CIS countries
4. Relations of Russia and Baltic States (issues of military security).
5. Russia and Belarus – role of NATO for the Union State.
6. Ukraine and Moldova: Between Europe and Russia.
7. Caucasus: geopolitics, oil and religion.
8. Central Asia – far off NATO, close to Russia and Afghanistan.
9. Vladimir Putin and Russian Security Policy in the CIS.
10. Conclusions.
11. Bibliography

1. Introduction.

The studying of post-Soviet States are now not as fashionable as they were a few years ago. There are many reasons for that, both political and economic. In practice, the only sector of politics, which for many years have been and will continue to be at the center of day-to-day international relations in Europe is processes in military contacts and cooperation between former Soviet republics. The reason is obvious – multi-million armies, mounts of weapons and huge military-industrial complex of the USSR continue to be important factor of European politics and natural reaction of Russian neighbors is to protect their security from instability in the Eastern part of European continent and Eurasia in general. That is why analysis of continuing military cooperation of the CIS countries has both academic and practical interest. Another significant topic of the research related to future of NATO. After the collapse of the Warsaw Treaty, the future of the Alliance (NATO) is to some extent dependent on what new areas of its activities the organization can cope with, securing at the same time its historical involvement into issues and challenges of practice of world politics.

In the framework of our research authors had several opportunities to visit (together or individually) Ukraine, Moldova, Belarus, Kirgizstan, Uzbekistan and Kazakhstan. There were tens of interviews, Q&A during conferences and seminars, many meetings with politicians, diplomats, military officers where we were trying to learn from our colleagues their views on CIS and its military wing. Distinctive feature of all our meetings and interviews was their open-minded character and readiness to discuss this complex issue.

What do we understand under “*military cooperation*”?

We use in our research broad concept of national and international security as it was formulated in the new Strategic Concept of NATO, adopted in April 1999, and in the new Concept of National Security of Russian Federation, which came into force in early 2000. Traditional neo-realist way of understanding interstate relations as search for power and stability in anarchic by definition world is not working in CIS studies, at least in studies of security challenges of Western part of CIS and the Baltic states. That is why set of ideas presented by *constructivism* and studied in many new publications of both Western and CIS scholars is reinforced us during our multiple interviews to question about all types of socio-

political life in the region.¹ Next important concern of our study is related to current status of the CIS and perspectives for the organization in future. The disappointment from lack of dynamics in the CIS and its bodies was perfectly expressed by experts of the Institute of National Security and Strategic Studies: “In the post-Soviet space the processes of disintegration are continuing. Just few percents from thousands of negotiated and adopted agreements and decisions have been implemented into practice. The cooperation in military and military-political sphere is practically blocked”.² Why former parts of superpower are not able to cooperate and what is the institutional influence on military cooperation in the CIS? As a result of our research we would like to give our point of view on the problems and foresee new possible scenarios for CIS and the Treaty on Collective Security in mid-term future.

When studying interstate relations we had to keep in mind that Russia itself is a challenge to European security for its Western partners. As Roman Shporlyuk from the Harvard University noted recently: “Today politicians and influential analysts in Moscow pay much more attention to problem of how to “take back” Minsk, Alma-Ata and Kiev than how “not to lose Kazan”. They think more about restoration of Empire and less about construction of their own country”³ That’s why the next purpose of the study is to analyze allegation as hypothesis, which include an opportunity for NATO to contain the threat of “restoration of Empire” if it’s the case, of course.

NATO has sought to change itself in a significant manner with the ending of the Cold War. Although it remains an alliance based on the twin principles that an attack against one member state is an attack against all of them and that the USA and Canada are linked to the security of Europe, NATO since 1990 has developed a two new strategic concepts, taken on a much broader mission and altered the means by which it seeks to accomplish its aim of achieving peace and stability in Euro-Atlantic region. The types of military initiatives flowing from these shifts can be distinguished from those of external adaptation, which include partnership with Russia and Ukraine, and internal adaptation, which include European

¹ The very good example of constructivist agenda in security studies is: Katzenstein, Peter (ed.), *The Culture of National Security*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1996.

² Kazennov Sergey Yu., Kumachev Vladimir N. *Kakoy “soyuz nerushimyi” nuzhen Rossii?* Moskva: Institut natsionalnoy bezopasnosti i strategicheskikh issledovaniy, 1998.

³ Shporlyuk, Roman. *Russkiy vopros i imperskaya ekspansiya*. In: Makeev, Sergey (ed.) *Demony mira i bogi voyny. Sorsialnye konflikty v postkommunisticheskom mire*. Kiev: Politychna Dumka, 1997, p. 267.

Security and Defense Identity (ESDI), Combined Joint Task Force concept and the new military command structure.⁴

Significant share of issues in the CIS is related to the problem of relations between one big power (Russia) and a number of small states (with the only exception of Ukraine, even being in economic and political crisis). Annette Baker Fox's classic study of small states demonstrated that a small power can optimize its position and maximize its freedom of maneuver by taking advantage of great-power interests. Great powers have wide and varied agendas unlike small powers that tend to focus on the primary aim of how to cope with a large neighbor. The Small power thus turns its full scope of resources towards minimizing vulnerability and maximizing the capacity to maneuver.

The effect of the end of the Cold war on small statehood has been studied by K.J.Holsti. He contends that divisive forces plunging states into "wars of the third kind" challenge not only the notion of the sovereign state but also the division of states into large and small powers based on capabilities and resources. Holsti argues that international political units of the post-cold war order are differentiated on the basis of their degree of coherence and legitimacy, resulting in "weak and failed" states, on the one hand, and "strong" states, on the other.⁵

We would like to thank many people for opportunity to meet during our visits, make interview or ask questions during conferences and seminars in Liège, St.Petersburg, Kiev, Yalta, Brussels, Chicago, Helsinki, Warsaw, Kishinev (Chisinau), Bishkek, Almaty, Tashkent, Minsk. People, who contributed to the research by their ideas and personal points of view are:

We are very grateful for opportunity to meet and talk to: Alexander Anisimov, The Center of Strategic Research (Moscow and St-Petersburg); Mr. Iskandar K. Asadullaev, Director of the Centre for Strategic Research under the President of the Republic of Tajikistan; Dr. Dzhanghir Atamali, Deputy Coordinating Director, Association of Euro-

⁴ General Klaus Naumann, Chairman of the Military Committee, 'A New NATO for a New Century', Address to the Konrad Adenauer Stiftung Group, Brussels, 15 October 1997, at www.nato.itn/docu/speech/1997/s97101b.htm

⁵ Holsti, Kalevi J. 1996. *The State, War, and the State of War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. P. 82-98.

Atlantic Cooperation, Moscow; Werner Bauwens, Office of Information and Press, NATO Head-Quarters; Colonel Anvar A. Berdiev, Chief of the Foreign Relations Department at the Ministry of Defense of the Republic of Uzbekistan; Dr. Marco Carnovale, Political department, NATO Headquarters; Alexander Dergachev, the editor-in-chief, The Political Thought (Kiev); Tuomas Forsberg, Director of the Finnish Institute of International Relations, Helsinki; Dr. Jeff Gedmin, Executive Director, "New Atlantic Initiative, USA; Sergey Geivandov, Department of Security and Disarmament, Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Russian Federation; Vadim Grechaninov, President, Atlantic Council of Ukraine; Ove Hall, Ministry of Defense of Sweden; Dr. Graeme P. Herd, Deputy Director, Scottish Centre for International Studies; H.M. Ambassador Christopher Ingham, British Embassy to Uzbekistan; Dr. Irina Isakova, Research Fellow, Centre for Defense Studies, London; Dr. Alla Karimova, Head of Division at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Uzbekistan; Serguei Kassymkoulov, Counsellor at the Embassy of the Kyrgyz Republic to Belgium; Mr. Vacheslav Khamisov, Scientific Secretary of the International Institute for Strategic Studies under the President of Kyrgyz Republic; Anvar R. Khidirov, Attaché at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Uzbekistan; Professor Ozod Khusanov, Deputy Rector of the Academy of State and Social Construction under the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan; Viktor Kochukov, Counsellor of Embassy of the Russian Federation in Belgium; Colonel-General Yevgeny Kondakov (ret.) Ministry of Defense of Russia; Sergei Konoplyov, Ukrainian National Security Program, Harvard University; Dr. Tatyana S. Koroleva, Scientific Secretary of the National Academy of Sciences of Kyrgyz Republic; Colonel Valery Manko, General Staff, Russian Ministry of Defense; Ingmar Oldberg, Ass. Director of Research, Defense Research Establishment, Sweden; Ms. Irina Orolbaeva, Deputy Director of the Strategic Studies and Information Department at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Kyrgyz Republic; Dr. Vyacheslau Paznyak, Director of the International Institute for Policy Studies, Minsk, Belarus; Grigoriy Perepelitsa, National Institute of Strategic Studies, Kiev; Colonel Sergey Pokladov, General Staff, Russian Ministry of Defense; Mr. Sabir Saidov, Head of the Department of Europe at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Uzbekistan; Ivan Safranchuk, Center of Political Studies (PIR-Center), Moscow; Valery Shtepa, MP, member of the National security and defense Committee, Supreme Rada of Ukraine; Yevgeny Silin, President of the Association of Euro-Atlantic Co-operation, Moscow; Dr. Pavel Smirnov, Center for International Studies, institute of the USA and Canada, Moscow; Stephan De Spiegeleire, Program of International Studies, RAND; Dr. Bulat K. Sultanov, Advisor to Director in International Relations at the Kazakhstan Institute

for Strategic Studies under the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan; Professor Anita Tiraspolski, The French Institute of International Relations, Paris.

2. The Tashkent treaty (1992)

At the time of collapse of the USSR authorities in Moscow had an illusion that Russian army was able to guarantee security for the whole post-Soviet space. In other words Moscow planned to take a traditional for Russia/ the USSR role of the "elder brother" for the post-Soviet republics having put those contacts on the new level. But the first years of independence proved that military, political, economic and even diplomatic possibilities of Russia to dominate at the post-Soviet space in old forms typical for the USSR were rather limited.

On 15th May 1992 Armenia, Kazakhstan, Kirgizstan, Russia, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan signed the Treaty on Collective Security at the capital of Uzbekistan, Tashkent. Azerbaijan, Belorussia and Georgia joint the Treaty later.⁶ In April 1994 the Treaty on Collective Security came into force after the process of ratification.

The Tashkent Treaty did not foresee a wide military integration of participating states. In accordance to it the mechanism of consultations between participants was to be formed. Therefore it was a political but not a military treaty.

The Treaty created a basis for new level of security problems solution for the participants with political peaceful means. It was a foundation for co-operation in the process of constructing new security system in the post-Soviet area. For instance, the Treaty says that the security system, which is to be formed, will be able to become a part of a future common and universal security for Europe and Asia. Hence a multi-polar world, which was an ideal of Russian foreign policy of the 90th, was a strategic target of the states, which signed the Tashkent treaty.

⁶ Georgia, Azerbaijan and Uzbekistan decided to be members of the Treaty on Collective Security because of very concrete reasons. Uzbekistan in 1992 was going to use the Treaty for improving its influence on destroyed by civil war Tajikistan. Tashkent had its own candidates for governmental positions in Dushanbe, but Moscow didn't allow to fulfill the plan. Georgia was hoping that Moscow would stop its support of separatists in Abchasia. Azerbaijan had the same expectations towards Russian support of Armenia. But Russia decided to follow the line which was chosen in early 1990ies – to use low-intensity conflicts on the territory of former USSR for obtaining control over New independent States.

In accordance to other document signed in a framework of the Tashkent treaty (the Conception of Collective Security) the participant states are to guarantee a collective security by all means and the priority is given to the peaceful settlement. The main orientations of co-operation at this sphere were following:

- 1) Co-operation with other states and international organisations to form a system of collective security in Europe and Asia,
- 2) Development of trust in a military sphere
- 3) Establishment and development partnership relations with different military-political organisations with regional security structures to strengthen peace and to conduct peacekeeping operations in accordance with decisions of the UN Security Council.
- 4) Co-ordination of measures in the sphere of disarmament and struggle against proliferation.
- 5) Co-operation on frontiers and so on.⁷

Article 4 of the Tashkent treaty stipulates that "in case of accomplishment of an act of aggression against the any of the country-member, all other member-countries provide it with necessary aid, including military assistance and they render disposable funds to that country-member on the basis of realisation of the right of collective defence in accordance with Article 51 of UN Charter". Hence, political activity composes the background for co-operation in the interests of forming of the system of collective security. Council of collective security (CCS), which is the highest intergovernmental political body, realises this political activity. Council of collective security comprises presidents, ministers of foreign affairs, ministers of defence of member-countries of the Tashkent treaty and the General Secretary of the Council of collective security as well. The Council of ministers of foreign affairs of member-countries is the highest consultative body of the Council of collective security concerning the questions of co-ordination of external policy. The Council of ministers of defence of member-countries is the highest consultative body of the Council of collective security concerning the questions of military policy and military building.

The Treaty defines two forms of consultations: urgent and regular. Urgent consultations are held on the level not lower than deputy minister of foreign affairs and deputy minister of defence of member-country. Regular consultations are held in the form of

⁷ Zemskiy Vladimir V. Kollektivnaya bezopasnost na prostranstve Sodruzhestva. //Mezhdunarodnaya zhizn, 1998, N 11-12.

meetings of plenipotentiaries of member-countries of the Treaty in the presence of the General Secretary of the CCS as often as required, but as a rule, not more than once in a month.

The Secretariat of the Council of collective security has been created as a constant body of the CCS, where the plenipotentiaries of countries-members of the Treaty are accredited. The Secretariat is responsible for elaboration of projects of documents for the highest bodies of the Council of collective security. It is in the framework of the Secretariat where states can exchange their points of view on specific problems of international relations in the region.

Among the principle aims of the Tashkent Treaty there are such ends as to proclaim the creation of the collective security system of the member-States, the encouragement of the intentions of the Treaty on Collective Security state-members to create a defensive unions, the preservation of the military infrastructure, the abstinence from the participation in the military unions and blocs directed against any Treaty on Collective Security state-member. Besides, it deals with the transfer to the principle of the military deployment, which should strictly regulate the Russian military basis' legal state in the ex-soviet republics.

A heavy blow for the ambitions of Moscow was the defeat in the first Chechen war (1994-1996). After the Hasaviurt (August 1996) in the Ministry of the Defence they hardly considered the power intervention of Russian into the resolving of the conflicts on the CIS territory seriously. And it was not only because of fear of being accused in the Russian neo-imperialism to which Boris Yeltsin was very sensible, but also because of the lack of belief in the Russian army itself. The task appeared to revive the prestige and the authority of the Army. This task was solved in part only when the Second Chechen War began in Autumn 1999.

After the Tashkent Treaty its member-States signed a number of documents developing the problems of the co-operation in the field of the collective security : Conception of the Collective Security, Declaration of the member-States of the Collective Security Treaty, Main Directions of the Extending of the TSC member-States co-operation. As Vladimir Zemsky, the General secretary of Council of the Collective Security, noted, "... the deficit of the political will, some mutual prejudices and the lag of the process of the practical realisation of the achieved agreements from the decision-making process."⁸

⁸ Zemskiy Vladimir V. Kollektivnaya bezopasnost na prostranstve Sodruzhestva. //Mezhdunarodnaya zhizn, 1998, N 11-12.

In fact the Tashkent treaty after ten years it was signed, is not strengthened as the main organisation form of the CIS-members' military co-operation. For instance, in one of the most important agreements between the CIS-members in the field of the military co-operation, the Agreement on the creation of the Joint Air-Defence System of the CIS-members⁹, the Collective Security Treaty is not even mentioned. At the same time not only the Joint Air-Defence System but also a Committee of Co-ordination on Air-Defence System with representative of Russia being a head of it were constructed in the framework of this agreement, the Plan of co-ordination of forces and means of the Joint Air-Defence System. The Treaty names as a centre of common co-ordination a Central command post of the troops of the air-defence of the Russian Federation, thus Russia gave all infrastructures for this agreement.

In December 1999 on the eve of the meeting of CIS ministers of defence some journalists inquired the secretary of the Council of ministers of defence of the CIS-countries Alexandr Sinajskiy whether this Council duplicated the bodies of the Treaty on Collective Security. The answer of the Russian diplomat was rather open and it showed the meaning of the Treaty on Collective Security for the CIS countries: " I can't agree with that. Among the questions, which are going to be discussed on the meeting of the Council of ministers of defence, only one sixth is for ministers from states that signed the Treaty on Collective Security. The rest is the common problems which more or less concern all countries".¹⁰

The first deputy of a head of the General Staff of Russian military forces General Valerij L. Manilov made another attempt to justify the need of co-operation of the CIS-countries in a military sphere, which had to be against a theory of a mono-polar world and those who support it (the USA and the NATO). He thinks that: " The opposition of these trends (to the mono- or multi-polar world – S.T.) causes main threats to the stability, security and peace. It is an objective process and we should estimate it and see its results."¹¹ Therefore Russia keeps a right to form unions and to develop "special relations" in a military sphere with States which also share an anxiety about a mono-polar world. But there is no such State

⁹ This Agreement was signed by leaders of the CIS countries on February 10, 1995 in the capital of Kazakhstan – Almaty. Azerbaijan and Moldova didn't signed it, and Belarus, Turkmenistan and Ukraine signed with some important reservations.

¹⁰ Mukhin Vladimir. Voennye ministry SNG vstretyatsya v Moskve. //Nezavisimaya gazeta, December 21, 1999.

¹¹ Manilov Valeri L. O voennoy doktrine Rossii.//Mezhdunarodnaya zhizn, N 5, 2000, p. 42.

at the territory of the CIS (with an exception of the Ukraine). Instead the idea of a multi-polar world is very popular among the ruling elite of China and India.

3. The main actors: Russia, NATO and CIS countries

The amount of Russian power structures, which in the 90ies was able to influence the defense policy and determine relationship between Russia and NATO, was rather large. First of all, the President of Russia and his administration should be pointed. During his presidency (1991-1999) Boris Yeltsin paid a special attention to the CIS, which was in particular obvious because of his absolute indifference to the foreign policy and his wish to have contacts only with a close circle of leaders of main countries of the world. Many experts estimated his wish to keep the CIS as an attempt to make up in the memory of descendants for a Belovezhye agreement, which fixed the disintegration of the USSR. Boris Yeltsin seemed to want to keep the CIS till he stayed in the Kremlin. And he has never issued any too important challenges to the Commonwealth as well as to other subordinate to him power structures.

The government of Russia in a whole and within it the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Defense Ministry are the second institutions by their importance for the foreign policy of Russia. The collapse of the USSR opened for them new spheres of activity, which had never been on the agenda of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Defense Ministry of the USSR. The Minister of Foreign Affairs from 1991 to 1996 A. Kozyrev remarked once after his resignation that it had taken about 80% of his working time to deal with problems of the CIS thus the time which had been left for other regions and problems had been minimal¹². The President of Russia didn't have any real interest of the activity of the government establishments in the CIS countries, which was combined with a lack of experience, trained specialists and means.

For the legislature a discussion of problems of the ex-republics of the USSR has become fast and the most popular topic. At the same time because the State Duma and the Council of Federations and the legislatures in Russian regions didn't have any real possibility to influence the CIS policy of Russia the irresponsibility of the opinions expressed and even legislative acts passed is surprising. For instance, Russian legislators announced the disintegration of the USSR illegal and intended to declare an impeachment to B. Yeltsin for his actions, which had resulted in the collapse of the USSR.

¹² According to current practice, The Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs is playing the leading and coordinating role among all governmental institutions and regions, which are involved in foreign relations, not just political, but also economic, cultural etc.

Russian Mass Media in 1991-1999 draw very small attention to the CIS problems with an exception of such items as Sebastopol, rights of the Russian-speaking population of the Baltic countries, and the Union between Russia and Belorussia. The Caucasus policy of Russia, the Chechen war and the threat of the Taliban regime in Afghanistan were reported routinely as well. As for the other questions, even one of such crucial importance as Russian relationship to the Ukraine and Kazakhstan were reported only if they got into the sphere of "presidential diplomacy". The professionalism of journalists and scholars, who publicized their articles in periodicals, significantly increased during this period. If at the beginning of the decade the most publications about the CIS appeared in a form of report then now analytical articles and discussions took the first place and attract large attention.

The CIS issues were an item of small importance for the power structures of Russia but the NATO-Russian relations was an opposite case. Each action taken by NATO or Russia attracted a large attention in Russia, caused pointed debates, discussed in the parliament, in the Mass Media and became a main topic of international conferences and researches. Thus the current "division of labor" in between these two topics was formed: a well-known Alliance and an almost unknown Commonwealth turned out to be put together in the mid-90th. The first reaction of Russia (which it still sticks to) was an anxiety and a wish to prevent NATO from any penetration to the CIS, even in form of mutual exchange of representatives, communication officers, not to mention the opening of Informative Centers of NATO. The ideal for Russia was the CIS countries communicating with NATO through Russia. But NATO had no reason to agree with such pattern. That was why Russia and NATO turned out to be in opposition to each other in the question of the CIS when NATO in January 1994 proposed the Partnership for Peace program and a lot of CIS-countries including Russia supported it and signed later.

Russian military forces are, of course, very important for our research. Russian official information about the strength of the Russian military forces is lacking. In accordance to the estimations of foreigner specialists the Russian military forces include more than 1.2 million of military, there are about 22.000 tanks in a military units and at a depots, 26.000 units of another armored technique, 21.000 units of artillery techniques, 2000 anti-aircraft missiles, 1800 military aircraft of the air forces, air-defense forces and naval forces, 900 shock-

helicopters, 40 multipurpose atomic and diesel submarines and 140 surface military ships of the main classes.

The influence of the CIS factor on Russian policy and day-to-day life was increased with a migration. Since the collapse of the USSR about 4 million people migrate to Russia from ex-Soviet countries (about one fourth was illegal). Though such inflow of population will have a positive influence upon Russia in a long run at the crises of the beginning 90th it made worse social-economic problems in the country and destabilized a situation in some regions (in particular in the Northern Caucasus).

Since Vladimir Putin has become a president significant changes have taken place in a power structure, involved into the solution of the CIS problems. After just another dismissal of the Ministry of the CIS affairs the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Economic policy and trade shared its functions. But both of them were focused only on their day-to-day work and the Security Council of Russia and its secretor Sergey Ivanov were authorized to elaborate Russian common politics at the post-Soviet area. Originally the status of the Security Council secretor within Russian power hierarchy was not high. It increased drastically in the second half of 90s, in particular since Putin has got this post. The Security Council, which is formally a deliberative body of the President of the State, has become nowadays a forum of power ministers, representatives of the president administration, heads of both parliament chambers and also representatives of the president in 7 federal districts. At the meetings of the Council all the most important questions of Russian security and text of program documents, which lay down approach of Russia to its internal and external policy, are discussed. The post-Soviet area attracts a very wide attention of Russian politicians that is why a key role in an elaboration and implementation of Russian policy in this region is plaid by Sergey Ivanov, which is, by accounts of some experts, one of five the most influential Russian politicians. Some specialists give him even a second place because he is closely connected to President Putin and because he has got from the latter very wide authorities¹³. As Sergey Ivanov got a post of the Defense Minister it seems to be that elaboration of Russian CIS policy will be shifted from the Security Council to the Defense Ministry.

In 2000-2001 an interest to the CIS policy of Russia has increased among the political elite as well as among civil society of Russia. There were several reasons:

¹³ Chubchenko, Yu. Sovbez Rossii vossoedinyayet SNG. – Nezavisimaya Gazeta, June 15, 2000. P. 11

- 1) large interest of the Russian president to the CIS agenda and his often visits to the States of the Commonwealth:
- 2) the formation of a conceptual basis of Russian policy in the CIS in 1999-2000.

It's too early to say that Russia has managed to articulate its priorities in relations with its nearest neighbors. But the National Security Concept (January 2000), the Foreign Policy Concept (June 2000) and the Military Doctrine (2000) have stated common parameters for the Russian policy in the region and the whole world. It also destroyed a possibility for skeptics to speak about a neo-imperialism of Russia and a hope of ultra-patriots upon a forced reintegration. These documents are not positive for foreign countries. For instance, the most important document, The Conception of National Security mentions among threats for Russia security, the West.

In accordance to the foreign Mass Media it means that Russia and the West are again becoming enemies.¹⁴ The main military threat for Russia, as the Conception points it, is a shift of the NATO to a peace-enforcement out of the zone of the responsibility of the NATO without sanction of the UN Security Council, which is becoming a strategic doctrine of the NATO.

There were always two opposite approaches to the NATO in the post-Soviet area.

One of them was based on the idea that the Alliance, which unites the most developed countries of Europe and the Northern America, can bring stability to any region of the world. It's enough to establish constructive relations with NATO and the American-European umbrella will soften security problems of a separate country.

Another approach paid more attention to specific characteristics of a military part of NATO and to the insignificant battle experience of the Alliance. Though NATO has up-to-date military technology but it used it very rarely. The cases of Bosnia and Kosovo demonstrated the Alliance is not really efficient for operations in an alien in terms of civilization society. In particular if the conflict is far from the zone of responsibility of the NATO. As for the post-Soviet area it is possible hypothetically to delegate the function of

¹⁴ Sokolovski, Maksim. Vykapyvaya topor vojny, Rossiya brosaet vyzov Zapadu. – Zerkalo nedeli, Kiev, January 22, 2000

control and direct intervention to one of the NATO's countries (Turkey) or one of the allies of the USA (Pakistan and other Arabic countries). But it's hardly possible that the NATO countries will use that mechanism. The matter is that the intervention of any regional superpower in Caucasian or Middle Asian problems will cause a resistance of its rivals. There are such rival countries in the Caucasus and the Middle Asia as Turkey, Iran, Saudi Arabia, Pakistan, and China. For example, not only these countries but also almost all developed countries of the world are interested in the Caspian oil. That means that the new "Big Game" in the region of the Caspian Sea and along lines of the oil transportation will not be limited with rival of two countries, as it was in the 19th century. Nowadays this game will involve almost the whole Europe and the USA. But it's absolutely impossible to imagine the NATO forces placed in this region to guarantee a safe transportation oil from Baku to Jeyhan.

That is why both these approaches to the co-operation with NATO turned out to be unrealistic. NATO is for some of the CIS-countries a way of getting episodic military-technical or limited financial aid. At the same time the level of the contacts with NATO helps to bargain with Russia about credits, access to Russian transport infrastructures and favorable access of goods to Russian market. In a critical situation (for instance, some crises in the Middle Asia connected to the Talibs who are moving to the North to the CIS-frontiers) NATO and the CIS are not even mentioned because the USA is unable to restrict or stop the activities of Usama ben Laden and other terrorists who have their centers in Afghanistan, Pakistan and some other Asian Muslim countries.

One of the important aims of Russia in the post-Soviet area is to create and to use in the framework of the Tashkent Treaty or its modification peacemaking rapid reaction forces, which will be able to be used under the UN. In this case the UN, as Russia sees it, should become a counterweight to the NATO, what will evoke rejection of the NATO-countries. In the opinion of Moscow the OSCE can also be an alternative to the NATO. In 1995 Russian diplomats managed to convince heads of all countries of the Treaty on Collective Security, except Azerbaijan, to sign the following text of the Decision of the Collective Security Council: "The participating States regard proposed by the NATO program "The Partnership for Peace" as an alternative to the mechanical expansion of the NATO. They consider that its realization should aim at the construction of the universal common European structure of the

military-political co-operation, which will strength the CIS-foundation.”¹⁵ Later the importance of the OSCE for the Russian politics has decreased.

The Russia-NATO relations turned out to be in crisis immediately after the beginning of the NATO operation in Kosovo in March 1999. The reaction of the Russian public opinion and almost of all CIS-countries to the bombing was negative. But only Russia and Belorussia have made corresponding blaming statement at the high State level. Moreover, Russia suspended almost all contacts with the NATO. And only a year after that, relations started to be re-established gradually. 15-16 of February 2000 J. Robinson visited Russia first after Kosovo conflict. As “Nezavisimaja gazeta” pointed out the main aim of his visit was the following: “The European member-countries of NATO and mainly the USA are in an inconvenient position. They understand quite well that it is impossible to minimize the role of Russia in a current situation and try to increase this role to the level, which will satisfy Russia.”¹⁶ After that in May 2000 in Florence the decision was made to open the NATO Information Office in Moscow.¹⁷ In this year the Joint Permanent Council Russia-NATO resumed its work but with a limited agenda.

It has become necessary to articulate the basic principles of the Russian foreign policy in the beginning of 1993, when the country has moved out from the edge of economic catastrophe. Russian diplomats played the key role in the development of international contacts of the country and of the various programs of international emergency aid to it. They also helped Russia to quickly join a number of important international economic organizations. Therefore, when the "crisis management task" of the Russian Foreign Ministry was fulfilled, the Kremlin ordered to define priorities of the country's foreign policy. The main priority was defined as relations with the CIS member States, which could not help disappointing the West, which hoped to remove Russia from the post-Soviet area and leave it the role of its smaller partner. According to A. Kvasov, "By the beginning of 1993 Russia has achieved international recognition and a special role on the former Soviet territory, which made skeptics both inside and outside the country critic that policy for "neo-imperialism"¹⁸.

¹⁵ Reshenie Sovieta Kollektivnoj Bezopasnosti o Deklaratsii gosudarstv – uchastnikov Dogovora o kolektivnoj bezopasnosti. February 10, 1995. – Sodruzhestvo. Informatsionnyj vestnik SNG. №.1, 1995. Minsk

¹⁶ Sokolov, Viktor, and Vladimir Mukhin. NATO khochet pomiritsya s Moscowoj.- Nezavisimaya gazeta, February 16, 2000

¹⁷ Charodeev, Gennadi. Severoatlanticheskaya ottepel. Otnosheniya Rssii s NATO budut vosstanovleny v polnom objeme.// Izvesiya, December 15, 2000, p.4. The Center was opened in February 2001.

¹⁸ Kvasov, Aleksey. Izbavlenie ot "kompleksa nepolnotsennosti". – Nezavisimaya Gazeta, February 17, 2000

Russia never lacked politicians, who viewed the co-operation with the CIS skeptically. Usually such skeptics belong to economists of different political views or to the right and center-right forces. According to the economists, Russia is not able to "feed" the CIS, therefore, the aim of Russia inside the CIS must be a non-conflict deconstruction of the Soviet Union. The rightists analyzed the issue from the other side: according to them, Russia is the most democratic State among the CIS members, therefore, its co-operation with less democratic partners may lead not to the increase of democracy in the partner countries, but to the rise of authoritarianism in Russia itself. That tendency looked inevitable in the situation, when the economic crisis in Russia continued and therefore the country was not able to lead the re-integration process. The volume of economic links between Russia and the CIS member States continued to decline (by now it has fallen down to 25 per cent of Russian foreign trade). Any re-integration in the CIS lacked an economic basement and became vulnerable and dependent on the good will of Russia's leaders and their ambitions to compete with the West in the post-Soviet area. The crisis of the CIS has become evident in mid-90ies. One may find the consequences of the crisis anywhere: in the low effectiveness of the CIS summits, in the CIS decisions' rare coming in power, in the different approaches to security issues. The CIS member-States have become to view differently the nature of threat (terrorism, internal opposition, international crime, foreign military threat) and therefore also the nature of security (neutrality, non-alignment, membership in the Tashkent Treaty, co-operation with NATO). NATO as a security factor in the post-Soviet area appeared also in mid-90ies. In practice the statements on closer co-operation with NATO and probable application to join the Alliance (especially those by the governments of the Ukraine, Moldova and Georgia) were addressed more to Moscow than to Brussels. Those statements have become a part of the political maneuver in the post-Soviet area. Russia has always reacted very painfully to such statement, especially after the Madrid (1997) summit of NATO, where three East European countries were accepted into the Alliance.

It has become popular in many post-Soviet States to discuss the upcoming collapse of the CIS. The political elite of Russia has also become more skeptical to the future of the Commonwealth. One may characterize the current situation this way: there is no need in the CIS, but the costs of its deconstruction are bigger than the costs of preservation of the Commonwealth in its current state. That situation will hardly change in the near future. Therefore, The current period of stagnation in the CIS may continue for many years, if Russia

does not change radically its foreign policy neither invests huge resources into re-integration of the post-Soviet area.

The critical spot of the military co-operation inside the CIS and of the Tashkent Treaty as such was the beginning of 1999. In April 1999 the term of the Tashkent Treaty exceeded. Several countries (Azerbaijan, Georgia and Uzbekistan) quitted the treaty¹⁹. Each of the countries had their own motivation, when they signed the Collective Security Treaty in 1992 – 1993²⁰. Uzbekistan hoped to enforce its pressure on Tajikistan, also via placing its protegees to various important posts in the country, however, Russia opposed that. Azerbaijan hoped to make Russia refuse from providing energetic aid to Armenia, but failed. Georgia had the same expectations on Russia in relation to Abkhazia, but failed as well. Remaining members of the CIS, those countries demonstrated their dissatisfaction with the Russia's foreign policy, quitting the Tashkent Treaty. However, Russia, which foreign political position was swinging from greater support to the CIS to its factual deconstruction, did not react tragically to that. It only made Russia change its foreign priorities from multilateral to bilateral co-operation with the CIS countries in the limited number of spheres.

The collapse of the Tashkent Treaty took place in the same time with the military crisis in Kosovo. Therefore, the public opinion in Russia accepted it even more painfully. The Government of Yevgeniy Primakov at that time attempted to change radically the character of links with the CIS member-States, which included the demand to pay off all debts to Russia. However, that led only to worsening of bilateral relations, especially in case of Uzbekistan, which not only refused to pay off the debts, but also closed the access of Russian companies to the most attractive objects of property in the country. The same situation took place in the other countries as well.

One of the most important motivations of the CIS member states to continue military co-operation is their need to maintain military security via co-operation in the field of military industry. That includes joint development of compatible military industrial products, in production of arms, which would be able to meet the modern requirements²¹. Over 7000

¹⁹ Chubchenko, Yuri. *Sodruzhestvo otkazyvaetsya platit Moskve.* – *Kommersant-Vlast*. February 4, 1999, # 13 (1657)

²⁰ *Sammit, kotoryy ustroil vseh.* – *Novye Izvestiya*, November 2, 1999

²¹ Bendikov, M. & Khrustalev E. *Integratsiya voennoy industrii stran SNG.* – *Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya*. 1998, # 12, p. 135

enterprises took part in military production in the Soviet Union, over 1000 of them were located outside Russia. The democratic Russia inherited over 80% of the military industrial complex of the USSR. However, the level of specialization in the Soviet Union was so high that currently Russia produces over 82% of types of its military supply in co-operation with the CIS member states²².

In 1994 to solve a problem of the co-operation in a military-technical sphere and military-economic integration in the framework of the CIS a special body with a function of co-ordination was created – Intergovernmental Commission on Military-economic Co-operation. As in the most of the CIS activities the success of the activity of this commission and integration of a military industry at the former USSR depended on Russian position. But the longstanding crises and constant reforms of the management of Russian defense industry resulted in a break of practically all relations in this sphere in the 90s.

In the sphere of a weapon production and military technique the CIS countries are interested in the co-operation with Russia, because despite a fact that almost all CIS countries have military industry, the final production of the military products is concentrated in Russia. Among approximately 55.000 institutions which worked for the defense (defense works, design offices and research institutions) 73 per cent was located in Russia, 14 per cent in Ukraine and in other republics from 3 to 1 per cent²³. It is hardly possible to create new works of the defense industry for the CIS-partners of Russia. The huge invests are needed for that and no state at the post-Soviet space can afford to create a scientific and experimental basis. That is why the reanimation of a military industry is possible only through including of the national military industry to Russian one. For Russia such co-operation can cause the competition with its own factories but it is profitable for it in terms of economics and politics in the most cases. It is obvious that it is irrational to produce military goods together and at the same time to be opponents in a military-political and even in military sphere. In 2000-2001 the Ukraine and Uzbekistan demonstrated the understanding of that fact when their presidents signed some agreements about a co-operation in the production of up-to-date

²² Kuznetsova, L.I. & Kuzmenko V.P. Integratsionnye i desintegratsionnye faktory mnogovektornykh protsessov na evropeyskom i postevropeyskom prostranstvah. – Polityka i chas. Kiev, 1998, # 9. P. 17-18

²³ Benediktov, M. & Khrustalev, E. Integratsiya voennoy industrii stran SNG. – Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya. 1998, # 12, p. 138

weapons²⁴. The co-operation in a weapon production between Belorussia and Russia is even closer. Other CIS countries also show quite regularly that they are ready to take part in a joint weapon production. Russia tried to make a sphere of a military production more or less transparent.

For instance, many enterprises of the Russian military industrial complex were privatized. In 1996 – 1997 the Russian government adopted the federal program of restructuring of the complex, which was fulfilled in 1998 – 2000. In 1998 Russia and the Ukraine decided to fulfill the program of economic co-operation for the upcoming three years. The program included bilateral supplies of arms and know-how in the military sphere, maintenance of co-operation between the enterprises of the military industrial sector and co-ordination of military exports in order to avoid competition on the world market. Russian military reform pays much attention to production of arms; the discussion in the field is open to public, though it leads to dissatisfaction of the government²⁵.

Becoming independent, the CIS member-States lost their image of military strong countries, which they inherited from the Soviet Union. Russia lost the vast part of such image during the first military campaign in Chechnya. However, it is not logical to suggest that Russia is military weak, since the basic part of the Russian defense system includes nuclear weapons and the means of their delivery. The second military campaign in Chechnya made a positive impact in the Russian security image, when it showed that the main enemy of Russian troops in Chechnya is not a regular army but small groups of terrorists, which use their own military tactics. It is quite difficult for the Russian troops to adjust to that tactics, especially in the circumstances, when foreign countries and mass media diligently watch their activities in the region.

²⁴ On the Ukrainian side, it is famous Uzhmash, producer of ballistic missiles; on the Uzbek side – Tashkent aircraft works

²⁵ Good example of the discussion is Arbatov, A. & Romashkin, P. Kakie voyny Rossii po karmanu. – Nezavisimoe voennoe obozrenie, April 27, 2001

4. Relations of Russia and Baltic States (issues of military security)

NATO is, still, excuse me, not about distribution of jam and tomatoes. This is a military organization. People there are dry, angry, military... That's why I see no reason for Baltic people ... to enter into NATO.

Dmitry Rogozin, Chairman of the Committee on International Affairs of the State Duma of Russia.²⁶

This comment of prominent Russian politicians, the Chairman of a leading parliamentary committee Dmitry Rogozin, was published in section of jokes and reservations of Russian politicians and governmental officials in a popular Russian weekly magazine. Of course, it is a joke, but it reflects perfectly quality and level of seriousness of Russian objections to the NATO enlargement into Baltic states.

The Baltic region, extended from traditional three post-Soviet States to significant territory of the Baltic Sea region is a proving ground for broader conception of security in post-Cold war times. Although old boundaries and relationships do not readily fade away, military security shares the attention in Europe's northeast with economic, environmental, energy and cultural security. But "hard" security still dominates in discussion on future of the region. A decade after the Cold War and independence for all three Baltic States, the region continues to wrestle with two essential security issues. 1) How does the region fit into European and Transatlantic structures? 2) What role can, should, or must the region play in the settlement of the much larger question of continental security building? NATO is the leading institution which may provide security into the region, according to prevailing opinion of ruling political elites in the Baltic states, that's why we may easily find evidences of interest of both Moscow and Brussels to the region.

Relations between Russia and the three Baltic States (Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania) in 1990ies were characterized by definition of low-intensity crisis. At the beginning it was "crisis of mutual understanding" between two democratic ruling elites, but quite soon it was replaced by the "crisis of trust" after Russian troops have left the territory of the Baltic states in 1994. Approximately since 1994 new period of relations started, when besides the rapid development of economic relations there were very limited political contacts and practically total absence of cooperation in military sphere. New situation was a paradoxical one: security

in the Baltic region was dependent on atmosphere of relations between Russia and Western countries, but there were newly independent Baltic States, which could have provoked sharp crisis between Russia and the West.²⁷

As a result of 1994 removal of military troops and hardware, all non-economic reasons for good relations with Russia for Baltic countries have disappeared. There were several reasons for that. First and the most important was, that with Russian troops out of their territory the Baltic states felt no threat from their giant Eastern neighbor. Another reason for “cold peace” in the region was that politics of newly independent states towards Russian-speaking population was far from totally democratic, and new elite in Tallinn, Riga and Vilnius were very displeased by criticism from Moscow (even if the same type of criticism they have heard from the OSCE and some European capitals). And finally, Baltic States were actively trying to oppose their obvious political and economic successes with permanent and complex crisis in all CIS countries with Russia as one of the most suffered from the crisis. Compared to growth of authoritarian regimes in the Caucasus and central Asia as well as economic instability and lack of legitimacy of new elite in Russia, Ukraine, Moldova and Belarus, the Baltic countries are a “fortress of stability”. Russian threat (doesn’t matter – real or virtual) could destroy the idyll. That’s why ritual mentioning of Russia as a threat to former USSR republics on the Baltic sea became integral part of their foreign policy and rhetoric in the international arena. NATO countries or Alliance itself have never officially reacted to that, but there was a strong impression in Moscow, that they have shared concern of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania for their security. In the situation of this “war of words”, Baltic States were expecting and are expecting now on powerful political support from the USA as well as finance assistance from the European Union, since traditional geopolitics pays special attention to access to open seas and this “science” was and still is popular both in Russia and among some officials in the West. The region in general plays now very important role in relations between the West and the East.²⁸ Estonia, as leader in this “rush to the West” among three Baltic countries, had the least cooperative relations with Moscow, especially prior to 1998, when it was named as one of first candidates to the European Union.²⁹

²⁶ Mezhdometija. – In: Itogi Magazine, May 22, 2001, p. 8.

²⁷ Arbatova, Nadezhda. Paradoksy bezopasnosti v Baltijskom regione. //Nezavisimaya gazeta, January 30, 2001, p. 3.

²⁸ Voronov, Konstantin. Rossiya i Baltiya: Sleduyuschiy raund – ot politiki k ekonomike. – Nezavisimaya gazeta, October 6, 2000.

²⁹ McNeil, Donald G. Estonia’s President: Un-Soviet and Unconventional. The New York Times, April 7, 2001.

Regional cooperation in the security issues, and first of all – Russian-Baltic cooperation – is the most important component of stability in North-Eastern Europe and North-Western Russia. But at the same time successful development of cooperation in this sensitive area will promote the Baltic States arguments in favor of their future NATO membership.³⁰ Because of that, Baltic States for many years have been totally rejecting important for Russia idea of improvement of regional security and joint international guarantees to security and territorial integrity of three States. Reason for inflexible policy - indispensable wish of Russia to participate in these guarantees.

Their wish to become full members of NATO the Baltic states had expressed among first in central and Eastern Europe. In response to the move, in agenda of Russian politics in the Baltic region new issue appeared : on measures of trust and guarantees of security, which Moscow would like to provide to Baltic States. Officially, Prime-Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin have presented this idea in September 1997, and the President B.Yeltsin repeated and developed these measures in December 1997 during his visit to Sweden. President of Lithuania Algirdas Brazauskas have received official Russian proposition on international guarantees to the three Baltic States during his official visit to Moscow in October of the same year. But reaction of all three Presidents was immediate and negative; in December 1997 at the Palanga Summit of leaders of the Baltic States they declared Russian guarantees as unacceptable for their countries.³¹ That move can be evaluated as the highest point of “Cold peace” period in contemporary history of the region. Everything, that happened after that in Russian-Baltic relations (not so much really happened) still carried stamp of conflict and confrontation. But in the initial stage very important event defined future processes – in January 1998 the Baltic countries and USA had signed the Charter on Partnership, which was estimated in Moscow as a delay in accession of the three countries to NATO.³²

Another important factor for security of the region was the Northern European Initiative (NEI) of the USA. Announced by the State Department in 1997, the NEI is intended to encourage prosperity, cooperation and integration in the Baltic North through linkages with European and Euro-Atlantic Institutions.³³ The U.S. Ambassador to Finland elaborated the Baltic significance in a 1998 speech: “I am not revealing a state secret if I suggest that if one

³⁰ Arbatova, Nadezhda. Paradoksy bezopasnosti v Baltiyskom regione. //Nezavisimaya gazeta, January 30, 2001, p. 3.

³¹ Voronov, Konstantin. Rossiya i Baltiya: Sleduyuschiy raund – ot politiki k ekonomike. – Nezavisimaya gazeta, October 6, 2000.

³² This point of view have been expressed by several Russian interviewers, both diplomats and military.

was asked a few years ago to draw up a short list of the toughest issues we thought we would face in European security, the Baltic issue would have been on that list”.³⁴ The Baltic element of the NEI is founded on the U.S.-Baltic Charter of Partnership (1998). The Baltic Charter is the starting point for U.S.-Baltic cooperation in many spheres, including international military cooperation in the Baltic Security Assistance Group (BALTSEA), the Baltic Airspace Management Regime (BaltNat), and the NATO Baltic Defense College in Tartu, Estonia.

Estonia more actively than its Baltic neighbors was trying to play the card of GUUAM in relations with Russia and other CIS countries. GUUAM was created in 1997 by Georgia, Ukraine, Azerbaijan and Moldova. These four States had become disenchanted with the CIS, and they sought a regional organization that would more directly meet their needs. Uzbekistan joined the organization in April 1999. The main goals of GUUAM are to support territorial integrity of member-States and create another pole of integration in former USSR – without Russia as a leader.

In principle, GUUAM is one of the most promising organizations for Estonian foreign policy in the post-Soviet area. Purely economic content of the GUUAM (construction of oil- and gas-pipelines) is not so much interesting for Tallinn. Another situation with military cooperation. In principle, any form of military cooperation of Russian neighbors without involvement of Moscow may be seen as oriented on weakening of Russian security. It was not an accident, that when during visit to Tbilisi the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Estonia Toomas Hendrik Ilves he got a question from journalists “What are perspectives for cooperation between GUUAM and the Baltic countries?”, his answer was: “I think the perspectives are very good”.³⁵

In 1998-2000 atmosphere of confrontation in Russian-Baltic relations began to cool and the relations for outside observers appeared as less conflict and more civilized. Such evaluation is based not only on external factors (absence of sharp statements and artificially loud propagandistic campaigns), but also on well-known facts of economic interest of the Baltic States in access to Russian market, as well as in Russian transit and growing share of Russian investments in all three countries, especially in Latvia. There are about 1.100 companies with Russian investments in Latvia, whose total capital is about \$100 million.

³³ Olson, Lyndon L. Jr. 1999. The U.S. Stake in Northern Europe. P. 58.

³⁴ Olson, Lyndon L. Jr. 1999. The U.S. Stake in Northern Europe. P. 56.

³⁵ ITAR-TASS, August 28, 1999. Press conference of the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Georgia Irakli Menagarishvili and the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Estonia Toomas Hendrik Ilves. Tbilisi, August 28, 1999.

Gradually, Russian policy in the Baltic region became more consecutive. Recognizing situation on the region as favorable from the point of view of security, Russia is attempting to follow the course on recognition of special status of the Baltic region as the zone of low military activity. It seems, the ultimate purpose of Russia is the creation of working regional model of European security in the European North. Moscow is ready to recognize as “working” that model, in which it would be able to play an outstanding role, and at the same time the region itself would not be divided in several zones with different level of involvement of Russia. If to recognize as a reality that in the near future Sweden and Finland will not become members of NATO, then in fact all efforts oriented on keeping untouched of existing security architecture in the region are limited for Russia by non-NATO status of the Baltic states (or more broadly – nonparticipation of the three countries in any military alliance). This activity of Moscow is directed equally against NATO and the European Union, if the EU create effective military structure, which would be capable to function without US involvement. At the moment it seems very unlikely to several Russian experts who have been interviewed by authors. The Baltic region traditionally has tranquil political landscape, which was defined by peaceful co-existence of USSR/Russia with NATO countries and neutral states of the region. That’s why Moscow avoid regretting for inflexibility of leaders of the Baltic States, who would like transform the security landscape of the region in such a radical way. Russia is trying to combine energetic diplomatic activity with means of economic diplomacy. The centerpiece of its economic efforts for securing political and military status-quo is now a program of construction of several sea-ports in the Baltic region, among them Primorsk, Ust-Luga, Batareynaya Bay and Sea Port “Saint-Petersburg” and main elements.

Another rather effective tool of economic pressure on one of three countries – Latvia - in Russia’s hands is draft of federal law “On measures of Russian Federation directed on prevention of violation of basic rights and freedoms of citizens of Russia and Russian compatriots in the Republic of Latvia”. The draft of the law have already passed two readings in the State Duma and can come into force at any moment. According to appreciation of Russian experts, implementation of the law may lead to annual economic losses up to \$300 million due to technical barriers to Russian transit trade through territory of Latvia. At the same time losses of Russian (mostly private) companies will be about \$30 million.³⁶ Perhaps, the most distinctive distinction of the Putin’s era and the era of Yeltsin is that in current situation Russian business is ready to obey any order from the Kremlin without very long

³⁶ Voronov, Konstantin. Rossiya i Baltiya: Sleduyuschiy raund – ot politiki k ekonomike. – Nezavisimaya gazeta, October 6, 2000.

discussions and search for concessions from the Presidential Administration and government. Of course, at the same time this situation will lead to outflow of capital, but currently the size of the problem is much less compared to early-mid 1990s.

It looks like one of the most firm convictions of Vladimir Putin is that the NATO enlargement is irrational and brings instability and threat to countries of the former USSR, and especially – to the Baltic States. Arguments of the Kremlin on the problem are well-known. But it looks like Russia's arguments are oriented not on basing its position in diplomatic debate, but once and forever fix desire of Moscow to keep between its own territory and NATO countries a sort of “*cordon sanitaire*” from former Soviet republics, including three Baltic States. In this situation Russia is not even trying to provide needed arguments for its choice. Symbolic meaning was one of the first official statements on foreign policy issues, which had been done very soon after inauguration of Vladimir Putin by Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs. On May 19th, 2000 Alexander Avdeev, a First Deputy of the Minister of Foreign Affairs took part in a session of the State Duma and said: “Joining of the NATO by the Baltic states, Georgia and Ukraine will lead to fundamental revision of relations of Russian Federation and the Alliance”³⁷ Opposition to the second wave of the NATO eastward enlargement is for Alexander Avdeev one of the priorities for his ministry. There is no official statements or even discussions about possible ways of Russia's reaction on the enlargement. That's why there is enough space for speculations for radical politicians and researchers. For Nadezhda Arbatova from Russian Academy of Science, the most probable consequence of the NATO enlargement to the Baltic States will be the creation of “...full-scale military union of Russia and Belarus, including deployment of Russian troops and dislocation of nuclear weapons on territory of Belarus”.³⁸ Another Russian scholar, Dmitry Trenin consider that it will be Baltic region, which play in future role of “good ground, laboratory of multilevel and various cooperation between Russia and the West, and it will be first element of “the Great Europe of Future”.³⁹

The NATO eastward enlargement to the Baltic States is continuing to be a very important issue for Russian foreign policy, even more important than issues of architecture of European security with growing role of the European Union. First of all – Russia is not totally

³⁷ RosBiznesConsulting (www.rbc.ru), May 19, 2000. 12.25.34.

³⁸ Arbatova, Nadezhda. Otnosheniya Rossii i Zapada posle Kosovskogo krizisa. – Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya. # 6, June 2000, p. 18-19.

sure that there is 100% guarantee that “Baltic” enlargement will take place in reality in 2002. There are arguments against the enlargement not only from Russian side, but from some other countries, who are members of both NATO and EU. Important argument for Russia’s final acceptance of the enlargement is the thesis that Russia has too much economic interests in access of national resources to markets of countries, which are the NATO members, and at final stage of discussion economic arguments will prevail over all others. We think that in practice situation of Russia’s dependence on European markets is not so much synonymous. Major part of currency inflow to Russia from European markets is related to export of energy. Oil, which is one of key Russian export goods, is trading on exchanges, that’s why fears that NATO countries will be able to organize boycott of Russian oil seems unreal in situation, then the UN will never support the boycott. Situation with Russian natural gas is totally different – Russia is dependent from Europe in this issue. But even here there is not so much choice for both sides; Russia trades natural gas by prices of world market via existing system of pipelines. Decision of Europe to replace Russian natural gas by gas from Norway or Algeria will be very costly one and opposite to currently existing tendency of the EU to develop dialogue with Russia in energy sector. That’s why it is too early to speak about real interdependence of Russia and Europe. Both sides have to create the interdependence, and such problems as NATO enlargement to the Baltic States or military operation in Kosovo and lack of will to defend Macedonia make the task more complicated. The issue of membership of Baltic States in NATO may complicate international relations in the Baltic Rim. As we know, at the moment Denmark is active proponent of enlargement to all three Baltic States, but Finland and Sweden trying to distance themselves from the problem, simultaneously convincing leadership of Latvia and Estonia in importance of developing better relations with Russia. Russia actively supported the tendency. For Moscow, it is objective and very positive tendency that Northern and Western Europe are not seeing it as source of military threat for sovereignty and territorial integrity of the three Baltic States. That’s why, for instance, regular statements of Estonian leaders (chief of command of Estonian Defense Forces, admiral Tarmo Kouts and vice-chancellor of the Estonian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Harri Tiido) on opportunity to deploy on its territory nuclear weapons after becoming member of NATO, are seeing in Moscow as provocations, oriented on further deterioration of already very cool bilateral relations.

³⁹ Trenin, Dmitri. Vneshnepoliticheskie proekty dlya Rossii. – Nezavisimaya gazeta, February 17, 2000.

The NATO enlargement to the Baltic States will force Russia to undertake reactive measures, which from military and political point of view affect whole Northern European region. Strategic purpose of Russia in several regions of the world, and in Northern Europe first of others, is the same during last ten years – to secure status-quo, which existed at the moment of collapse of the USSR in form of balance of power between the West and the East in a very important European region. From Russian point of view, NATO enlargement will totally destroy the balance, which was very favorable for Moscow. There are enough serious and unsolved problems in the Baltic region from Russian point of view (securing Russian economic interests in the region and Russian-speaking minority are the most important), and that's why Russia's interest in the Baltic Rim is permanent. As the best scenario, NATO membership of the Baltic States will frost current positive dynamics in relations of Russia with Latvia and Estonia, as well as development of links between Russian regions in the North-West part of the country, and Estonia. Russia will have to revise priorities of its transport politics, forced private companies to export goods through sea ports in Leningrad and Murmansk regions. The optimum scenario for Russia – delay or total rejection of the idea of NATO enlargement to the Baltic States. It may, for Moscow, give Russia and European nations an opportunity to come back to Russia's idea of 1997 on joint security guaranties to three Baltic States.

Beginning of the year 2001 became a sort of borderline in relations of Russia and the Baltic States. More precisely, new tendencies appeared in relations of Moscow with Latvia and Lithuania⁴⁰, but not with Estonia. Formal expressions of the new course of Moscow were summits between the President of Russia and Presidents of Latvia (in January in small Alpine spa in Austria) and the President of Lithuania (in March in Moscow). During both summits the NATO enlargement was not the key topic of discussions, at least, according to official statements.⁴¹ Just this interest to have dialog on the highest political level and readiness to move “NATO factor” out of the center of bilateral relations, at least for a while, can be seen as Moscow concession to its neighbors. But at the same time, these signals are quite ambiguous, if Moscow's concession understand as sign to the Baltic States, that they are not

⁴⁰ Chernogorski, Dmitry. Interview with Vaira Vike-Freiberga, the President of Latvia. – *Nezavisimaya gazeta*, February 1, 2001.

⁴¹ During his talks with the President of Latvia, Vladimir Putin “repeated once more negative attitude towards NATO east-ward enlargement”: Falkov, Viktor. *Prezidenty Rossii i Larvii vstretilis v Avstrii*. – *Nezavisimaya gazeta*, February 14, 2001.

in practical politics independent in Trans-Atlantic relations and “serious” dialog Moscow is going to run in Brussels, Washington and Berlin.

If Russia will be able to create and keep atmosphere of cooperation and even trust with some leading EU members, which are economically interested in Russian market and energy resources, then it is possible that in the year 2002 during the Prague Summit of NATO even powerful US pressure on its allies may not lead to the NATO enlargement to the Baltic region. Russia have made its first statement about negative attitude towards NATO enlargement after interest to be NATO member had been expressed in the Baltic capitals. But that fact doesn't impede Moscow to utilize a great variety of tools and opportunities to express its dissatisfaction. It can be conveyed in trade sanctions and embargoes, reduction of diplomatic contacts to minimum, deployment of additional troops and nuclear weapons in the North-Western region of Russia. It is not clear if Europe would like to initiate tensions in one of the most stable and calm regions of the continent and the whole world.

Very important factor of Baltic security politics is the position of Germany towards NATO enlargement. Historically, both Germany and Russia have been dominant players in the region. Today, both countries are again in a position to shape the region's security. It is clear now, that for current generation of German leaders peace and security in Northern Europe cannot be established without constructive Russian involvement. None of German leaders have spoken out on the NATO enlargement towards Baltic countries since the Madrid NATO Summit in July 1997 voted for inviting Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland to the Alliance. In his June 2000 visit to Estonia and Latvia, addressing the Estonian parliament, Chancellor G. Schröder affirmed Russia's role in Europe, declaring it of “strategic significance”. Speaking about need to involve Russia in decisions that concern Russia's interests, he sent clear signal that the Baltic States can not expect to become members of NATO without Russian consent. The same type of signal Nordic countries of Sweden and Finland are sending to the three former USSR republics. It means that the NATO factor is very important in the region and coming NATO enlargement may lead to the creation of a new model of Russian-European relations or to new tensions and deterioration of atmosphere of stability. Main victims will be both Russia and the Baltic States, but not NATO itself and the Bush Administration as the most active advocate of the enlargement. For many Russian observers, chances of the Baltic States to become full members of NATO are getting smaller. The reason is that now world politics is changing its nature for more “realistic”. It means that

artificial virtual threat for small Baltic States have to be graded as less important to problems of “high politics” – balance of power between Europe and the USA, between Western democracies and some Muslim countries (Afghanistan) and China. For all these “balances” NATO member-States need Russia.

5. **Russia and Belarus – role of NATO for the Union state.**

*As long as Lukashenko remains in power, Belarus will remain a maverick in the region while its domestic political and economic infrastructure continue to erode.*⁴²

Jessica Hand, Former HM Ambassador, Belarus

Lt-Col Robert Hand, Former US Defence Attache, Belarus

Close cooperation between Russia and Belarus started since 1994 when Alexander Lukashenko was elected the second head of state of independent Belarus. The main stages of development of the cooperation reflected in several bilateral agreements: Treaty on Union of Russia and Belarus; Treaty on military cooperation of Russia and Belarus; Agreement on joint guarantee of regional security between Russia and Belarus.

Belarussian President A.Lukashenko has partly credited integration with Russia with the achievement of “stable economic growth” in Belarus, which has allegedly resulted in “a more effective tackling of social problems”.⁴³ The diplomatic positions of Belarus on the eastward enlargement of NATO has been practically identical to those of Russia, even more adversely in some moments of European political history of 1990ies (Kosovo conflict, of course, was one of them). Following the example of Russia, Minsk has proclaimed a “multi-vector” foreign policy. The principal aim of the policy was to give Belarus its own profile in international affairs, enabling it to be involved in European political and economic processes. When faced with Western hostile approach to his regime, Alexander Lukashenko made several times provocative statements. His most controversial statement have included a call for the formation of a Minsk-Moscow-Beijing axis.⁴⁴ The active use of Cold-war language lead to formation of his image in the CIS (mostly in Russia, Ukraine and his own country) as a staunch defender of Slavic-Orthodox unity, ostensibly threatened by the West in the form of NATO.

Since the enlargement of NATO emerged as reality of European politics, the Belarus increased its calls to Russia for enhancement of the military aspects of integration with Russia

⁴² Hand, Jessica, and Robert Hand. Belarus & Foreign Relations: Slavic Cooperation Or Competition? In: Graeme P. Herd. European Security & Post-Soviet Space: Integration or Isolation? Conflict Studies Research Centre. UK Ministry of Defence. December 2000. P. 65.

⁴³ Lukashenko, Alexander. Belarus and the CIS. Minsk, 1999. P. 6.

and turning the Union of Russia and Belarus into powerful and effective military alliance with joint army and military planning system. During a visit of Minister of Defense of Russia, Igor Sergeev to Minsk in 1998, his Belarussian colleagues reportedly assured him that Russia could – to all intents and purposes – regard Belarus as a Russian military district.⁴⁵ The key lesson from the Kosovo conflict, which Minsk have learned, was that unpredictable and undemocratic Belarus under Lukashenko's leadership may become the object of a "humanitarian intervention". Since spring 1999 anti-NATO standing of Minsk became official policy and, in many cases, the only way to deal with challenges of the European politics and relations of Minsk with western neighbors. Occasionally, there are conciliatory signals from Belarus towards NATO – in autumn 1999 Belarus has expressed reserved satisfaction with its participation in the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council and a wish to develop "normal relations" with the Alliance. But nobody took the signal very seriously, especially in the situation of Russia sharp financial crisis.

The Russo-Belarusian Union is at the moment the most developed form of integration in the CIS area. In its genesis the union seems to repeat all major steps of European integration after the Second World War, which lead to the European Union. Now all key institution of European integration have their replica in the Russo-Belarusian Union: European Council, Commission, Council of Ministers, European Parliament and others. The only field where the Union is definitely ahead of the EU is military cooperation. Both countries have been advocating the development of a European security architecture around the OSCE, firmly opposing the current NATO-centric system and any expansion of the Alliance to the East.⁴⁶

Inspiration from NATO practices in Kosovo is reflected in a Russo-Belarusian effort to develop rapid reaction forces. During his visit to Minsk in April 2000, President Putin announced the creation of a regional force, combining the whole of the Belarussian Armed Forces with the Moscow Military District, which was negotiated before and fixed in the Union Treaty. The force is to number up to 300 000 troops, which include military units, border control and ministries of interiors' troops. This huge military unit has to be deployed on the territory of Belarus in case of an immediate external threat to its security.

⁴⁴ Kommersant-Daily, September 25, 1998, p. 2.

⁴⁵ Kommersant-Daily, October 17, 1998, p. 3.

⁴⁶ Rontoyanni, Clelia. Russia-Belarus Union: The Role of NATO and The EU. In: Graeme P. Herd (ed.) European Security & Post-Soviet Space: Integration or Isolation. Conflict Studies Research Centre. UK Ministry of Defence. December 2000. P. 87.

Besides with the Union with Russia, Belarus concluded the Agreement on military union with Armenia in February 2000.⁴⁷ According to the logic of integration, next step in bringing Russia and Belarus together has to be membership of Armenia in the Russia-Belarus Union. There are many supporters of the idea in two Slavic countries as well as in Armenia, but nowadays possibility for this move is extremely low, mainly because of very cautious policy of Moscow in the Caucasus region, where Russia can not permit itself straightforwardness of Alexander Lukashenko. Russia have to construct very complex balance of power in relations with Azerbaijan and Georgia. Certainly, these two countries have much more significance for security of Russia compared to Yerevan, which possess support of powerful Armenian diaspora all around the world.

For “filling by concrete substance of military part of the Treaty on Union state”⁴⁸ Sergey Ivanov, newly appointed minister of Defense of Russia, visited Minsk in mid-April 2001. It was his first foreign trip as a Minister of Defense, that’s why the visit has very important symbolic meaning, especially as signal to the West about real priorities in Russia’s military cooperation with its neighbors.

Among questions under discussion in dialog of two countries were: The Military Doctrine of the Russia-Belarus Union; unification of legislation of the two countries in military sphere; functioning of regional grouping of two countries. During this visit as well as immediately after it, the topic of NATO appeared constantly in Russian and CIS media. The reason was – to explain need for further development of military cooperation between Minsk and Moscow. As an observer of the “*Nezavisimaya gazeta*” noted, the obvious threat to the Union state is “powerful military potential of the NATO Alliance and its permanent striving for its own enlargement by inclusion of next in turn Eastern European and Baltic States. Tens of divisions, equipped by the most up-to-date armaments, hundreds of NATO warships and combat planes, which are ready for use at any moment, are, objectively speaking, cocking-piece, which can be pulled immediately”.⁴⁹

⁴⁷ Aivazovski, Ivan. Azerbaijan khochet v NATO. Baku uvazhaet chechentsev. – *Nezavisimaya gazeta*, February 19, 2000.

⁴⁸ Khodarenok, Michail. Rossiya i Belorussiya ob’edinyayt voennuyu mosch. *Nezavisimaya gazeta*. April 18, 2001.

⁴⁹ *Ibidem*.

Relations of Belarus and Ukraine during 1990ies were far from perfect. Despite of the Agreement on free trade between the two countries, which was concluded in late 1990ies, economic cooperation of the countries is limited. Contacts in the military sector are even less intense. To some extent it can be explained by suspiciousness of Alexander Lukashenko to bringing together Ukraine and NATO in a period, when Boris Tarasyuk was the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Ukraine. Several Belarusian military exercises during late 1990ies have envisioned an enemy insurgent from the Pripyat marshland – from the direction of Ukraine. This, probably was the result of Kiev's engagement with NATO, and a demonstrated capability to hold joint military exercises with NATO members, particularly the United States. Belarus is locked also in fierce competition with Ukraine for predominance in the arena of relations with Moscow. Idea of construction of new gas pipe-line to Europe via territory of Belarus and Poland was hard blow for Ukraine and Belarus is very energetic to fulfil the plan.

The Union of Russia and Belarus may play role of stabilizing factor in politically and militarily unstable territory of the CIS. It may demonstrate defensive nature of Russia's and future Union's Military Doctrines and raise trust to Moscow from the side of international community. But the same Union may become reason for painful troubles of Moscow, if the President A.Lukashenko continue to make irresponsible statements on behalf of the Union. Issues of military security on the European continent are very sensitive issue. And if Moscow was able to emerge finally, after ten years of instability as predictable and stable partner in the international arena (despite of continuing problems in internal politics where Chechnya is issue number one), Belarus has very definite and unfavorable for Russia situation. As a matter of fact, the Union of Russia and Belarus will become the litmus test for Russia of Vladimir Putin. Moscow may begin its activity oriented on strengthening its own leadership in the CIS through export of institution of democratic society into other CIS countries, which much less devoted to respect of democratic legislation and procedures. And then Moscow may force the West to recognize and respect of its leadership and status of regional great power For all that both Russian leaders and their partners in Europe should be clear, that it is task for many years. And even simply stable Russia with predictable policy towards other former USSR countries, will be *in practice* great power besides other respected democracies in the world. If, in another scenario, the Russia-Belarus Union will be able to transform itself into a wider security system on the territory of the CIS countries, securing at the same time specific features of defense policy of Moscow, its historical mission would have global consequences.

But for becoming reality, Moscow have to learn A.Lukashenko to live in accordance with democratic laws. It doesn't seem realistic at the moment.

The Union of Russia and Belarus as well as the President of Belarus are exceptionally popular among significant part of Russian diplomats and military. The same we may state about some public officials of some other CIS countries, who had interviews with authors of the report. Partly, this phenomenon can be explained by political preferences of people we have interviewed. Practically all of them are former communists, missing for Soviet period, when military and diplomats were representing the superpower, but not countries who have defense budget which is not enough to buy even one modern military aircraft. Another important feature for understanding their views is that anti-western convictions, traditional for elite of Soviet era, became again strong after the Kosovo conflict, and now are part of mentality of Russian (Ukrainian, Belarussian, etc.) public officials nowadays. In times of the President Yeltsin it was rather difficult psychologically to share them – there were disorder all around CIS, and the lack of will-power and total corruption in the Kremlin. Compared to permanently ill B.Yeltsin, healthy and energetic A.Lukashenko was not bad at all, that's why at least part of population sympathies and support, which in other situation would go to B.Yeltsin, went to the President of Belarus. The situation have changed totally since 2000. Compared to short-spoken, resolute and to some extent effective Vladimir Putin, A.Lukashenko looks amateur of politics, which by chance became at the top of power pyramid of his own country. It seems like Russia is expecting as an inevitable process slowly moving ahead integration with Belarus. It is clear for Moscow that A.Lukachenko has to be paid for his loyalty to Russia in late 1990s – early 2000s by political and financial support during the Presidential elections in Belarus in 2001 where he will be re-elected in any scenario. And it means that during next few years Belarus will follow all ups and downs of Russian policy towards NATO, and, as the result, keys from defense policy of Minsk will be preserved in Kremlin. Any “NATO factor” will not be able to take them out!

6. Ukraine and Moldova: Between Europe and Russia.

For the first nine years following independence, Ukrainian foreign policy was directed westward, at eventual integration into European political and economic institutions. Last October, however, the first signs of an eastward shift appeared.

A.Karatnycky.⁵⁰

1) Ukraine

Relations of Moscow and Kiev in 1990e represented continuous chain of conflicts, radical statements and promises, which were not fulfilled. Major steps in bilateral relations of the two countries are related to their security problems. Among them: sharp discussion of Kiev and Moscow about Sebastopol; the problem of signing Big Treaty on relations of Russia and Ukraine after the collapse of the USSR; position of Kiev towards integration in the CIS; Ukrainian debts for Russian energy resources and especially – for natural gas; perspectives for membership of Ukraine in NATO. As R.Shporlyuk noted: «...in practice all political circles in Russia are continuous to question even the fact of existence of Ukrainian nation, although some of them prefer not to speak publicly about that due to tactical considerations».⁵¹ We think that already existing official statements and actions of Ukrainian, Russian politicians and government officials more then enough for analysis of forms of Russian-Ukrainian interaction in military and security areas as well as on the distinctive features of the bilateral relations of Ukraine with NATO and Russia in the 1990s.

During last decade both American specialists in geopolitics and admirers of the theory in Ukraine and Russia had been paying special attention to the place of Ukraine in continental politics. Leitmotiv of the discussion was an issue of threat from reemergence on the territory of the former USSR of a new union state, which was named a-priori by Z. Brzezinski “empire” as well as “European rogue”.⁵² Supporters of “the European choice” in Ukraine appeared to be in difficult situation. The dream was about creation of collective security system in the continent, but it was rather clear that in scenario of deterioration of relations

⁵⁰ Karatnycky, Adrian. Meltdown in Ukraine. Foreign Affairs. Vol. 80, No. 3, May-June 2001, p. 73.

⁵¹ Shporlyuk, Roman. Russkiy vopros i imperskaya ekspansiya. In: Makeev, Sergey (ed.) Demony mira i bogi voyny. Sorsialnye konflikty v postkommunisticheskom mire. Kiev: Politychna Dumka, 1997, p. 267.

between Moscow and Washington such a system would never be created. In a case of military threat for Ukraine, according to A.Gavrilenko, the UN Security Council will not be able to make any decision, because of one of the Council members (USA or Russia most probably) will use its 'veto'.⁵³ Here is the source of persuasion, shared by part of Ukrainian political and military elite, that Ukraine is bound to be a buffer zone between NATO, from one side, and countries of the Tashkent Treaty, the military union of Russia and Belarus, or simply Russia, from other side.

After disintegration of the USSR, Ukraine became the only post-Soviet State, which has all key elements of the economy of a modern country. It has well-developed industry, included such important branches of industry as ferrous and non-ferrous metallurgy, natural resources, energy sector, agriculture, food and textile sectors and many others.⁵⁴

With a time-being a tendency appeared in Ukrainian political life, that public opinion and electorate in Ukraine treat Russia better compared to attitude to Russia of Ukrainian ruling elite. Leonid Kuchma hardly was able to be elected as the President in 1994 and 1999 without his statements that rapprochement with Russia would be in the center of his foreign policy. However, after both Presidential elections both his rhetoric and practical steps radically opposed his own statements. Russian leaders soon got used to this reality. In the situation of lack of ability to formulate Russian national interests on the post-Soviet territory in general and in relations with Ukraine, in particular, Moscow decided to avoid direct involvement into the Presidential elections in 1999 in Ukraine. Russian polity in the CIS became much more concrete in 2000, when the new Russian President decided to reevaluate essence of country's foreign policy. In the case of Ukraine, new priorities are: recreation of previous economic links; reinforcement of positions of Russian capitals in Ukrainian economy; reorientation of Ukrainian security policy from NATO back to Russia and even the CIS; Ukraine as loyal ally of Russia in such important projects, as the Custom Union, single antiballistic missiles defense, etc. Possibility for radical improvement of Russian-Ukrainian relations stimulate serious apprehensions among Western foreign policy experts. As Sherman

⁵² Brzezinski, Zbigniew. *Velikaya shahmatnaya doska*. M.: Mezhdunarodnye otnossheniya. 1998. P. 147.

⁵³ www.svitnet.ua/protect/military/mil9.htm

⁵⁴ Godin, Yuri. *Slavyanskaya solidarnost i evroatlanticheskiye orientiry: Vstupit li Ukraina v Soyuz Rossii i Belarusi?* – *Sodruzhestvo NG*, February 23, 2000.

Garnett noted: «Or Ukraine will be the cornerstone of new structure of European security, or because of Ukraine all the structure will collapse»⁵⁵

In the CIS Ukraine is on firm second position not just in terms of number of the population (about 50 million), but in terms of GDP in general. In the USSR, Ukraine was well-known due to its high-tech production. Too optimistic evaluation of the significant economic power led in early 1990s Ukrainian political elite to overestimation of attractiveness of country for foreign investors and politicians from leading Western states. Ukrainian economy itself, as 1990s demonstrated, costs not so much without internal political stability and integration into markets of neighbors from the CIS and the biggest internal market in the world – single market of the European Union. Few affords of Ukrainian leadership in reorientation of national economy into direction of Europe gave very limited outcomes for national economy (with exception of metallurgy and chemical industry). Role of Russia in foreign economic policy of Ukraine is continuing to be very important. In structure of Ukrainian imports about 49% are Russian goods. The role of Russia as part of the CIS is for Ukrainian economy even higher: 71% of Ukrainian export to CIS go to Russia, and 79% of import – come from Russian Federation.⁵⁶

Ukrainian elite reacted very jealously to negotiations of Russia with NATO in late 1996 – early 1997, which led to signing of The Founding Act in May 1997 in Paris. In compensation NATO decided to establish in the same year 1997 the NATO-Ukraine Commission and proclaim the Distinctive Partnership between two sides. NATO and Ukraine signed the Charter on Distinctive Partnership at the Madrid Summit in July 1997. This step moved the NATO-Ukrainian cooperative relationship to a qualitatively higher level. From his side, President of Ukraine, Leonid Kuchma declared that Ukraine had made a “strategic choice of integrating in European and Transatlantic structures”. The Distinctive Partnership has opened up new opportunities for practical cooperation and consultation, including the highest level. At the same May 1997 Ukraine have signed a “Big Treaty” with Russia – “Treaty on friendship, cooperation and partnership”. For Russian experts, it was a major step for Western politics towards current Ukrainian President Leonid Kuchma – his mission of

⁵⁵ Razumovski, Kirill. Rossiya zabiraet Ukrainu u NATO. //Kommersant-daily, January 24, 2001, p. 11.

⁵⁶ Godin, Yuri. Slavyanskaya solidarnost i evroatlanticcheskie orientiry. //Nezavisimaya gazeta. February 23, 2000.

establishment of Ukraine as independent and sovereign State was completed for Western countries, and they decided to support more pro-western political forces in Kiev.⁵⁷

On April 24, 1999 a summit meeting between the leaders of the 19 NATO member countries and President Leonid Kuchma was held in Washington. Leaders of NATO countries and Ukraine welcomed the progress achieved in the implementation of the Distinctive Partnership between NATO and Ukraine. It opened up new opportunities for practical cooperation and consultation in different aspects of both political and military cooperation. A NATO Information and Documentation Center, the First such center in a Partner country, has been set up in Kiev under a Memorandum of Understanding, signed in May 1997.

In December 1997 Ukraine and NATO concluded another Memorandum of Understanding on civil emergency planning. It provides for cooperation in the field of disaster preparedness and other civil emergencies. A third Memorandum of Understanding was signed in December 1998 to provide for the posting two NATO liaison officers – one civilian and one military – in Kiev.

Ukraine plays a significant role in Partnership for Peace and is engaged in a program of PfP activities. In addition, the NATO countries have officially designed the Yavoriv defense training area, West of Lviv, as a PfP training center. Simultaneously, Ukraine didn't cease contacts of its military forces with military forces of Russia. But every time Ukraine specially underlined that this cooperation is very limited in size, and there was no “anti-Western element” in the contacts. For example, during the Fairway of Peace'97 exercise of Ukrainian and Russian fleets, initially formed Soviet Black Sea Fleet, the Ukraine's Defense Minister Colonel-General Alexander Kuzmuk repeatedly pointed out that the exercise “should by no means be regarded as the start of military cooperation with Russia,” that it was “of a purely peacemaking nature,” and that Ukraine “is a non-bloc State”.⁵⁸

One of forms of military cooperation, which Ukraine regards as its priority, is creation of several multi-national military units. This policy even got its special term:

⁵⁷ Zatulin, Konstantin, and Alexander Sevastyanov. “Druzhiba, sotrudnichestvo i partnerstvo” mezhdru Rossiey i Ukrainoy. Dva goda spustya posle obmana v proshlom veke. – Nezavisimaya gazeta, January 31, 2001.

⁵⁸ Falichev, Oleg. Russia and Ukraine Hold Joint Naval Exercise on the Black Sea. – The Military Parade, January-February 1998. www.milparade.com.

“batalionotvorchestvo” – creation of battalions.⁵⁹ Mostly, Ukraine is creating bilateral and multilateral battalions with NATO countries (Poland) or applicant countries (Slovakia, Romania). For Moscow it is clear signal of real priorities of Kiev in the field of military security and search for allies to improve its security without participation of Russia. In addition, in frameworks of Joint working group Ukraine-NATO on issues of military reform there are following issues under discussion: expediency of creation of Single Naval Fleet based on unification of existing naval fleet of Ukraine and coast guard of the Frontier Guard; and “conceptual principles of naval policy of Ukraine in context of further strengthening of national security”⁶⁰

From the side of NATO there are growing number of signs of respect to this country as one of the most important partners of the Alliance in Eastern Europe. On January 27, 2000 the Secretary-General of NATO, G.Robertson visited Kiev and had several meetings with leading politicians of the country.⁶¹ During the visit to Kiev and Odessa in southern Ukraine he made a statement that priorities for the Alliance in Ukraine are: “practical cooperation in military and non-military spheres” and “restructuring of defense industry” of Ukraine.⁶²

For the first time in its history, on March 1-2, 2000 the NATO Council had its session on the territory of former USSR – in Kiev, where all 19 Ambassadors to NATO and the Secretary-General of the Alliance had been participating.⁶³ Just on the eve of the session the Supreme Rada of Ukraine ratified the SOFA agreement, which defined status of NATO troops and legal protection of military units, participating in joint military training in frameworks of the “Partnership for Peace”⁶⁴ The same agreement determined status of the Yavoriv training ground in Western Ukraine as an international training center under aegis of NATO. According to Russian media, making comments on the ratified document the Secretary-General of NATO said, that the Alliance will finance maintenance of the training ground.⁶⁵ Most probably, G.Robertson would like to say that resources for the training

⁵⁹ Badrak V. Batalyonotvorchestvo, ili novaya filosofiya voennogo sotrudnichestva. (Batalyonotvorchestvo or new philosophy of military cooperation). //Zerkalo nedeli. Kiev. January 22, 2000.

⁶⁰ www.zerkalo-nedeli.com/print.php?id=29489, February 2001.

⁶¹ Dneprov, Andrey. Kiev prinimaet Sovet NATO. – Nezavisimaya gazeta, February 18, 2000.

⁶² Timoshenko, Viktor. Robinson inspektiruet Ukrainu. – Nezavisimaya gazeta, January 28, 2000.

⁶³ Timoshenko, Viktor. NATO sobralos v Kieve. – Nezavisimaya gazeta, March 1, 2000. It is important to strengthen that President Leonid Kuchma was “on vacation” in Crimea during session of the Council of NATO, distancing himself from this event.

⁶⁴ Timoshenko, Viktor. NATO poluchila poligon v SNG. – Nezavisimaya gazeta, March 4, 2000.

⁶⁵ Ibidem.

ground, which is in a very bad condition now, will come from budgets of NATO member-States. As an official of NATO said in interview to authors of the report, the budget of NATO usually doesn't foresee such type of spending for countries, which are not member-States. Moreover, the budget itself is very limited for using its resources for improvement up to NATO standards of the Ukrainian training field. Another sensitive topic for Russia, which was discussed during visits of the Secretary-General and the NATO Council to Ukraine is the opportunity for NATO to utilize just ratified Treaty on Open Sky for observation flights over territory of Ukraine, which, of course, include flights over Russian Naval base in Sebastopol; participation of NATO in elaboration and implementation of military reform in Ukraine. According to point of view of a Western expert, describing symbolic significance of Kiev's NAC meeting: "With this gathering, it appears that the alliance (NATO) is sending two sharp messages: one of support to Kiev and one of warning to Moscow."⁶⁶ On March 7, 2000, soon after the session of NATO Council in Kiev the Press-Secretary of Ukrainian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Igor Grushko stated, that "Ukraine under certain conditions may submit to the North-Atlantic Alliance its request for membership".⁶⁷ For Russia it was too much! Moscow was ready to construct bilateral relations with Kiev taking into account mutual interests, but it was totally unacceptable to be a creditor and a guarantee of economic stability for a country, which is planning to join a military alliance, which Russia sees as threat to its national security. We think, that since that statement it is possible to define another period of history of bilateral relations. Previous period, which began in May 1997, when the "Big Treaty" between Ukraine and Russia was signed, was not very fruitful for both Ukraine and Russia, but there were no large-scale conflicts and the two countries started to accommodate themselves with the new reality – Ukrainian and Russian sovereignty. Since the statement of Ukrainian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, many elements of Russian behavior have changed and Moscow was able to demonstrate that it has enough tools to influence policy of Kiev in the international arena in general and towards "the NATO factor" in particular.

Formation of the GUUAM and active role of Ukraine in the organization were unpleasant surprise for Moscow. Russian politicians and military reasonably decided, that creation of the organization will cut some opportunities for influence on all five countries, and first of all – on Ukraine. Formation of the GUUAM and departure of some members of the

⁶⁶ Finally, NATO tests A Resurgent Russia – in Kiev. – www.stratfor.com Global Intelligence Update, March 2, 2000.

⁶⁷ Kozin, V.P. Kreml and NATO: perspektivy vzaimodeistviya. – *Mezhdunarodnaya zhizn*, #4, April 2000.

Tashkent Treaty from Russian-led military alliance have demonstrated intention of several newly independent States to undermine domination of Russia in the former USSR area. First anxiety of Moscow was related to perspective of enlargement of cooperation between a number of CIS countries and NATO in frameworks of the Partnership for Peace Program. It is quite evidently, that Russia practically from the start of the program was reacting negatively and suspiciously. Under unfavorable for Moscow scenario, the situation is possible when the PFP program will be starting point for spreading of NATO influence on the Former USSR's territory – such scenario have been foreseen by several Russian diplomats, whose agreed to answer our questions. The same idea is very popular in Russian media.

We didn't find facts of official contacts between NATO and leaders of five GUUAM countries. There is an impression, that NATO simply doesn't notice even existence of GUUAM because of its amorphous structure as well as striking even for the post-Soviet countries instability in member-States of the organization. Indeed, Ukraine didn't become a stable country even after its economy began its boom in 2000; in Moldova Communists-led opposition came to power in early spring 2001 with idea of joining the Union of Russia and Belarus as full member. Regimes in Georgia and Azerbaijan may hardly be designated "stable" and democratic by any sort of evaluation. Authoritarian features are dominating in political system of Uzbekistan. From point of view of authors, NATO is unlikely take the risk of making GUUAM its partner in the post-Soviet system. Most likely, the Alliance wait for final collapse of the project. There is a clear conflict of interests between GUUAM as organization, oriented on prevention of Russian control of energy (oil and, maybe natural gas) supply from the Caspian Sea to European markets, and GUUAM as an instrument of cooperation of member-States in the spheres of security and defense. However, after statements of Russian officials in early 2001, that Moscow is not concerned in integration in the CIS and ready for multi-speed integration (or lack of any integration), GUUAM as mechanism of pressure on Russia simply became out-of-date. The policy of Ukraine in early 2001 demonstrated this shift very clearly. Now Kiev prefers tranquil dialog with Russia to conflict, especially when under discussion are issues of keeping Russian market open for Ukrainian goods or when the topic of negotiations is the huge Ukrainian debt for supply of Russian natural gas. NATO factor, which was dominant in relations of Ukraine and Russia, which was in the beginning of Boris Tarasyuk's term as the Minister of Foreign Affairs among the most important for Russian-Ukrainian relations, ceased to be an independent value for bilateral relations now and is just a combination of interest of such countries, as the USA,

Germany, France, etc. The President L.Kuchma have dismissed B.Tarasyuk at the moment, when he understood that. Symbolically, he did it at the same day (September 29, 2000), when the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Ukraine express its protest to diplomatic representatives of USA and Canada against their interference into internal affairs of Ukraine.⁶⁸ Soon after that L.Kuchma stated: “There is no alternative to strategic relations with Russia at the moment (for Ukraine) – nobody is waiting Ukraine in Europe”.⁶⁹

It is too early to say that current rapprochement of Russia and Ukraine is a long-term tendency. Majority of Ukrainian specialists, who agreed to give us interviews in Kiev (February 2000) and Yalta (May 2000) have confirmed the importance of Russian factor in security policy of Ukraine. But much more time during our interviews had been spent for analysis of Ukraine’s relations with NATO. There is a consensus in Ukraine that there is no possibilities for Ukraine to be a NATO member in a near future due to internal instability as well as very small chances for full-scale cooperation between Kiev and Brussels. This cooperation should take form not only grants of military equipment or simply transfer of financial resources. The essence of NATO-Ukraine cooperation should be in military reform according to standards of NATO. The military expenditures of Ukraine for that should be many times more then now, but Ukraine is not able to do that. If any direction would be taken from the current policy of Ukraine as a non-block country, this direction is NATO or military structures of the European Union. These ideas were dominant in Ukraine just one year ago. Since that time both situation and public opinion had changed in a radical way because of change of Russian politics towards Ukraine in a year 2000 and activity of Russian diplomacy in the country.

During one year after inauguration of Vladimir Putin as the President of Russia, totally new themes are now in dialog among Moscow and Kiev, which were never existed before 2000. For example, Russia is asking for getting property rights on tens objects of military infrastructure, which have been built in Sebastopol during previous 10 years.⁷⁰ Russian and Ukrainian military are discussing mechanisms informing each other about visits of foreign warships to Crimea. More and more concrete is discussion on creation of joint Russian-

⁶⁸ Zatulin, Konstantin, and Alexander Sevastyanov. “Druzhiba, sotrudnichestvo i partnerstvo” mezhdru Rossiey i Ukrainoy. Dva goda spustya posle obmana v proshlom veke. – Nezavisimaya gazeta, January 31, 2001.

⁶⁹ Ibidem.

⁷⁰ Rudenko, Grigori. Marshal i Prezident vstretyatsya po delu. //Kommersant-daily, January 19, 2001, p. 11.

Ukrainian squadron in Black Sea.⁷¹ During his visit to Kiev in January 2001 when Minister of Defense of Russia, Igor Sergeev, according to information of The Kommersant-Daily, signed an agreement with his Ukrainian colleague on participation of Russian military experts in planning of multinational training exercises on the Ukrainian territory.⁷²

The visit of President Putin to Dnepropetrovsk on February 11-12, 2001 became one of the most risky undertakings in his short presidential career. Large-scale demonstrations in Kiev, directed against the President Leonid Kuchma and his Administration created background of the visit. The world media at that time lively discussed chances for L.Kuchma to keep his post. That's why visit of Putin became a symbol of Russia's support of existing Ukrainian leadership. In exchange to that President Putin was able to formulate new economic and political priorities of Russia towards second-biggest CIS country. Officially, the Dnepropetrovsk talks were about bilateral economic relations. In fact, however, the invigoration of top-level contacts between Russia and Ukraine was essentially geopolitical.⁷³ It is hard to overestimate the potential gains for Russia, if the unified industrial and energy complex of the former USSR, which used to be based on the territories of the RFSFR and the Ukrainian SSR, will be recreated. This movement will destabilize strategic situation in Central and Eastern Europe and sharply improve Russian position in the post-Soviet area.

Enlargement of forms and means of cooperation between Russia and Ukraine in 2000-2001 allowed all countries of the Black Sea region to make significant step towards military cooperation in the region. On April 2nd, 2001 in Istanbul, officials of six countries of the region (Bulgaria, Georgia, Russia, Romania, Turkey and Ukraine) have signed an agreement on establishment of Black Sea naval group of operational interaction - (Blackseafor).⁷⁴ The purpose of the Blackseafor – rescue and peacekeeping operations, immediate assistance to countries of the region in a case of emergency, cleaning of the Black Sea from mines, as well as visits of the Good will.⁷⁵ Such initiative, which is modest by any estimation, demonstrated new quality of regional cooperation with growing feeling of trust and wish to assist neighbors.

⁷¹ Razumovski, Kirill. Rossiya zabiraet Ukrainu u NATO. //Kommersant-daily, January 24, 2001, p. 11.

⁷² The Financial Times confirm this information from Kiev: "Ukraine has agreed to allow Russia to take part in the planning of all multinational military exercises on its soil" – Clover, Charles. Ukraine looks east. The Financial Times, January 21, 2001.

⁷³ Ulyanov, Nikolai. Reviving joint industry is to tie Ukraine to Russia. – <http://russia.strana.ru/stories/2001/02/12/981971026/981986777.html>, February 12, 2001.

⁷⁴ Safikanov, Salavat. Professionalny nahodyat obschiy yazyk. Nezavisimaya gazeta, April 10, 2001.

⁷⁵ www.strana.ru/print/986200576.html

The important element of the plan is involvement in the project of Turkey – a member of NATO and countries, who are seeking membership of the Alliance in a near future.

2) Moldova

For several years after the military conflict between Kishinev (Chisinau) and Tiraspol in Transdnistria (1992), Moldova attracted minimal attention of Moscow. Partly it can be explained by difficulties in settlement of interethnic conflict in Moldova itself. But in practice, the interethnic problems were not the only one. For Moscow the issue of preserving troops in the region, influence of organized crime in Tiraspol as well as unclear position of Kiev towards situation in Transdnistria were complicated the process of elaboration of strategy towards Moldova.

Period of uncertainty in Transdnistrian's policy of Russia was too long. To some extent, it can be explained by activity of general Alexander Lebed, maverick Russian general with big political ambitions, who was the Commander of Russian troops up to 1996. He was portrayed by Russian media as the guarantor of stability in Transdnistria. The formula of the stability has never been officially presented by the Kremlin, but it was very clear that major elements of the formula were: territorial integrity of Kishinev (Chisinau) over all territory of the country; and keeping uncertainty over real control of Kishinev (Chisinau) over the most economically developed part of the country without real search for solution of the problem. Most probably, the situation in Moldova was just a part of bilateral relations with Ukraine. Kiev and Moscow were able to cooperate in the peace process, but with Moscow's abstention Ukraine had a zone of instability on its western border, which potentially could turn into real conflict, dangerous for both Moldova and Ukraine. This uncertainty was beneficial for Russia, which was forced to remove its troops from Transdnistria after signing of the Conventional Forces Treaty, and Russia did it even ahead of original schedule.⁷⁶

Activation of Russian politics in Moldova and Transdnistria began in 2000, when the Kremlin decided to modernize its policy in the CIS and make it more dynamic. Tradition of joint military exercises of Russia and Moldova returned. For example, in August 7-12, 2000 the peace-keeping training 'The Blue shield – 2000' was organized at the Bulboaka training

⁷⁶ Zueva, Kira. *Rossii i Evrope nuzhna sobstvennaya bezopasnost: OBSE, a ne NATO.* – <http://strana.ru/state/foreign/2001/03/07/983964662.html>.

ground, where about 40 Russian military servicemen took part.⁷⁷ It is important to emphasize, that observers from Transdnistria also took part in the exercises.

The State Commission on assistance in political settlement of the Transdnistrian problem was established in Russia. Yevgeniy Primakov, former Minister of Foreign Affairs and the Prime-Minister of Russia in 1998-1999 became the Head of the Commission. In early 2001 the Commission prepared a draft of the Agreement on foundations of interrelations between Moldova and Transdnistria. Another document, suggested by the Commission, was “The basic principles of Mandate of Forces for maintenance of peace and stability in the Transdnistrian region of the Republic of Moldova”⁷⁸ These and some other drafts of Commission’s documents leaked to Russian newspapers and became an object of severe criticism. Primakov was accused as “... the principal designer of consecutive “surrender” of Russian interests” not just in Transdnistria, but in whole Europe, or at least in the European part of the CIS.⁷⁹ As a result, the functioning of the Commission was blocked and President Putin with his Presidential Administration became key players in the region.

Soon after publication of results of Parliamentary elections in Moldova in February 2001, the President of Belarus Alexander Lukashenko supported an idea of admitting Moldova into the Belarus-Russia Union. Vladimir Voronin, the leader of the Moldavian Communist party, which won 49% of the votes and 71 of the 101 parliamentary seats, ran a campaign calling for integration into the Belarus-Russia Union and establishment of Russian as a second official language.⁸⁰ Probably, major interest of Russia in Moldova is related to security concerns as well as opportunities to have better starting positions for all types of negotiations with Ukraine. In fact, Russia is very much concerned in securing an opportunity to have troops in Moldova as mechanism for influence on Moldavian foreign policy. Strong positions in Kishinev (Chisinau) may give Moscow better opportunities for controlling Ukrainian foreign policy. Without Moldova in GUUAM, the geopolitical essence of this block is disappearing immediately. If Moldova will establish good relations with Russia, proponents of Russia-Belarus-Ukraine Union in Kiev obtain very influential arguments for this union.

⁷⁷ Ministerstvo inostrannyh del Rossii. Departament informatsii i pechatii. Informatsionnyj bulleten. August 7, 2000 (2000-08-05-001).

⁷⁸ Airapetova, Natalia. “Sdast’ li Vladimir Putin Pridnestrovye? – Nezavisimaya gazeta, March 28, 2001.

⁷⁹ Ibidem.

⁸⁰ Jack, Andrew. Moldova ‘welcome’ in Belarus-Russia Union. – The Financial Times, March 1, 2001.

Significantly enough, Putin, whose skepticism towards the integration in the CIS is well-known, made special statement on possibility of Moldova to join the Union of Russia and Belarus in his Internet press-conference on March 6, 2001, immediately after the Parliamentary elections in Moldova, when Communists establish their control over the Parliament of Moldova and office of President of the country. The only obstacles for Russian President were "...need to follow internal procedures in Moldova for that"⁸¹ During the first official visit of the newly elected President of Moldova Vladimir Voronin to Moscow in mid-April 2001, avoided even a single mentioning of NATO as an important factor for European security. He preferred to discuss other problems: possibilities of integration of Moldova into the European Union, the Union of Russia and Belarus, the Euro-Asian Economic Community; the Transdnistrian issue; signing of the Basic Treaty between Russia and Moldova.⁸² In the case of Transdnistria new position of Moldova is favorable for Russia: rejection of "internationalization" of the conflict via permission of the OSCE observers to come into the region. It means that he is ready to negotiate for rather long time and accept Russia as the principle side in the mediation of the conflict.⁸³ For Georgiy Tikhonov, a member of Russia State Duma, the message of the President of Moldova has to be understood as full-scale participation of Russian troops in the region as the key guarantor of stability in the situation when Romania is applying for NATO membership,⁸⁴ and in the near future NATO's infrastructure will be on the borders of Moldova. Probably, this "apocalyptic" scenario was reported to the Presidential Administration of Russia and reaction there was very negative. As a result, Russia in spring 2001 demonstrated its interest in Moldova and Transdnistria, and made several effective steps towards reinforcement of its role in the region as the only powerful guarantor of stability.

The results of Presidential elections in Ukraine in 1994 and 1999, and in Moldova in 2001, testified that only a politician, who is supported an idea of close cooperation and some forms of unification with Russia has a chances to be elected as President in both Moldova and Ukraine. That's why opportunities for interaction of Ukraine and Moldova with NATO are becoming more limited. In principle, the Alliance will be able to cooperate with both

⁸¹ Putin privetstvuet zayavleniye Moldovy o vozmozhnosti vstupleniya respubliki v Soyuz Rossii i Belorussii. – www.strana.ru, March 6, 2001, at 19:52.

⁸² Airapetova, Natalia. Vladimir Voronin: Vopros o statuse Pridnestrovyya zhelatelno reshit v etom godu. – *Nezavisimaya gazeta*, April 18, 2001.

⁸³ He said, for example: "We have to solve by ourselves problems in our own house – with guarantees from Russia". – *Ibidem*.

⁸⁴ Airapetova, Natalia. "Sdast" li Vladimir Putin Pridnestrovyye? – *Nezavisimaya gazeta*, March 28, 2001.

countries in a very limited way in a near future. Among possible forms of cooperation: consulting on ways of implementation of military reform (with very limited financial resources); defining forms of interaction between military people and civilians; joint exercises with “unmilitary scenarios” – peacekeeping, rescue operations, natural disasters. Strictly speaking, these forms were officially declared as purposes of cooperation of NATO with Ukraine. Moscow is looking for many years if there is something “more” in NATO-Ukrainian relations. Many of our interviews led us to conclusion that the most probably, there is nothing “more” And, in fact, NATO factor in Moldova and especially in Ukraine’s politics is limited to unclear idea of “cooperation with the West”, and influence of NATO in political life of Ukraine is limited by small group of pro-western politicians, journalists and scholars.

As events of April 2001 (dismissal of Prime-Minister Viktor Yuschenko and anti-presidential demonstrations in Kiev and many major cities of Ukraine) have perfectly demonstrated, split of Ukrainian elite, started in early 1990s, is continuing to be significant and even becoming more dangerous. The major dividing-line of the split concerns the geopolitical orientation of the country: the search for a place of Ukraine in community of western democracies or in new post-Soviet area, where it is one obvious leader – new Russia.⁸⁵

Like NATO and even more than NATO, Russia has many cards to play with Ukraine. Ukraine’s Russian minority composes more than a quarter of the Ukrainian population. Russian military and security services retain strong presence in Kiev.⁸⁶ According to a Western expert: “In case of a conflict, no one in Kiev truly knows who would rally behind the (Ukrainian) flag”.⁸⁷ And despite the size of Ukrainian territory and its multimillion population, it still shares a long and nearly indefensible border with the Soviet Union’s most powerful successor state: Russia.

Strategic purpose of Moscow in relations with Ukraine and Moldova should be economic cooperation, settlement of the Transdnistrian conflict, establishment of Russian private companies in the most attractive sectors of Ukrainian economy and creation of good

⁸⁵ Godin, Yuri. Slavyanskaya solidarnost i evroatlantskiye orientiry: Vstupit li Ukraina v Soyuz Rossii i Belarusi? – Sodruzhestvo NG, February 23, 2000.

⁸⁶ Interview in Chicago (February 2001) with an Ukrainian military expert.

⁸⁷ Finally, NATO tests A Resurgent Russia – in Kiev. – www.stratfor.com Global Intelligence Update, March 2, 2000.

conditions for investments into Ukraine of Russian capitals. Consequently, relations of both Russia and its western neighbors will be more civilized, and only in that situation Russia's natural advantageous will be demonstrated for both political elite and business communities: geographical proximity, higher level of openness of internal Russian market compared to the EU; readiness to be equal partner in negotiations on any issue of bilateral and multilateral relations. For many years, the most important conditions for improvement and development of bilateral relations, especially with Ukraine, was the political and economic stability in Russia. Now this condition doesn't seem totally unreal.

7. Caucasus: geopolitics, oil and religion.

*“Geography should make the Caucasus rich and happy. History and politics make it poor and miserable”.*⁸⁸

The Economist.

In the 90s the Caucasus, previously remaining in shadow, turned out to be one of the hottest Eurasian regions. This has resulted from discovery of new oil- and gas-fields, problem of Caspian oil-transportation, numerous territorial and ethnic conflicts. There are more than 3000 kilometres of international borders in the Caucasus. Only the smallest - the 9 km - stretch between Azerbaijan and Turkey is really peaceful. All other borders have already been violated (between Azerbaijan and Armenia) or marked the situation of potential conflict, may be not necessary military (border of Russia and Georgia, or Georgia and Armenia).

The United States recognised the Southern Caucasus as the zone of its concern and declared that it "principally opposed any idea of creating spheres of interests in the post-Soviet area and would stick to this idea in the future".⁸⁹ Actually, this means reluctance of the United States to acknowledge special interests of Russia in this region and let the former interfere into the policies - foreign as well as internal - of the Caucasian countries affecting their choosing of partners on the world scene. As it has been noted by professor Vladimir Degoev, Russia considers that "the area bordering with Russia in the North, Iran and Turkey in the South is - according to situation - might play as a buffer, or a competitive ground, or a constructive link between them".⁹⁰ A perspective of Caucasian countries' joining military alliances directly or indirectly designed against Russia is "justly considered in Kremlin as a threat".⁹¹ At the same time, analysis of the US foreign policy gives a reason to a number of specialists to characterise the Moscow and Washington policies as utterly alternative.⁹²

During the second half of 90s Azerbaijan and Georgia disappointed by CIS peace-keeping abilities actively welcomed US and NATO interest for the Southern Caucasus based

⁸⁸ Where worlds collide. – The Economist, August 19-25, 2000.

⁸⁹ Statement of S.Sestanovich at the U.S. Senate Hearings on April 30, 1998. Mezhdunarodnaya zhizn, N9, 1998.

⁹⁰ Degoev Vladimir V., Proekt-XXI. Globalizatsiya dlya SNG. Modeli obshekavkazskoi bezopasnosti: pro et contra. – Nezavisimaya gazeta, April 25th, 2001.

⁹¹ Ibidem.

on its strategic importance for NATO-members in terms of energy resources. As Russian experts have noted, "The loss of Transcaucasus left Russian South naked in geopolitical sense with its security undermined and the very state more vulnerable. Azerbaijan is blackmailing Russia by a threat of stationing a NATO military base on its territory... Georgia is trying as well not lose opportunity of a blackmailing in a similar fashion... Armenia, though having become a strategic partner of Russia, is not against playing "NATO tricks too".⁹³ It can be observed that the very fact of maintaining contacts with NATO is viewed by Moscow "geopolitics" as a kind of stigma on a country's reputation. Relations with NATO are obviously treated not as a real threat but as a blackmail not deserving reaction.

However, reaction - rather sharp - always took place in fact. For example, on July 10, 1998, the Head of the Central Administration of International Co-operation of the Russian Ministry of Defence colonel-general Leonid Ivashov has flayed NATO plans to strengthen military pillar of the alliance's Southern flank, calling the situation in Transcaucasus "alarming and dangerous".⁹⁴

Steady interest of Turkey to the NATO presence in the Caucasus has been confirmed in Autumn 2000 by the decision to establish a head-quarter of the alliance's rapid-reaction force having the Balkans, the Caucasus and the Middle Asia within its zone of responsibility.⁹⁵ These force should consist of some 1500 officers and play a role of a deterring factor for extremists acting in the region.

Strategically located on the western coast of the Caspian Sea and heir to an ancient civilisation and Soviet industrialisation, Azerbaijan preceded other former Soviet republics in declaring its independence from the USSR.⁹⁶ In the recent decade the country underwent drastic shifts in its internal and external policies, stabilising somehow only under leadership of the former higher communist Geidar Aliev who has taken power in 1993.

Hopes for economic prosperity based on the great oil and gas reserves appeared to be overestimated. Vague judicial status of the Caspian Sea and zones it is to be divided between

⁹² Sokolovski, Maksim. Vykapyvaya topor vojny, Rossiya brosaet vyzov Zapadu. – Zerkalo nedeli, Kiev, January 22, 2000.

⁹³ Avakova R.M., and A.G.Lisova. Rossija i Zakavkazye: realii nezavisimosti i novoe partnerstvo. Moscow, 2000, p. 22.

⁹⁴ Chernyavsky, Stanislav I. Yuzhny Kavkaz v planah NATO. Mezhdunarodnaya zhizn, N9, 1998.

⁹⁵ RosBiznesConculing (www.rbc.ru), September 12, 2000, 16.20.36.

coastal countries complicates the situation even further. About 2-3 million Azerbaijanis reside in Russia, earning money to support their relatives left in the home-country.⁹⁷ Thus, Russia plays an important role for Azerbaijan (the government of the latter previously preferred to overlook this fact). Preserving connections between people in Russia and Azerbaijan is one of the crucial things for its policy affecting not only Baku economy but defence priorities as well.⁹⁸

Baku intends to decrease its traditional dependence on Russia. In this regard, Azerbaijan has established cordial, co-operative and close relations with Ankara. Especially it is noticeable in the military sphere where Turkey has become its main partner during exercises, with Azerbaijani officers training in Turkish schools and about 70 Turkish military instructors working in Azerbaijani army.⁹⁹ The major challenge to Azerbaijan is territorial integrity, that is why Baku intends to strengthen base both economically and militarily in such a fashion that could regain the disputed Nagorno-Karabakh region from Armenia.

In his book “The Grand Chessboard” Zbigniew Brzezinski identifies Azerbaijan as a pivot State in the Caucasus (Brzezinski 1997), a State of particular geopolitical significance. It is important to mention that Azerbaijan is the only Caspian littoral State that is a member of GUUAM, which include also Georgia, Ukraine, Uzbekistan and Moldova. Although this organisation does not claim to be anti-Russian or anti-Commonwealth of Independent States, it is a group which seeks to establish new ties and to develop transport connection. The primary *technical* aim of the GUUAM is to open access to Caspian oil to Central and East European markets. But more *strategic* aim for at least Azerbaijan, Georgia and Ukraine is to move out of Russian influence and dependence on Russian transit links. That is why Azerbaijan as the key oil-exploring country in the region is the most important member of the GUUAM and main opponent for Russia’s attempts to build new transport infrastructure following old Soviet routes.

⁹⁶ For an overview, see: Croissant, Michael, and Bullent Aras. Azerbaijan: Oil and Geopolitics in the Caspian Sea Region, Westport, Conn.: Praeger, 1999, pp. 101-129.

⁹⁷ Sergeev, Dmitry. Azerbaijan: novye nadezhdy. Geidar Aliev nadeetsya, chto emu udastsya dogovoritsya s Vladimirom Putinym o rasshirenii sotrudnichestva Rossii i Azerbaijana. – Izvestia, July 22, 2000, p. 5.

⁹⁸ When in mid-1990ies highway and railway connection between Azerbaijan and Russia was stopped, it resulted by “death” of agricultural export of Azerbaijan. Since the times of the USSR Russian Federation is the main point of destination of agricultural export which is one of pillars of economy of Azerbaijan.

⁹⁹ Chernyavsky, Stanislav I. Yuzhny Kavkaz v planah NATO. Mezhdunarodnaya zhizn, N9, 1998.

The highest yet level of Azerbaijan's interest in a NATO-membership took place in the Autumn of 1999 and the beginning of 2000.¹⁰⁰ The following explanations might be admitted. First, the new military campaign which started in August, 1999, threatening with new complications for Russia. Second, a certain fear of transferring military actions onto Azerbaijani territory, this might be prevented - as Baku considered - only with NATO help. Third, shift of leadership in Kremlin, with a young and pragmatically thinking president coming forth as a partner in talks with authoritarian and even totalitarian CIS leaders, Geidar Aliev as their real patriarch possibly proved to be most stung.

Even before the visit of Geidar Aliev to the United States took place (the eve of 2000), Azerbaijan offered NATO leadership its plan of establishing in Baku a regional information centre, i.e. covered with its activities the three Caucasian States.¹⁰¹ Work practice of such centres displays not only day-by-day information about the Alliance's current issues and statements but spreading freedom, human rights and democratic relations between militaries and society as well. It was only in the beginning of 2001 that the USA dared to characterise the Azerbaijani political regime as "clannish and corrupted", mentioning "violations of human rights and free press persecution".¹⁰² These facts were well known in Russia but such "double-standards" of USA in terms of Azerbaijan turned out to be unexpected.

It has been appraised in Azerbaijan that the first visit in the new millennium the President of Russia paid to this country, having stepped aside of Russian diplomatic stereotypes which, as a ritual, usually gave Armenia a first turn.¹⁰³ The warm atmosphere of the visit signalled the other world that Russian and Azerbaijani interests in the region are not that opposite to consider the policy of the former *a priori* pro-NATO and anti-Russian. It has also been confirmed in the "Baku Declaration on the Principles for Provision of Security and Co-operation Development in the Caucasus". Soon experts started discussing a possibility of resolving the conflict in Nagorno-Karabakh or even establishing the strategic Moscow-Baku-

¹⁰⁰ During his visit to USA in February 2000, President of Azerbaijan Geidar Aliev didn't reject an opportunity for his country to become member of NATO. He also defined relations of his country with Russia as "normal", at the same time relations of Azerbaijan with USA were characterized as "relations or partners and allies". // Aivazovski, Ivan. Azerbaijan khochet v NATO. Baku uvazhaet chechentsev. – Nezavisimaya gazeta, February 19, 2000.

¹⁰¹ Romanov, Petr. V Baku budet otkryt informatsionnyi tsentr NATO. – Nezavisimaya gazeta, February 22, 2000.

¹⁰² Khanbabayan, Armen. Washington ochen nedovolen postsovetskimi stranami. – Nezavisimaya gazeta, March 28, 2001.

¹⁰³ Gornostaev, Dmitry. Posle simboliki. O novykh marshrutah rossiyskoy diplomatii. – Nezavisimaya gazeta, January 18, 2001.

Tehran axis.¹⁰⁴ However Russia is much more interested in securing its control over the Gabala Early Warning Radar Station which has entered into service in 1985, becoming one of the main element of the radar system and covering the whole space of the Middle East and Persian Gulf. Its future yet is under discussion.

Armenian course of foreign policy suffered different jerks in the 90s and can not be characterised as ultimately shaped. The country's co-operation with NATO is limited enough. This is the result, above all, of intensive military contacts with Russia. They were reflected in the text of the "Treaty on Friendship and Co-operation" signed in Moscow (August 29, 1997) which contains a paragraph concerning mutual guarantees in case of armed conflict with participation of one of the parties.¹⁰⁵ In addition to the military assistance, Russia maintains a base in Armenia with a 4000-personnel.¹⁰⁶ For years military co-operation with Russia was a guarantor of Armenian sovereignty. During the visit of the President Kocharyan to Moscow in September, 2000, Russia and Armenia signed the "Declaration on the Allied Co-operation between the Russian Federation and Republic Armenia for the 21st Century"¹⁰⁷ It has created new standard for bilateral relations between Russia and its closest CIS partners, a special attention being paid to the Treaty on Collective Security.

Armenia has common border with one of NATO-members - Turkey, but relations between those two states are traditionally cold. Even more tough are relations with another neighbour - Azerbaijan. The war in the first half of the 90s exhausted both countries. It should be noted that the existing political regime in Armenia is one of the most democratic ones if compared with that of Azerbaijan or Iran where authoritarian forms of rule are predominating. An idea of co-operation with Russia constantly gains popularity among Armenian political elite and the population of the country in the whole. But an attitude to bilateral problem settling with Azerbaijan, in contrast, is distinctly negative. As Geidar Aliev once suggested, the assassination of the Armenian prime-minister and speaker of the Parliament in October, 1999 gave benefits only to opponents of normalisation of Armenian-Azerbaijani relations.¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁴ Gafarly, Mehman. Vozvrashchenie v Azerbaijan. – Nezavisimaya gazeta. January 31, 2001.

¹⁰⁵ Chernyavsky, Stanislav I. Yuzhny Kavkaz v planah NATO. Mezhdunarodnaya zhizn, N9, 1998

¹⁰⁶ Armenia: Security Pact Signals Concern Over Russia. Global Intelligence Update. 24 November 1999.

¹⁰⁷ Ministerstvo inostrannyh del Rossii. Departament informatsii i pechati. Informatsionnyj bulleten. October 5, 2000.

¹⁰⁸ Aliev, Geidar. Interview. //Nezavisimaya gazeta, June 20, 2000, p. 5.

This was acknowledged by NATO as well. When visiting Transcaucasian States, NATO General-Secretary George Robertson admitted that Armenia will not be invited to join the Alliance, giving it opportunities only within the framework of the "Partnership For Peace" programme.¹⁰⁹

After withdrawal of Russian forces from Georgia, Armenia remained the only country where the Russian Transcaucasian Forces (RTF) can be stationed. According to the agreement signed in 1995 RTF in Georgia should be removed by the Summer of 2001.¹¹⁰ Thus, in November, 1995 Russia has faced an unpleasant surprise when President Kocharyan of Armenia and President Aliiev of Azerbaijan in their statements both supported an idea of a new Pact for Security of the Southern Caucasus region. This idea envisaged withdrawal of Russian troops from Armenia and significant improvement of its relations with Turkey.¹¹¹

Currently, there are about 2800 servicemen in the Russian Transcaucasian Forces in Armenia. According to the Treaty of 1997 they "together with the armed forces of Armenia guarantee security of the Republic Armenia on the on the outer borders of the former USSR"¹¹² In case of the total removing of Russian forces from their Georgian bases (Gudauta, Vaziani, Akhalkalaki, Batumi) some 5000 militaries might be added to the army group in Armenia with a significant grow of quality owing to the better equipment.

Relations between Russian and Armenian military officers are intensive as well. Their character might be described by the issues discussed during the visit of the delegation of the Russian General Staff to Yerevan in March, 2001. Among them were creation of the joint Russian-Armenian force on the territory of Armenia, joint air patrolling, operation planning,

¹⁰⁹ Maksimenko, Oleg. NATO prinyayut v Armenii. //Kommersant-daily, January 16, 2001, p. 11. It is important to note that just before visit of Secretary-General Robertson to Yerevan, President Vladimir Putin of Russia made a telephone call to the President of Armenia Robert Kocharyan and "discussed questions of bilateral relations".

¹¹⁰ Ermolin, Vladimir. Ne Gruziiy edinoi. Voennoe prisutstvie Rossii v Zakavkazye prodolzhitsya.//Izvestia, April 28, 2000.

¹¹¹ The most challenging page of Turkish-Armenian relations is murder of about 600 000 Armenians during the First World War. Current generations of politicians of both Turkey and Armenia is not ready to overcome this heritage. Armenia still see Turkey as the most hated historical enemy, and Turkish leadership is not accepting evaluation of Armenian ethnic massacres in 1915 as genocide.

¹¹² Ermolin, Vladimir. Ne Gruziiy edinoi. Voennoe prisutstvie Rossii v Zakavkazye prodolzhitsya.//Izvestia, April 28, 2000.

co-operation in the spheres of air forces organisation, communication, logistics and armament.¹¹³

Georgia more than other CIS countries succeeded in exploitation of the "Russian threat" in its relations with NATO and the United States. The latter pays much attention to it since Eduard Shevardnadze has become Georgian President. During the last decade the United States rendered in assistance for Georgia as much as \$1 billion.. In 2001 financial support is expected to amount \$91 million.¹¹⁴

Having a trifling military budget, Georgia, nevertheless officially declared its claim to adopt its air-defence system to NATO requirements. Tbilisi is planning to put at alliance's disposal air-bases, military training grounds and its Black Sea ports as well as some military units for participation in peace-keeping operations.¹¹⁵

Being interested in Russian energy supplies and other strategic goods, Georgia does not risk to endanger its relations with Russia too much.¹¹⁶ As Georgian Ambassador to Russia Zurab Abashidze once stated, "Russia should not worry about NATO expansion, for it will not concern Georgia".¹¹⁷

About one tenth of the 5 million Georgian population live in Russia for here they have an opportunity to find a job to keep their families. Many Georgians obtain Russian citizenship and move to Russia.¹¹⁸

Georgia tries to manoeuvre between the two poles of its foreign policy - US and Russia - to get advantages from both. Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs Georgi Burduli was candid enough in his speech: "It is important for Shevardnadze that the US should support Georgia

¹¹³ Utochneny perspektivy voennogo sotrudnichestva RF i Armenii. – published on the website strana.ru. <http://strana.ru/state/foreign/2001/04/01/986134379.html>

¹¹⁴ Miles A.Pomper. Georgia Presents Challenges to Bush Administration. In: Houston Chronicle. Reprinted in Russian in Kommersant-daily, January 16, 2001, p. 11.

¹¹⁵ Chernyavsky, Stanislav I. Yuzhny Kavkaz v planah NATO. Mezhdunarodnaya zhizn, N9, 1998.

¹¹⁶ E. Shevardnadze: Uglubleniye svyazey Gruzii s NATO ne napravleno protiv Rossii. –www.rbc.ru. September 25, 2000, 14.52.00

¹¹⁷ Khisamova, Zarina. Gde vshodit gruzinskoye solntse? "Ruka Moskvy" vypisyvaet vizey. In: Ekspert, N 47, December 11, 2000, p. 86.

¹¹⁸ Chachia, Aleksandr. Gruziiya na poroge katastrofy. //Nezavisimaya gazeta. February 2, 2001, p. 5.

facing Russian menace. We need this pressure upon Russia; without it the possibility to change situation will be also absent".¹¹⁹

In December 1998 during the EAPC meeting the Minister of Defence of Georgia, David Tevzadze, made clear statement, that Georgia prefer internationalisation of conflicts on its own territory better than continuing involvement of Russia: "NATO/EAPC should further focus their attention on all existing conflicts in the Euro-Atlantic space – there are no first and second class conflicts. Consultation on regional issues should also be reinforced".¹²⁰

Kremlin reacted painfully.¹²¹ On the one hand the main course of the Russian policy since Boris Yeltsin entered his post was an anti-imperialist nature of the new Russia and rejection of the Soviet legacy, on the other - Russia had to prepare itself for the possible joining of some former USSR members to NATO. Thus reaction on the wish of Georgia to take part in NATO could be a kind of the first defensive line in the future political fight against the Alliance's expansion.

Western countries were, in their turn, distressed by the possibilities of co-operation in the military sphere, in January 2000 uneasily watching negotiations between the two States on the matter of the joint border patrolling in the sector adjoining to Chechen Republic. When on January 22nd, 2000, the Russian and Georgian interior ministers announced the launching of such patrols, it immediately became one of the major international news. The U.S. analytical company STRATFOR evaluated it in a rather radical manner: "If true, this marks a collapse in Georgian government policy and establishes a new Russian military presence in Georgia. The West must react quickly, or Russian policies will further erode Georgian independence".¹²² As it became clear in the nearest future, it was misunderstanding in interpretation of bilateral discussions, but sharp reaction in the West clearly demonstrates importance of lack of Russian-Georgian co-operation for defending Western interests in the

¹¹⁹ Miles A.Pomper. Georgia Presents Challenges to Bush Administration. In: Houston Chronicle. Reprinted in Russian in Kommersant-daily, January 16, 2001, p. 11.

¹²⁰ Statement by Lt.Gen. David Tevzadze, Minister of Defence of Georgia. –www.stratfor.com, December 18, 1998.

¹²¹ As an example of Russian reaction we may take interview of Russian Foreign Minister Igor Ivanov in October 1999. Speaking about threat of international terrorism to Russia, he said: "Our partners (in the Caucasus region – S.T.) should be more energetic in fight with terrorism. If we have information that guerillas and weapons reach Russia via territory of Azerbaijan, Georgia, it means that these countries MUST cooperate with us. It is our common course". – Interview of Igor Ivanov. Nezavisimaya gazeta, October 12, 1999.

¹²² The West Loses Its Grip on Georgia. In: www.stratfor.com, Russia/Georgia, January 25, 2000.

region. The STRATFOR also formulate rather difficult option for Georgian leadership: “The only way Georgia can be prevented from falling back into Russia’s orbit is if Turkey establishes a military presence in Georgia – something that becomes less likely with every passing day”.¹²³

The constructive position of Russia on the future of its military bases in Georgia has become the important feature of the Russian policy. The decision to close them has been adopted by both States on November 17, 1999 during the Istanbul OSCE summit.¹²⁴ According to the agreements followed in 2000, Russia will transform its base in Abkhazia (Gudauta) into rehabilitation centre for its peace-keepers;¹²⁵ the military airport at Vaziani will be operated until Russian forces remain in Georgia.¹²⁶

One may easily presume that in the nearest future manoeuvring of Georgia between Russia and USA-NATO will continue. Thus, on the eve of George Robertsons's visit (September 25-27, 2000) to Tbilisi, President Shevardnadze characterised relations between NATO and Georgia as a "partnership", but soon mentioned that "Georgia and NATO are interested developing good relations with all the countries, Russia first"¹²⁷ Such a policy offers Georgian leadership a possibility to avoid dramatic changes in the internal issues. Finally, Moscow could believe that it is the Russian influence that made Tbilisi make concessions and decline an idea of joining NATO.¹²⁸ It might be not an absolute accident that in the beginning of 2001 the neutral status of Georgia has been talked over in Tbilisi. As N.Broladze noted, "Leading politicians believe neutrality to be an optimal way for Georgia

¹²³ Ibidem.

¹²⁴ Vavilov, Nikolay. Rossiya na Gruziyu ne davit. – Nezavisimaya gazeta, January 10, 2001.

¹²⁵ The Gudauta military base had strategic importance for Russian troops located in the zone of Georgia-Abchasia conflict. Decision of the government of Georgia to close the base mean that Georgia would like Russian peace-keepers to leave the region. But new problem appear – Russian weapons. Position of leadership of Abchasia is very definite: Russian troops may leave territory of Abchasia, but without weapons. This may lead to new escalation of military conflict in the region.

¹²⁶ Babichev, Nikolay and Yuri Chubchenko. Ushla s bazy. Rossiya vyvodit voyska is Gruzii. – Kommersant-daily. April 26, 2000, p. 11.

¹²⁷ E.Shevardnadze. Sotrudnichestvo Gruzii s NATO ne napravleno protiv interesov Rossii. www.rbc.ru, September 11, 2000, 15:55:00.

¹²⁸ On February 13, 2001 Minister of Foreign Affairs of Georgia Irakly Menagarishvili after meeting with his colleague from Azerbaijan said that “There may be no peace or stability in the North Caucasus without Russia’s participation” – www.rbc.ru. February 13, 2001. 16.29.25.

because of its geopolitical location".¹²⁹ At the same time Georgia will keep its chance to blackmail Russia with an idea of quitting CIS.¹³⁰

Invention of visa regime by Russia pursued the political aim of making Georgia undertake adequate measures against groupings of Chechen terrorists on its territory. It was as early as in Autumn of 1999 that Russia requested permission for a military actions to force them out of Pankisi ravine because Georgian army lacked capabilities to do so.¹³¹

Georgian President preferred, instead, deterioration of relations with Moscow. But the experience displayed that Russia after this step and after turning Chechen conflict into a low-intensity form has only broadened its possibilities. First of all, it concerns the support of Russia in Southern Osetia and Abkhazia, where Georgian position is traditionally weak.¹³² Scale of support from Western states in this matter has also been overestimated by Georgia.¹³³

Today the West is ready to criticise Russian policy in the Caucasus, but serious diplomatic pressure, economic sanctions or any other actions of such kind are obviously not planned. If this case the weight of settling multiple conflicts in this region will fall onto its shoulders. Stationing forces to keep stability here is practically unavoidable. The Georgian ruling elite required a certain time to realise it. Only in February, 2001 President Shevardnadze made a sudden statement which marked changing of his previously rigid position. The message implied unwillingness of Georgia to do any quick steps with a neutral status as the most possible perspective for its external policy.¹³⁴

GUAM is an additional way for Georgia to play its own game. Georgia, from the position of economic perspectives, must be the most interested party here. It is stuck to the

¹²⁹ Broladze, Nodar. Shevardnadze boitsya oshibitsya. Gruzija mozhnet stat neutralnym gosudarstvom. – Nezavisimaya gazeta, February 10, 2001.

¹³⁰ www.rbc.ru, 6 March 2001. Gruzija hochet vyiti iz SNG. - http://top.rbc.ru/policy/index.shtml?/news/policy/2001/03/05/05092245_bod.shtml.

¹³¹ Rokotov, Valery. Esche odin faktor vliyaniya. Vizovyi rezhim s Gruzией menyaet situatsiyu na Severnom Kavkaze. //Nezavisimaya gazeta, January 16, 2001; http://www.ng.ru/cis/2001-01-16/5_factor.html

¹³² Russian Federation is active member of international group, involved in settlement of conflict between Georgia and Abkhazia. Russia plays also important role in restoration of destroyed economy of South Osetia as mentioned in the Dagomyss Protocols of 1992.

¹³³ Mekhdied, Anvar. Eduard Shevardnadze vernulsya iz turetskogo pohoda. //Kommersant-daily, January 31, 2001, p. 11.

¹³⁴ Yusin, Maksim. Shevardnadze menyaet aktsent. Gruzija bolshe ne hochet v NATO. //Izvestia, February 7, 2001, p. 7.

only perspective pipeline route Baku-Jeikhan (previously Baku-Supsa)¹³⁵ and the transport passage TRASECA.¹³⁶ Thus, Georgian diplomatic circles were very active when preparing CIS summit in Kiev in March, 2001¹³⁷, its cancellation being a heavy failure for Tbilisi.

With the "Caucasian knot" getting more and more tight, different States have different stakes in the "big game". For three of them it is a question of existence and opportunity to keep territories and unexpectedly obtained sovereignty. Russia is aiming at securing the Soviet heritage, though this very fact is contested almost by each of its regional opponents as well as by the world powers. Resting upon interventionism these powers, Vladimir Degoev keenly noted, " have pretensions for something they can not yet have".¹³⁸ Russian policy has become much more active since August, 1999 when substantial military forces were used to wipe out Chechen terrorists invading Dagestan. Serious diplomatic steps followed in the very Caucasian direction and in terms of the bordering States. It was in February, 2000, that an expert of "Nezavisimaya Gazeta" pointed to the fact of "general stirring up of the Moscow policy in the Caucasus" and one of the Western diplomats working in Yerevan admitted that "Russia remained a decisive force in the region, capable of bringing perceptible corrections into development of situation in Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia".¹³⁹

Elaborating and implementing its own policy in the Caucasus, Russia is interested in protecting its territorial integrity by responding effectively to any regional warfare, such as Chechnya. This goal is so significant for Moscow, that Putin and his team in Kremlin have not worried about Western countries' criticism of Russian anti-terrorist operation in Chechnya since 1999. Russian leaders have reminded the West that Russia still remains to be one of the two main global nuclear powers, which aims to protect its territory and does not allow international interference in what it considers to be a domestic issue. But the Second War in Chechnya, especially in its initial stage in autumn 1999, demonstrated to Kremlin that such a conflict could spill over to the rest of the region – not just to Dagestan, but even to Georgia

¹³⁵ There is growing feeling of mistrust to Georgian President's policy in the sphere of energy transit. As Georgian businessman G.Topadze said in an interview "Let's see, how much the pipe-line and terminal in Supsa brought (to Georgia). Just 800 thousand dollars!" - Broladze, Nodar. Gogi Topadze: "My ne mozhem schitatsya polnotsennymi evropeitsami". – Nezavisimaya gazeta, December 27, 2000.

¹³⁶ Avakova R.M., and A.G.Lisova. Rossiya i Zakavkazy: realii nezavisimosti i novoe partnerstvo. Moscow, 2000, p. 30.

¹³⁷ Dvali, Georgi. Gruziny poehali v Kiev za oruzhiem. //Kommersant-daily, February 6, 2001, p. 11.

¹³⁸ Degoev Vladimir V., Proekt-XXI. Globalizatsiya dlya SNG. Modeli obshekavkazskoi bezopasnosti: pro et contra. – Nezavisimaya gazeta, April 25th, 2001.

¹³⁹ Dzhilavyan, Arman. Rossijskij faktor v Armyanskoj politike. – Nezavisimaya gazeta, February 3, 2000.

and Azerbaijan. Russia wants to make sure that other States in the Caucasus, particularly Turkey and Azerbaijan, would not pose a direct or indirect threat to Russian territorial integrity by assisting the terrorists.

8. Central Asia – far off NATO, close to Russia and Afghanistan

Republics of the Central Asian part of the USSR found themselves after 1991 in a very hard situation, which is still the same even after 10 years of independence. Firstly, independence was totally unexpected for them. Although in the times of the USSR feudal traditions continued to exist in these Soviet republics, but persistent policy of Moscow, not just repressive, but also educational, brought into the region radical changes, which transformed Central Asia into more modern and developed from social-economic point of view. Secondly, newly independent countries of Central Asia didn't have enough experience for dealing with challenges of regional and world politics without assistance from Moscow. That's why in early 1990s five sovereign States of Central Asia had used quite successfully contacts with Moscow for moving into their new status smoothly. It is obvious, that stake on Moscow in many occasions was wrong or failed to be really effective. Partly it can be explained by severe crisis in Russia itself. But even more important was the fact, that Russia was trying to choose its new strategic partners and define its zone of influence in geopolitical terms. Moscow easily proclaimed as its the most important strategic partners Belarus, Ukraine and Armenia. Attitude of Moscow to republics of Central Asia was a bit different. Most probably, it was a belief in Kremlin and the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, that newly independent countries of the region are so dependent on Moscow that they have no free choice. That's why Moscow demonstrated its interest to the region, but the interest was not really big one. Supporting this opinion, Central Asian countries became members of the CIS and practically all of them – members of the Collective Security Treaty. It looks like Moscow was quite happy that Turkmenistan, which has the longest border with Afghanistan, decided to keep distance from “integration nuclear” and using rhetoric about “returning back to traditions of previous generations” started its transformation into a despotic State. In general, before the Taliban Movement appeared as the powerful force in Afghanistan, Russia's interest to Central Asia was modest. The only exception was interest in huge oil and natural gas resources of those countries of the region, which are around Caspian Sea (Turkmenistan, Kazakhstan, and to some extent – Uzbekistan). The main purpose of Russia's policy here was to create barriers for Central Asian oil and gas on the way to world markets, or to force countries of the region to use Russian oil and gas pipe-lines for transit of energy resources to Europe through Russian territory. Moscow has got quite limited results in this sphere, but it is quite clear, that Kremlin had no need to use military force for solving problems of transit in favorable way or to use for that cooperation in the military sphere. The Tashkent Treaty was

designed for demonstration Russia's key role in providing military security in the region and dominant position in the reintegration processes, if they one day become a reality.

But since mid-1990s Moscow had understood, that radical changes transformed the region. For our research two aspects are the most important: 1) the process of State formation have been completed in the region, that's why there were no chances that domination of Moscow (if ever existed) will be guaranteed in future; 2) the reaction of Central Asian States on threat from Afghanistan was different, that's why Moscow have to work out five different policies in the region instead of one policy, which would be able to create joint opposition to threat of Taliban Movement. Since late 1990s there were no illusions in Moscow that any of the newly independent states of Central Asia was going to keep "special" relations with Moscow, if the relations are not profitable for its own. Now countries of Central Asia know very well how "to improve" their positions in dialog with Russia – via diversification of their foreign partners (USA, Turkey, Iran, NATO, China), as Ukraine, Georgia and some other countries of CIS did before. Since 2000 new period in relations of Moscow with Central Asian countries have begun. It is based on receipts of *Realpolitik*, tough and to some extent – aggressive. The situation in Afghanistan push Russia for the change.

In late 1990s several agreements have been signed, which developed an idea of extension of military cooperation in the region, and some of the agreements were not in interest of Russia. For instance, Kazakhstan, Kirgizstan and Uzbekistan have signed the Treaty on establishment of the single economic area, ensuring peace and stability in the region.¹⁴⁰ From the other point of view, Russia have signed several important agreements with countries, competing for leadership in Central Asian region (Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan): Declaration of Russian Federation and the Republic of Kazakhstan on perpetual friendship and union, oriented towards XXI century; Joint Statement of Presidents of Russian Federation and Republic of Kazakhstan; Joint Statement of Presidents of Russian Federation and Uzbekistan. These documents contain articles, which foresee joint actions in spheres of defense and security.

In autumn 1996 after a sharp aggravation of the situation in Afghanistan, member-States of the Tashkent Treaty from Central Asian region have used mechanism of urgent

¹⁴⁰ Tadjikistan have joined the Treaty in April 1998.

consultations for coordination with Russia their attitude towards threat to southern borders of the CIS. In a very urgent manner the summit of five member-States of the Tashkent Treaty have been organized in Almaty. As the result of the Summit the Joint statement was adopted, where leaders of Kazakhstan, Kirgizstan, Russia, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan proclaimed their readiness to react in an adequate manner to any threat to their common interests, as well as they confirm that they are ready to do all they need to improve security of borders of the Tashkent Treaty's member-States.

The Collective Security Treaty have played an important role in localization of internal conflict in *Tajikistan*. The mechanism of settlement of the long-term conflict, which turned Tajikistan into the Civil War in mid-1990s, consisted of active participation of Russian troops in creation of border between the country and external forces, mostly coming from Afghanistan.¹⁴¹ Objectively speaking, such Russia's policy favored the President of Tajikistan Emamali Rakhmonov. But advantages of peaceful life as well as inclusion into management of the country representatives of all conflicting sides give us opportunity to speak about positive influence of Russia on the situation in the country.

From our point of view, the strategic purpose of Moscow's policy in Tajikistan is to protect Russia's southern borders. Already in 1993, in the Treaty on cooperation in military sphere between Russia and Tajikistan these two countries have agreed that "Military formations of the Armed Forces of Russian Federation are staying during transitional period on the territory of the Republic of Tajikistan in places of their permanent dislocation with all weapons, munitions, military equipment and other stocks".¹⁴²

The important aspect of crisis in Central Asia is related to production of narcotics – opium and heroine. In 1999 about 75% of world production of opium was concentrated in Afghanistan, with production about 4 600 metric tones of opium.¹⁴³ According to estimations of specialists, about 65% of Afghan's opium cross borders of Central Asian countries to Russia and from Russia – to Western Europe and all around the world. One of the purposes

¹⁴¹ Now Russian contingent in Tajikistan consists of 201 division and border-control troops (27 000 soldiers and officers). // Gerasimov, Michail. Chto Bynuzhdaet Tashkent smyagchit svoje otnosheniye k talibam? Kommersant-daily, January 30, 2001, p. 5.

¹⁴² Treaty between Russian Federation and Republic of Tadjikistan on military cooperation. Ratified by Russian Supreme Soviet on July 1993, No. 5444-1, came into force on November 17, 1993.

¹⁴³ Danilin, Sergey. Tsentralnaya Aziya – zona osobogo vnimaniya. //Nezavisimaya gazeta. April 20, 2000.

for Russian troops on the border on Tajikistan and Afghanistan is to restrain narcotics and protect its own territory as well as territory of other countries.

It is rather difficult because borders between countries of Central Asia, as well as between them and Russia are existing now only on maps. That's why it is more profitable for Russian Federation from military and economic points of view to protect old Soviet borders then establish new borderline on the territory and create all needed facilities, needed to fulfil the task of protection of Russian territory. Here interests of Russia and States of Central Asia are intersected, that's why all of them supported Moscow's idea of establishment of the Center of struggle with international terrorism, affiliated to the Federal Security Service of Russian Federation. Following this tactic Moscow was able to replace cooperation in purely military sphere with countries of region under observation by cooperation in struggle against terrorism and organized crime. Probably, the policy will create a better image of the Russian Federation in the region and in the CIS in general.

The fact that Russia had changed its military policy in the region of Central Asia, was demonstrated by decisions which had been made in summer 2000. Moscow has made decision to reorganize the Collective Peace-keeping forces in Tajikistan and start removal the troops from Tajikistan. The problem is that the core of collective peace-keeping forces in Tajikistan was always consisted of Russian troops.¹⁴⁴ The civil war in the country finished in 1997 after an agreement between government of Tajikistan and Muslim opposition. The process of national reconciliation came to final stage after Presidential elections in Tajikistan in 1999. But Russia's aspiration to keeping its troops in Tajikistan pushed Moscow "to change signboard" of troops in the country. Division 201 since 2000 would be deployed in Tajikistan as Russian military base. Taking into account threat from Afghanistan and problems of spreading of terrorism, this division will be reinforced by Russia's special antiterrorist units – in framework of the Agreement on establishment of joint Antiterrorist Center, which was signed by the CIS countries on June 20, 2000.¹⁴⁵

Regular interference of Muslim radicals into political life of Tajikistan is weakening the stability of regime of President E. Rakhmonov and that makes this small Central Asian

¹⁴⁴ Small units from Kazakhstan, Kirgiziya and Uzbekistan were also involved into collective peace-keeping forces.

country potentially explosive part of the region. For instance, Kirgizstan have decided in 2000 to mine passes in mountains and roads at the border with Tajikistan, where terrorists may come into neighbor country.¹⁴⁶

Threats to security of the Central Asia are discussing not just in frameworks of the CIS or on the bilateral summits, but also on Summits of the Central-Asian Economic Community, whose members are Kazakhstan, Kirgizstan, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan.¹⁴⁷ This organization is a typical example of poor countries' attempt to create a union for attracting attention of international community to problems and interests of small States. In practice, the Central-Asian Economic Community is facing difficult choice to define a key suzerain for the four countries under analysis. Objectively speaking, Russia may pretend for the role due to historical reasons and proximity of political cultures, created during Soviet period. But activities of such countries as Iran, Saudi Arabia, Turkey and Pakistan demonstrate, that countries of Central Asia have an opportunity to choose their option of foreign policy strategy and Russian variant is not the only one. Arguments of Moscow are still the most powerful, but beside political motifs, there are also important economic reasons to include economically powerful regimes of the Middle East to the list of partners for Central Asian States. In the sphere of economic relations and assistance Russia's arguments are getting weaker with a time-being.

In the beginning of March 2001 the RIA-Novosti Information Agency (Russia) have informed about an opportunity to send about 3000 Russian paratroopers to Tajikistan in a near future.¹⁴⁸ This information was in line with discussion, started in late 2000 – early 2001 about creation of the Central Asian system of regional security and forming of international defense coalitions as military pillars of the system. Already in October 2000 member-States of reformed Tashkent Treaty have signed two agreements, which are closely related to security problems in the South flank of the CIS: “Agreement on status of formation of forces and means of the system of Collective security”, and “Agreement on deepening military-political integration in frameworks of the Collective Security Treaty and measures oriented on

¹⁴⁵ Chernogaev, Yuri, Gankin, Leonid. Mirotvortsev vyvodyat iz Tajikistana. Tam nuzhny antiterroristicheskie podrazdeleniya. //Kommersant-daily, June 21, 2000.

¹⁴⁶ Vavilov Nikolay. Blizitsya vesennee nastupleniye. V Kirgizii resheno zaminirovat granitsu s Tajikistanom. – Nezavisimaya gazeta, January 19, 2001, p. 5.

¹⁴⁷ Chernogaev, Yuri, Michailov, Vasili. Tsentralnaya Aziya ne hochet byt krayney. //Kommersant-daily, June 15, 2000, p. 11.

¹⁴⁸ Georgiev, Vladimir. Rossiyskih desantnikov poshlyut v Tajikistan? – Nezavisimaya gazeta, March 3, 2001.

formation regional systems of collective security”. The key striking tool of regional armed forces have to be Russian Airborne Forces. As Russian expert noted, “ Russian Airborne Forces in near two-three years will lose their peace-keeping functions and will be totally concentrated on fulfillment of mobile tasks for guaranteeing security of Russia on its territory as well as outside of its territory where the need to protect interests (of Russia – authors) exists”.¹⁴⁹

Difficulties of interstate relations in Central Asia have been demonstrated in late April – early May 2001 during visits of Presidents of Tajikistan and Uzbekistan to Moscow. These visits demonstrated rivalry between two very important countries of the region for attention and resources of Russia. In the case of President of Tajikistan, the visit was organized in a very short period of time, and the only explanation, which observers consider as rational, was his intention to meet Russian President Vladimir Putin before his meeting with the President of Uzbekistan Islam Karimov. In fact, rivalry between Tajikistan and Uzbekistan, as well as accusations of Tajikistan by leaders of Uzbekistan in flirting with Muslim opposition and lack of political will to prevent activities of the opposition from territory of Tajikistan to Fergana valley. That could destroy fragile stability in the territory to the North of Afghanistan. As we have mentioned before Moscow for many years was trying to keep equal distance from all five countries of the region. But “pragmatization” of Russian foreign policy in Presidency of Vladimir Putin led to a need to define countries, which are in a very center of Russian diplomacy and military activities in the region. It looks like now there are two lists of the most important partners in the region. In terms of economy, Kazakhstan and Turkmenistan with their huge oil and gas resources are the most important partners and Moscow is ready to devote them more attention than to other three States. But problems of military security didn't lose their importance for Russia, that's why the second list of Russia's priorities most probably includes Tajikistan and Uzbekistan. Tajikistan keeps its importance for Russia due to location on the border with Afghanistan,¹⁵⁰ as well as military base for several thousand Russian officers and soldiers, who defend Russian territory on its distant approaches. Uzbekistan, contrary, is continuing to be the most important country in Central Asia for Russian national interests, whose stability are trying to undermine radical terrorist groups for several years since obtaining independence. It is typical for bilateral relations, that in violation to all traditions of diplomatic protocol, Russia gave status of the State visit of the President of

¹⁴⁹ Georgiev, Vladimir. Rossiyskih desantnikov poshlyut v Tajikistan? – Nezavisimaya gazeta, March 3, 2001ю

¹⁵⁰ The length of border between Tajikistan and Afganistan is about 1500 kilometers.

Uzbekistan to Moscow twice during three years (second “state visit” was in May 2001). Tajikistan reacted to this news rather negatively, and evaluated this fact as evidence of declining interest of Moscow to Dushanbe. The President E. Rakhmonov once again confirmed during his visit in April 2001 to Moscow: «We have never been disappointed, and, I hope, that will never be disappointed in our strategic relations of partnership and cooperation with Russia in any sphere, oriented into the XXI century».¹⁵¹

Kazakhstan as the biggest country in the region with significant Russian-speaking population and all types of mineral resources in its land has special significance for Moscow. President Nursultan Nazarbayev of Kazakhstan was seen by Western States in the early years of Kazakhstan’s independence as a potential moderate and even reformer. But after many years in power he has grown less tolerant of dissent of pluralism, even as multiple stories of high-level corruption multiply in his country, potentially very rich of oil, gas and a lot of other mineral resources.¹⁵²

In late 1990s Russia and Kazakhstan became leaders in scale of bilateral military cooperation among CIS countries. As the minister of defense of Kazakhstan Mukhtar Altynbayev noted, “...the two states have concluded more than 60 bilateral interstate, intergovernmental and interdepartmental treaties and agreements”.¹⁵³ Probably, the most important from all bilateral agreements was the Treaty on Military Cooperation, signed by presidents of two countries on March 28, 1994 and ratified later by the two countries’ legislatures. Significant setback for military cooperation of two countries was Russia’s decision to introduce new rules for export/import operations, in accordance with which armaments and military equipment must be exported and military-technical services extended via intermediary State organizations. It made products more expensive. But at the same time Russian military academies and military schools were open for Kazakh servicemen (about 1100 Kazakh military had their studies there).

Kazakhstan took very cautious position on conflict in and around Afghanistan: neutrality and non-interference into internal affairs of the Kabul regime. Such cautious

¹⁵¹ Panfilova, Viktoria. Interview with Emomali Rahmonov, President of Tajikistan. – *Nezavisimaya gazeta*, April 24, 2001.

¹⁵² Kazakhs Need help. – *International Herald Tribune*, May 4, 2001.

¹⁵³ Interview with the Minister of Defence of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Colonel-General Mukhtar Altynbayev. – *The Military Parade magazine* (Internet version). – www.milparade.com, Issue 30, November-December 1998.

position can be only partly explained by significant distance between two countries. More probably, that another factors are playing crucial role here. First of all – absence of legitimacy of the President Nazarbaev due to prosecution of political opposition and disputable manner of organization of the presidential elections in Kazakhstan. Secondly, giant natural treasures of Kazakhstan, which attract attention of practically all biggest States and the most important transnational corporation of the world to its national economy. Astana (the capital of Kazakhstan) have taken into account interests of at least three the most influential countries in the region – Russia, China and the United States. But their interests are very different! The United States have economic interests due to activities of their oil companies, but at the same time high democratic standards in US foreign policy force American diplomacy pay a lot of attention to securing democracy in Kazakh's political life and, especially, during parliamentary and presidential elections in the country. Russia pays significantly less attention to issues of democracy and fair elections in bilateral relations with Kazakhstan, but there is another problem, which at least potentially may damage relations with Astana – multimillion Russian-speaking population. Civil rights of Russians in Kazakhstan are quite frequently violated by Kazakh's authorities. As a result, migration from Kazakhstan to Russia continuing to be very sensitive issue and this country is one of the main suppliers of immigrants into Russian Federation. For Moscow migration is a rather difficult economic and political problem, but Russia's interests in keeping "temperature" in bilateral relations are so high, that Moscow is ready to close eyes on this and many other problems. The United States and NATO countries are simply not able to do the same.

The fact, that *Uzbekistan*, as a country with the biggest population in the region and strategic location in the very center of Central Asia, plays the key role in Central Asia's security, respected by all major countries in the world.¹⁵⁴ But the aggravation of tension in the country and on its borders led to reconsideration of Tashkent's attitude to the Collective Security Treaty of 1992.¹⁵⁵ President Islam Karimov of Uzbekistan began to develop mechanisms of solving sharp security problems of his country via activities outside of the Collective Security Treaty. Special role in above mentioned attempts of Uzbekistan plays "Declaration on strengthening cooperation between Russia, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan". According to comment of the President I.Karimov at the ceremony of signing of the

¹⁵⁴ According to opinion of Russian expert Leonid Levitin, Uzbekistan is one of few examples of self-sufficiency country in the former USSR. – Levitin, Leonid. *Uzbekistan na istoricheskom povorote*. Moscow: Vagrius, 2001.

¹⁵⁵ Dubnov, Arkadi. *Uzbekistan vyhodit is Tashkentskogo dogovora*. //Vremya-MN, February 2, 1999.

Declaration "...aim of Russia is to create on Southern borders of the CIS a sort of Union or block of states, which, being under control of Russia ...will be countervailing dangerous developments".¹⁵⁶ The signing of the Declaration was followed by deterioration of relations Dushanbe and Tashkent, that's why quite soon the Declaration disintegrated into two treaties of Russia with its partners, as well as a sort of a "Cold War" between two Central Asian nations.

After leaving the Collective Security Treaty in April 1999, Uzbekistan, probably, have hoped to increase political and technical assistance from the NATO countries in its resistance from threat of Afghanistan. But before his country have left the Tashkent Treaty, Islam Karimov have made rather skeptical comment on double standards. After leaving the Collective Security Treaty *de jure* in April 1999, Uzbekistan, probably, had hopes for radical increase of assistance from NATO countries in its opposition to the Taliban regime in Afghanistan. It should be mentioned that before his country had already left the Treaty, the President Karimov very skeptically reacted on what he called "double standards" of NATO and the EU to post-Soviet countries: "Representatives of NATO and EU recently have formulated their position as such: in Kosovo the Yugoslav authorities humiliated human rights and avoid fulfillment of the UN decisions , that's why we have right to strike. But why in Afghanistan where war is continuing for 20 years and there is not just humiliation of human rights, but a full-scale slaughter of people, total genocide of all national minorities, they (NATO and EU – authors) don't pay even half of their attention compared to Kosovo. There is not just catastrophe in Afghanistan, but source of what is an object of energetic fight for the whole civilized world: narcotics, terrorism, illegal trade of weapons."¹⁵⁷

However, if the aspiration for NATO assistance have ever existed in Tashkent, it didn't become reality. Instead of political support and military assistance, the NATO countries began to criticize the regime of Islam Karimov as authoritarian and non-democratic. As a result, according to comment of a Russian journalists: "Islam Karimov have to go cap in hand to Moscow".¹⁵⁸ It resulted in creation of practically full-scale defense alliance of Russia and Uzbekistan, oriented on protection of Uzbekistan from threat of Afghanistan, as well territorial integrity of Uzbekistan in a situation when there are no officially respected borders between countries of Central Asia.

¹⁵⁶ Interview with Islam Karimov. – Vremya, October 1998, #19 (96).

¹⁵⁷ Arkady Dubnov. Interview with Islam Karimov. – Vremya, October 1998, #19 (96).

But cooperation of Moscow and Tashkent in the military sphere was very modest in 1999-2000, and Tashkent selected new policy towards Afghanistan – very limited dialog with Taliban leaders and simultaneously – rapid development of its army for growing threat. The policy of Tashkent in 2000 was a great failure for Moscow – instead of bilateral military union with the country, Russia have got a partner in a very dangerous region, which was very skeptical to ability of Russia to be effective and a loyal partner. For instance, Moscow, keeping several thousands soldiers in Tajikistan never tried to prevent cooperation between leaders in Dushanbe and radical Muslim opposition, which has clear anti-Uzbek essence. For many months Moscow was not able to ratify the Treaty on further deepening of cooperation in military and military-technical spheres, which was signed on December 11, 1999 by Vladimir Putin and Islam Karimov in Tashkent.¹⁵⁹ It took about eighteen months for this ratification instead of few weeks!

Ruling elite in Tashkent during 1990s was trying to create image of stable and prosperous country for Uzbekistan. There is a significant economic growth in the country since 1996 as well as inflow of foreign direct investments. Average growth of the economy is about 4,5 5 per year, budget deficit – 2% of GDP, monthly inflation is practically equal to inflation in Russia – 1,9.¹⁶⁰ Step by step Uzbekistan is transforming from agrarian country into a modern State with industry, oriented to demand of internal market as well as to export (Russia is one of the main destinations of Uzbekistan's export). The policy of keeping distance from conflict in Afghanistan was very successive in 2000: industrial production jumped to fantastic for post-Soviet countries annual 30% growth in 2000.

Results of the State visit of the President Islam Karimov to Moscow in May 2001, according to Russian and international media, were unclear. But journalists found out that military-technical cooperation of the two countries was at the top of agenda of the summit. As the President Karimov noted in his interview: “We, in Uzbekistan, see strategic partnership with Russia as cornerstone for strengthening security in the whole region, where situation is not simple due to invasions of terrorist groups into the territories of Tajikistan, Kirgizstan, and

¹⁵⁸ Sborov, Afanasiy. Posle tyazhelyoy, prodolzhitelnoy bolezni. Smert SNG, o kotoroy tak dolgo govorili, nastupila. – Kommersant-vlast. #21, May 30, 2000.

¹⁵⁹ Ministerstvo inostrannykh del Rossii. Departament informatsii i pechati. Informatsionnyi bulletin. April 10, 2001.

¹⁶⁰ Gerasimov, Michail. Uzbekistan dobilsya stabilnosti. Itogi uhodyashego godda vnushayut optimism. Nezavisimaya gazeta, January 19, 2001, p. 5.

Uzbekistan".¹⁶¹ He also stated that activity of Russian Federation, oriented on providing better security in the region of Central Asia, is totally supported by Uzbekistan.¹⁶²

Turkmenistan occupies a special place in the discussion on security co-operation in the post-Soviet area. A quick view does not show any puzzles in the foreign policy of this country. The President of the country Saparmurat Niyazov, who has ruled the country for already ten years, announced neutrality already in early 1990s, and based his foreign policy on friendly relationship to all its neighbours¹⁶³. According to a Russian expert, "Turkmenistan avoids participating in the activities of the CIS, targeted on fight against terrorism"¹⁶⁴. Moscow regards the regime of Taliban as the main foreign partner of the terrorists in Chechnya, against which Russia is continuing a military operation. Turkmenistan has introduced visa regime with all the CIS member States, but at the same time it allowed double citizenship with Russia. Moscow reacted negatively to such a policy. Besides the fact that both Russia and Turkmenistan agreed on the strategic character of the bilateral relations, in practice the amount of ties between the two countries declined continuously; by 1997 their economic co-operation slowed down to zero level. A sensitive shift to the relationship was given in late 1999, when "Gazprom" eliminated the blockade against natural gas from Turkmenistan and allowed it into the Russian pipe system. Moscow unofficially supported the agreement between Turkmenistan and the Ukraine, according to which Turkmenistan occupied a part of the Ukrainian natural gas market, which earlier had belonged to Russian companies in full. It could be a coincidence, but according to the international organisations' data, the growth rate of Turkmenistan's economy in 2000 was a record among post-Soviet countries of about 17,6 per cent of GDP¹⁶⁵.

Russian leading media estimates the visit of NATO Secretary General Robertson to Turkmenistan in January, 2001 as bringing no advances to the Alliance¹⁶⁶. NATO's highest representative made certain the reluctance of Turkmenistan to be bound with any new

¹⁶¹ Uzbekistan opasaetsya letnego vtorzheniya terroristov. – Published at the [www.strana.ru](http://strana.ru/state/kremlin/2001/05/04/988972498.html)
<http://strana.ru/state/kremlin/2001/05/04/988972498.html>.

¹⁶² Tkachuk, Tatyana, Mekhman Gafarly, Vladimir Georgiev. Rossiya-Uzbekistan: nastupaet epokha potepeniya. – *Nezavisimaya gazeta*, May 5, 2001.

¹⁶³ Gerasimov, Michail. Chto Vynuzhdaet Tashkent smyagchit svoje otnosheniye k talibam? *Kommersant-daily*, January 30, 2001, p. 5.

¹⁶⁴ Georgiev, Vladimir. "Taliban" – glavnyi faktor nestabilnosti. – *Nezavisimaya gazeta*, February 8, 2001.

¹⁶⁵ Pereplesnin, Michail, Egor Yashin. Ispytatelnyi srok dlya chinovnikov. *Kadrovaya peretryaska v Turkmenii na fone liderstva po rostu VVP*. *Nezavisimaya gazeta*, January 19, 2001, p. 5.

¹⁶⁶ Chernogaeva, Gulmira. Turkmeniya dala otpor NATO. George Robertson uehal ni s chem. // *Kommersant-daily*, January 19, 2001, p. 11.

international obligations. As the *Kommersant-Daily* put it: "Mister Sardjaev (Minister of Defense – authors) rejected Western "technical aid for establishing a more beneficial cooperation", claiming that "Turkmenistan's got everything it needs"¹⁶⁷. At the moment Turkmenistan is a member of the Euro-Atlantic Cooperation Council and the Partnership for Peace. However, it takes part exclusively in those PfP activities, which do not involve regular troops.

Probably, *Kirgizstan* is the less significant country in the region from economic point of view. This country and its President Askar Akaev for a long period of time were "good boys" for Western countries. That's why Kirgizstan for several years was receiving economic assistance, support for membership in the WTO as well as political support of the highest political level. But quite soon it became clear for Western leaders that Kirgizstan is an ordinary Eastern country with ruling despot, whose characteristics are less rough, compared, for example, with Turkmenistan, but anyway – too far from rules and norms of a democratic State. For Askar Akaev, the main threat to his country is related to activities of radical Islamic groups, trying to establish a Muslim state in Fergana valley.¹⁶⁸ Another serious threat to the country is continuing conflict with Uzbekistan. When danger from the Islam Movement of Uzbekistan forced Tashkent to take energetic military measures for defense of its territory, Uzbekistan have decided to lay territorial claims to Kirgizstan. At least, diplomats and observers in Russia interpreted in this way the wish of Tashkent to establish control over some territories on the border of the two countries before legal delimitation of the border. In January 2001 Uzbekistan undertook radical measures of economic pressure over Kirgizstan – Tashkent cut all supply of natural gas to the neighboring country. Uzbekistan have tied up continuation of the natural gas supply to Kirgizstan, on which market it is in practice a monopolist, with concessions of territories as a result of negotiations on delimitation of never existed as reality border of two countries.¹⁶⁹

The year 2000 became the threshold for Russian policy in Central Asia, first of all in reestablishment and further development of military strategic co-operation of Moscow with Uzbekistan, Kirgizstan, Tajikistan and Kazakhstan.¹⁷⁰ It is too early to speak about results of the process. Probably, in future the growing cooperation of Russia and Central Asian countries will create more formal relations, a type of strategic cooperation, oriented on

¹⁶⁷ Ibidem.

¹⁶⁸ Frantz, Douglas. Central Asians Brace for Islamic Offensive. – *The New York Times*, May 4, 2001.

¹⁶⁹ Nikolaev, Dmitry. Ferganskaya dolina pod pritselom. – *Nezavisimoye voennoye obozreniye*. March 2, 2001.

protection of the region from Taliban's Afghanistan and Pakistan, which is supporting current regime in Kabul. As *The Economist* noted: "In Central Asia, the Kremlin has in the past year successfully re-established its geo-political clout by playing on fears of Islamic insurgency".¹⁷¹

From the other side, analysis of all forms of Russia's policy in the region doesn't give as an opportunity to speak about well-developed and understandable policy of Moscow towards the region.¹⁷² Up to now Russia was able only react on some problems of the region, and at the same time – to develop infrastructure for its interference into affairs of Central Asia in future. But already now Russia's interests are interconnecting in Central Asia with such powerful countries as the United States, China, Pakistan, Iran and Turkey. The United States are playing the most significant role in the region, partly – according to our interviews and media reports – via contacts with Pakistan. The new important factor for Russian foreign policy in the region is the new generation of political leaders without the "Soviet past" and oriented towards Western countries, where they were educated.

If the United States participation in Central Asian politics is very significant, the NATO factor in the region is practically non-existent. Countries of Central Asia have signed the Partnership for Peace programs, but they didn't demonstrate any sort of active involvement into contacts. For all five countries of the region, participation in the Program is not the transitional period on the way into the Alliance, but a symbol of fashion and, at least partly, instrument for obtaining advice and assistance from the Alliance. We think that in the near future the NATO factor may be totally absent in the international relations in the region. Brussels (first of all – European members of NATO) is not so much concerned into playing geopolitical games faraway from its borders. The Central Asian countries at the same time will move towards more authoritarian regimes, where opposition is under hard pressure without legitimate power of leaders and political elite, and the main principle of foreign policy is to keep equal distance from major power centers in the region: Beijing, Moscow, Islamabad and maybe – Ankara.

¹⁷⁰ Khanbalyan Armen. *Obschaya ugroza kak faktor sotrudnichestva*. – *Nezavisimaya gazeta*, May 31, 2000.

¹⁷¹ *Where worlds collide*. – *The Economist*, August 19-25, 2000.

¹⁷² Bushkov, Valentin, Igor Mazharov, Aleksandr Sobyenin. *Rossiya v Sredney Azii*. – *Nezavisimaya gazeta*, January 31, 2001.

9. Vladimir Putin and Russian Security Policy in the CIS

What kind of Russia emerged from the dissolution of the USSR? It has been the subject of considerable debate both in Russia and abroad. The key characteristic of Russia in Boris Yeltsin's times was its unpredictability. But NATO eastward enlargement and prospects for further enlargement of the EU and NATO, as well as NATO's intervention in Kosovo have compelled Russia to articulate at least some foreign policy preferences. For a Western expert from "Stratfor", Russia under Putin is not only increasingly nationalist at home – as in the war in Chechnya – but is pursuing a vastly different foreign policy abroad, one that is forceful and decidedly independent of the West".¹⁷³

Transformation of Moscow's relations with the CIS States (especially with Caucasus members of CIS) became outstanding yet when Vladimir Putin was just named as the successor of Boris Yeltsin and occupied the office of Prime-Minister of Russia. Usually very delicate in commenting CIS affairs, Igor Ivanov made following statement about Caucasus country and their policy: "They should be more determined to fight against terrorism. If we have information, that terrorists and weapons are penetrating through territory of Azerbaijan and Georgia – they have to cooperate with us. It is our common cause"¹⁷⁴

Definition by Russia of its new "Putin's" foreign policy began from the change of attitude to CIS countries and NATO. In fact, first that Vladimir Putin undertook after inauguration in May 2000 was abolition of the Ministry on CIS Affairs.¹⁷⁵ The history of the Ministry was very complex and difficult – it was established, merged with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, closed and established again several times. We think that after August 1998 financial crisis and crush of illusion that Russian economy could be the locomotive for economic revival of CIS, the very existence of the Ministry have lost rational sense. Rapid economic development of Russia in 1999-2001 have led to careful renewal of hopes for reintegration, but not exclusively in CIS frameworks. Another very important new factor is the more active use of economic tools and even pressure in diplomatic relations of Moscow

¹⁷³ Finally, NATO tests A Resurgent Russia – in Kiev. – www.stratfor.com Global Intelligence Update, March 2, 2000.

¹⁷⁴ Dmitry Gornostaev. Interview with Igor Ivanov, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Russia. – *Nezavisimaya gazeta*, October 12, 1999.

¹⁷⁵ Sborov, Afanasiy. Posle tyazheloy, prodolzhitelnoy bolezni. Smert SNG, o kotoroy tak dolgo govorili, nastupila. – *Kommersant-vlast*. #21, May 30, 2000.

with the CIS countries. Advanced in February 2001 by former Secretary of Security Council of Russia slogan, that full-scale integration has no perspectives in the CIS, sent very clear signal to leaders of former USSR Republics – Moscow starts construction of its CIS policy on bilateral basis promoting national interests and will oppose to creation inside CIS area anti-Russian coalition of a GUUAM-type. The message from Moscow is following: if you (CIS members) are asking for cooperation with Russia in such spheres as opening markets to goods and services, supply of energy resources and access to Russian transport infrastructure – “don’t call us – we call you”. The first call of this type from Russian side was about approval of the Program of antiterrorist measures¹⁷⁶

According to the Russian Foreign Minister Igor Ivanov's statement in spring 2000, the new Russian foreign policy doctrine does not impose the will of partners on the sample of integration within the CIS. Therefore, economic motivation of the integration on the post-Soviet space left the floor to the needs of security, at least for Moscow. On May 19, 2000 Russian First Deputy Foreign Minister, Aleksandr Avdeev, stated that opposition to the second wave of NATO enlargement is one of the priorities of the Russian foreign policy¹⁷⁷. The Russian Foreign Ministry divides post-Soviet states into three groups according to their readiness to join NATO: (1) the Baltic countries, which have already announced their desire to join the Alliance, (2) the Ukraine, Georgia and Azerbaijan, which do not mention NATO in their security concepts but have recently increased the amount of contacts with the Alliance, (3) and the states of Central Asia, Armenia and Moldavia, which preserve neutrality. Avdeev also mentioned that the CIS member States themselves have rejected the idea of NATO as the only factor of stability in the region; he characterized principles of the Russian foreign policy as opposition to building a NATO-centric security model in Europe and preservation of the OSCE as the basis of security in Europe. One must mention that those statement by the Russian Foreign Ministry have never been denied or reviewed later and continue being topical and urgent.

In March 23 – April 3, 2000 the joint military exercises of the Collective Security Treaty member States and Uzbekistan, represented by the 201st division in Tajikistan, again showed the domination of the anti-terrorist dimension in the Russian security policy. Participation of Belarus and Armenia in the exercises has become the first practical step to

¹⁷⁶ Sokolova, Viktoria. Putin ischet podderzhku v SNG. Strany Sodruzhestva gotovy pomoch Rossii razobratsya s Chechnei. – Izvestia, March 13, 2000, p. 3.

¹⁷⁷ www.rbc.ru May 19, 2000. 12:25:34

fulfill the Collective Security Treaty, which allows gathering joint military forces of its member States in any part of the Commonwealth¹⁷⁸.

The visit of Vladimir Putin to Kazakhstan in October 2000 has become another step towards increasing of Russia's influence in the CIS. The Treaty on Eurasian Economic Space signed there unites the five member States of the CIS Customs Union and allows to develop the economic cooperation within the Commonwealth to a new level¹⁷⁹. There Collective Security Treaty member States adopted also very important decisions at the meeting of the Collective Security. Among them one must mention the action plan to build up the collective security system within the CIS for the years 2001 – 2005, the Agreement on the status of troops of the collective security system and the Agreement on the development of the political and military integration in the framework of the Collective Security Treaty and on the measures to establish regional collective security systems¹⁸⁰. Those documents defined the procedure, the functions and the tasks of the joint troops of the Collective Security Treaty member States - a new step in the military cooperation between the CIS member States. Uzbekistan, which used to view the Collective Security Treaty skeptically, sent its delegation with the status of observer to that summit.

The Summit of the member-States of the Collective Security Treaty (October 11, 2000 in Bishkek) marked a very important borderline in formulation of Russia's defense policy in the CIS area. The new "era of pragmatism" in Russian foreign policy, which associated with Vladimir Putin, manifested itself in successful attempt of Moscow to force other members of the Treaty to sign the Agreement on status of forces and means of the system of collective security. The Agreement created favorable legal base for transportation of troops and military technologies between the Tashkent Treaty member States. Besides of that, Russia have guaranteed access to its markets of ammunition and military technologies for the Treaty's members, where prices are significantly lower compared to the price level of the world market of weapons.¹⁸¹ Results of joint military training operations ("Southern Shield of Commonwealth 2000" and several others) were analyzed in Bishkek and the decision have

¹⁷⁸ Mukhin, Vladimir. Uchastniki DKB gotovyatsya k ucheniyam. – Nezavisimaya gazeta, March 18, 2000.

¹⁷⁹ The agenda of this new institution of integration in the post-Soviet space includes coordination in structural transformation of member-states' economies, free-trade regime and introduction of common external tariff, single market for transport services.

¹⁸⁰ Romanova, Ludmila, and Vladimir Mukhin. Sozdaetsya Tsentralnoaziatskaya sistema bezopasnosti. – Nezavisimaya gazeta, October 11, 2000.

¹⁸¹ Babayeva, Svetlana. Evraziyskoye NATO.//Izvestiya, October 12, 2000, p. 3.

been made to establish the Collective Forces of the Collective Security Treaty. The central part of the Forces will consist of military formations, which took part in above mentioned exercises. In practice, Bishkek Agreements marked an attempt to create on significant part of post-Soviet territory a sort of hybrid of a military alliance of NATO-type and “Blue Helmets” of the United Nations. It should be mentioned that one day before (October 10, 2000) a decision has been made to transform the Custom Union of five CIS members into the Euro-Asian Economic Community – a copy of the European Economic Community of pre-Maastricht years.¹⁸²

New agenda for co-operation in frameworks of the Tashkent Treaty have been demonstrated during Moscow meeting of defense ministers of its member-States (December 21, 2000). It was the fourth meeting of the ministers in 2000 and had extraordinary character.¹⁸³ Officially, the theme of the meeting was related to discussion on further military cooperation for period 2001-2005. But in practice, the central part of the discussion was formulated as “a Struggle against international terrorism”.¹⁸⁴ The Treaty member-States and other CIS countries elaborated quite traditional program of contacts, but more important – defense ministers and leaders of the CIS countries have decided to establish the Antiterrorist Center for exchange of information and coordinate joint operations and activities. Ministers of defense from Moldova, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan didn’t take part in Moscow meeting. Probably, it was one of the reason why issues of struggle against terrorism occupied significant part of bilateral contacts of Russian Ministry of Defense in bilateral contacts with the countries (especially, with Uzbekistan and Moldova) in 2001.

In fact, during 2000-2001 Vladimir Putin let know both CIS countries and major Western states, that Russia is not a hostage of the CIS anymore. Other CIS members have at least equal interest to securing normal relations with Moscow. Very often these countries prefer format of bilateral cooperation, and in perspective combination of the bilateral contacts may lead to multilevel cooperation in economic field, as well as even in the field of security. If Russian economy stop its fast development, probability of the scenario is getting smaller. But if the economic boom of 2000-2001 with its record level of industry’s growth and

¹⁸² Babajeva, Svetlana. Pochti kak v Evrope. Sozdayetsya Evraziyskoe ekonomicheskoye soobschestro. //Izvestiya, October 11, 2000, p. 3.

¹⁸³ Mukhin, Vladimir. Odobren plan voennogo sotrudnichestva SNG. – Nezavisimaya gazeta, December 22, 2000.

positive trade balance will continue in coming several years, implementation of the scenario doesn't look totally unreal.

Former Secretary of Russia's Security Council, Sergey Ivanov, during his speech in Munich (February 4, 2001) at the 37th International Conference on Security Issues repeated once more that Russia keep its negative stand towards NATO eastward enlargement.¹⁸⁵ For him, NATO intentions to secure and even reinforce Alliance's structure can hardly be explained in nowadays circumstances, when Russia started reform of its military forces not just in the Ministry of Defense, but in other "power ministries" as well. In particular, total number of troops in "power ministries" will be reduced by 568 000, including 440 000 officers and soldiers of the Ministry of Defense. Sergey Ivanov put NATO activities under a severe criticism. According to his address to participants of the Conference, the Kosovo crisis demonstrated "inability of NATO to manage effectively peacekeeping tasks". The NATO attempt to try itself in the role of peacekeeping operation, according to the same address of S.Ivanov, "led to escalation of the Kosovo conflict to scale of humanitarian catastrophe, bigger in size then the Chernobyl disaster."¹⁸⁶ So, the continuity of Yeltsin's foreign policy to NATO was demonstrated very clearly, and the message was sent – NATO enlargement will lead to Russian reaction in a sphere, where Russia's positions continuing to be quite strong.

We think that there are two variants of Russia's reaction on NATO enlargement, which are in line with policy of Vladimir Putin. In the case of enlargement towards Central Europe and Balkans (Slovenia, Austria, Slovakia, Romania and Bulgaria) Russia will criticize the move but avoid any concrete steps for deterioration of its relations with NATO. But if NATO enlarge to the Baltic States or any other post-Soviet State, then diapason or measures available for Moscow in every concrete situation would be individual. But in any scenario we will face with new and more deep crisis in Moscow-Brussels relations compared to situation of the Kosovo conflict. For Moscow it will be rather difficult in this case to distinguish between (bad) relations with Brussels and (constructive) policy towards major NATO countries. We should still remember short and eloquent note of Vladimir Putin in Vienna in February 2001: "Well, they (NATO countries – authors) don't accept us in NATO". Probably, it means that

¹⁸⁴ Ministry oborony stran SNG obuczdayut voprosy sotrudnichestva v borbe s mezhdunarodnym terrorizmom. – www.ort.ru/owa/ort_win/ORT_NEWS1, December 21, 2000, 12.51.

¹⁸⁵ Sekretar Sovbeza RF: politika Rossii v SNG stanovitsya bolee pragmatichnoj. – <http://strana.ru/security/state/2001/02/04/981293310.html>

¹⁸⁶ Rossiya predpochitaet OBSE NATO – www.rbc.ru, February 4, 2001, 15.43.

Russia has already decided that relations with NATO are rather important and “temperature” in the relations should not be very cold. Moscow needs permanent connection with NATO Head-Quarters and dialog on the basic issues of European politics. But at the same time, the relations should not be very close, that’s why Kremlin isn’t react positively on statements of NATO representatives about importance of such institution of cooperation as the Permanent Joint Council.¹⁸⁷

We consider that Russia in the near future will pay small attention to relations with NATO. “Super task” of Russian foreign policy in 1990s consisted of rising of OSCE status up to getting monopolistic control over security in European continent. The task was not correlated with realities and, as a result, was not fulfilled. But Moscow didn’t give up the idea. In situation when Moscow is not considering as a threat to Europe, and at the same time Europe is not a threat to Russia, there is no need in maintenance of broad and intensive cooperation with NATO. Good relations with NATO may be at any moment sacrificed for an effective propagandistic measure against enlargement of the Alliance. As Russian journalist D.Kosyrev noted about activity of Igor Ivanov as Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs: “Essence of Igor Ivanov’s policy can be characterized in a following way: to behave as a great power waiting for a moment, when Russia really will be a great power”¹⁸⁸ We may say the same about political course of the President Vladimir Putin.

International Conference on security Issues in Munich (February 2001) was commemorated by another several statements of Sergey Ivanov, which are important for our report. His statements were related to Russia-CIS cooperation and perspectives for changes of Russian foreign policy in post-Soviet area. Talking about totally “new approach” towards CIS, Sergey Ivanov said, for example: “...rapid transformation of the Commonwealth (of Independent States – authors) is not possible in a near future”.¹⁸⁹ He immediately gave economic reasons for the new strategy of skepticism towards CIS. According to Russia’s estimations, total debts of CIS countries to Russia are about \$5,5 billion (\$8 billion according to another source).¹⁹⁰ Russia is considering the debts as its economic assistance to the newly independent states. But Moscow is waiting for some concessions from CIS countries in

¹⁸⁷ At the final press-conference after meeting of Permanent Joint Council NATO-Russia a representative of Spain said, that “in XXI century PJC will become one of key institution of providing security”. – Shumilin, Aleksandr. *Mnogopolyarny egoizm. Ekspert*, N 49, December 25, 2000, p. 61.

¹⁸⁸ Kosyrev, Dmitry. *Kakoy Ivanov nuzhen na Smolenskoy?* – *Nezavisimaya gazeta*, April 19, 2001.

¹⁸⁹ Kasaev, Alan. *Sovet bezopasnosti Rossii reshil zakryt SNG*. – *Nezavisimaya gazeta*, February 7, 2001, p. 5.

response.¹⁹¹ In reality, however, there are no “special” relations with CIS members from Kremlin’s point of view (with the only exception of Belarus). In this situation Russia under Presidency of Vladimir Putin is not going to continue the policy of economic assistance and concessions, when Moscow regularly is getting in response only rhetoric about faithfulness to the idea of integration, but never – concrete actions for the integration. This point of view may be seen as pragmatic and economically rational for Russia. But in reality practical outcomes of the new course for Russia could be much less favorable compared to currently existing policy of moderate intervention into affairs of the CIS countries. The most probably, the new policy is based on ideas, formulated in the Center of Strategic Studies (known as the Gref Center in Russia). One of the Center’s believes is that there is necessity for Russia to turn in relations with former Soviet Republics to norms, recommended by the WTO. It means that Russia has to play in the most important sphere of its foreign policy (foreign economic relation) according to rules, which are unknown in Russia, or are known mainly from theoretical point of view.

Another priority of new Russian foreign policy – priority of bilateral relations with CIS countries to the detriment of multilateral contacts. Indeed, the only possible leader and sponsor of cooperation and integration in the post-Soviet area is Russian Federation (if it is a member of an integration-oriented organization). But now economic situation in Russia itself is so difficult that Moscow is spending all resources for getting control over situation in its own country. It is not time for economic philanthropy from the side of Russia. It means that Moscow is not in power to use the most effective tool of influencing partners and obtaining friends at the international arena – via regular and frequently symbolic economic assistance to poorer countries. In addition to that, Moscow is loosing very effective instrument of influence in form of international organization under its leadership. It is hardly a rational and pragmatic policy for new leaders in Kremlin. Indeed, after possible dissolution of the Collective Security Treaty, the period of open and unlimited competition over dominance in the post-Soviet area starts. As we have mentioned above, from our point of view Russia possess good position in the competition in the long run. But at the moment more important that Russia are loosing good *starting* position for the competition. As one Russian expert noted recently, analyzing new foreign policy of Vladimir Putin: “Today pragmatism means revision, while not just in a

¹⁹⁰ Godin. Yuri. Dilemma Rossii v posysovetskom prostranstve. – Nezavisimaya gazeta, January 31, 2001.

¹⁹¹ Sekretar Sovbeza RF: politika Rossii v SNG stanovitsya bolee pragmatichnoj. – <http://strana.ru/security/state/2001/02/04/981293310.html>

sense of denial of former priorities and reorientation towards new ones, but in a sense of inventorying all results of post-Soviet, Soviet, and even Imperial periods of foreign policy of Russia. The task is arrogant and there are some doubts that Putin and his team would be able to manage with the task”.¹⁹²

There is the phantom of GUUAM over all Russian politics in the CIS area. Indeed, the perspective to face with powerful and firm “cordon sanitaire” on its Southern borders is hardly wonderful for Russian diplomats and military. Russian scholars are talking about GUUAM as a threat more and more loudly.¹⁹³ But it looks like the perspective is not attractive for Western countries as well. As one of Western experts told authors in interview, officials from military and political structures of NATO are trying to avoid discussion on establishment of direct contacts with GUUAM and recognition of GUUAM as a partner in cooperation in the field of security. GUUAM, for Russian Federation, is an economic organization, where key player is not Kiev, but Baku.¹⁹⁴ But there is more and more information coming from Azerbaijan, that oil reserves in the country are not as big as leaders in Baku were trying to convince. Since Moscow in late 2000 and early 2001 was able to change general course of Azerbaijan’s foreign policy for less confrontational to Moscow, “the phantom of GUUAM” is disappearing from political landscape of CIS. Summit of GUUAM, organized after several failed attempts in Yalta in June 2001, demonstrated the artificial character of the organization in current situation. It looks like the main topic of discussion at the Summit was about Russia’ attitude to GUUAM and the main idea – that GUUAM is not an anti-Russian organization. Few results of the Summit bring us to conclusion that the organization will exist (i.e. there will be conferences, meetings and even Summits) up to the moment when the United States stop financing of the organization. But without positive reaction of Moscow the organization may be transformed in a very near future into GUA (Georgia, Ukraine, Azerbaijan) or even disappear totally. It is very clear now that Russia is not going to join GUUAM for fulfilling objectives of the organization, pronounced in Yalta. That’s why the shortest way to create transport infrastructure as well as establish free trade area is via GUUAM joining Euro-Asian Economic Community. Of course, under the political

¹⁹² Gornostaev, Dmitry. Posle simboliki. O novykh marshrutah rossiyskoy diplomatii. – Nezavisimaya gazeta, January 18, 2001.

¹⁹³ According to point of view of Professor Viktor Kremenyuk, “The West have decided to come back to idea of creation of buffer zone between its structures and Russia for avoiding confrontation in the sphere of security and being excessively dependent on need to cooperate with Russia”. – Kremenyuk, Viktor A. Zapad ischet predely otnosheniy s Rossiey. – Mezhdunarodnaya zhizn, # 10, October 2000, p. 70.

and economic leadership of Russia. The reason is quite simple – there is no European security and well-functioning economy without democratic Russia. The German Minister of Defense Rudolf Sharping emphasized the idea in a very open way in early 2001: “For solving global, as well as European problems, we need Russia”.¹⁹⁵

NATO factor in 1990s have experienced sharp upward flight, whose pick was during second Presidential term of Boris Yeltsin (1996-1999). Now we may see another stage of its dynamic – reduction of NATO influence in the CIS. It may be explained not just by active opposition of Russian Federation during just started Presidency of Vladimir Putin, but unwillingness (or inability) of NATO to play more active role in the post-Soviet area in accordance with interests, which can unite whole Europe. Security of the European continent is not possible to divide between NATO members and non-members. Up to the moment when NATO (OSCE, etc.) will unite the whole Europe in a single security organization, we witness competition between two power centers, where traditional for *Realpolitik* zones of influence exists and competition continuing to be intensive.

¹⁹⁴ Zatulin, Konstantin, and Alexander Sevastyanov. “Druzhba, sotrudnichestvo i partnerstvo” mezhdru Rossiey i Ukrainoy. Dva goda spustya posle obmana v proshlom veke. – Nezavisimaya gazeta, January 31, 2001.

¹⁹⁵ Among obstacles to inclusion of Russia into European security structures, German Defence Minister mentioned “Russian reflection of international partners”, operation in Chechnya and Russian reaction on NATO operation in Kosovo. – www.strana.ru/state/foreign/2001/02/04/981296386.html

10. Conclusions

The relationship between Russia and the West on the edge of centuries have developed to the point when any scenario of their development has become possible: from full-scale co-operation to entire split in security sphere. The ability to decide rationally has narrowed, so has the dependence of decisions in foreign affairs on economic realities. After the financial crisis in Russia in August 1998 the West has approximately cancelled all its aid and credit programs to Russia; in response, Moscow's decision-makers finished considering their Western colleagues more experienced. The issue of interdependence split in the current Russian-Western relations in two parts. The West remains the main supplier of hard currency and know-how to Russia. The latter remains an important supplier of fuel to Europe; its exports, which does not depend on OPEC's decisions, allows to limit the growth of the world price on oil. Both parties remain very important to each other. However, one should not exaggerate the mutual interest, the interdependence of Russia and the West is very weak. The West is able to solve its energetic problems without Russia; the share of Russia in the external trade of the West is very small. Formally, Russia is very interested in preserving the access of its goods to Western markets. At the same time the West would hardly build barriers against Russian export of oil, gas and other mineral resources. What concerns Russian production and services, the Western markets are almost closed for such imports. The current stage of the Russian-Western economic relations should be viewed as a very unimportant one, which shows the crisis of trust and co-operation on both sides. Nowadays, when the US focuses on internal economic affairs and the process of European integration and the EU reform remains difficult, Russia and the West do not pay much attention to each other, therefore, the scenario of confrontation appears easier than the long seek for respect of mutual interests.

It would be wrong to research Russian interests as limited only with Russian territory. It would be also unrealistic to view the rest of the world as the zone of the United States and NATO interests. The true lies somewhere in between those marginal points, however, it is still unclear, whether Russian and Western politicians appear to be able to find that solution. The situation will be first tested in 2002, when it is clear, whether the Baltic States entered the NATO or not. There will be more tests for the relations to be passed.

The fortune of the Tashkent Treaty reflects the common tendency of the CIS development: very important and often very radical laws get adopted, but never get ratified by

national parliaments and supported by national governments. Even if it does take place, those laws never get fulfilled.

By the end of 1997, when the development of the CIS faced its most difficult crisis, CIS member States signed only 130 papers of the 886, adopted by the Council of Heads of States or by the Council of Heads of Governments; only five of the papers came in force in all the countries.¹⁹⁶ Generally speaking, Russia sought stability on all frontiers. Superpower that it was, the Soviet Union had a political handful with its small-power periphery. Today the bounds of the periphery have changed but Russia's nearest neighbors are still a handful to handle.

The Vladimir Putin's visit aimed on the moderation of the disintegrative processes inside the CIS. It looks like he plans to achieve the aim in an unusual way via accelerated deconstruction of "dead" institutions and concentrating attention on the perspective ones. Among the latter there are bilateral military cooperation of Russia with other CIS countries, several multilateral initiatives in the military sphere (common anti-missile defense) and production of arms.

The factor of personality of Vladimir Putin in the post-Soviet area needs more attention of researchers. However, even now one may say that he is a better person to strengthen links in the post-Soviet area than Boris Yeltsin has ever been. Besides his evident ability to visit any CIS member State in case of emergency or in accordance to the protocol, Vladimir Putin, already during first months of his presidency, did what Yeltsin has never been able to do: he articulated the main aims of Russian policy in the post-Soviet area. Geydar Aliev, the President of Azerbaijan and one of the most affective politicians in the area, underlined that in June 2000, claiming that "after the change of leadership in Russia the CIS has started the second stage in its life".¹⁹⁷

Nowadays the Tashkent Treaty implements the principles of multi-level and multi-speed integration. Cooperation in the security sphere among significant CIS member States and their small groups is developing. However, such multi-level and multi-speed development

¹⁹⁶ Bendikov, M., and E.Khrustalev. Integratsiya voennoy industrii stran SNG. – Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya. 1998, #12, p. 140.

¹⁹⁷ Aliev, Geidar. Interview. //Nezavisimaya gazeta, June 20, 2000, p. 5.

shows a deep crisis of the idea of military cooperation of the CIS member States, especially in the sectors of collective security inside the CIS and common priorities of the defense policies of its member States. None of the member States sees collective security as an urgent matter, especially in the conditions of the economic crisis, of which all CIS countries suffer currently. The majority of the countries possess their main threats inside the State borders. They are separatist movements, ethnic conflicts, corruption, organized crime, etc. The solution of those problems requires not only military measures, but also social and economic reforms, democratization of the political life, ensuring of democratic freedoms. The solution of those problems also requires bilateral cooperation with Russia and closest neighbor countries. In such a situation the relationship between the CIS member States and NATO look like efforts of couturiers: one can produce and show such clothes, but one can not wear it.

Moscow policies towards NATO in 2000-2001 have demonstrated that it considers freezing of relations with the Alliance, which took place in 1999, as a failure. Automatic counter-action against NATO's move of any kind is being gradually replaced with the other policy model: seeking of areas where Moscow and Brussels could co-operate, understanding that "common danger overweighs current contradictions"¹⁹⁸. The appointment by the new US Administration of Alexander Vershbow as an Ambassador in Moscow is characteristic in that context. This appointment is traditionally considered to be the "...one of the most important political decisions made at the outset of a new administration".¹⁹⁹ Government-oriented mass-media in Russia did not interpret it as a sign of decline in Russia-USA relations, though in time of Kosovo conflict Vershbow was the one among mostly criticized NATO leaders.

The crisis in Chechnya, around Afghanistan and other hot spots on CIS territory showed, that NATO did not plan direct interference into conflict settlement there. NATO member-States possess large potential for organizing diplomatic dialogue, they can give considerable economic assistance on bilateral basis and also through international financial institutions as mediators. However, NATO countries always link such help to certain provisions. Some of them are unacceptable for CIS member-States, especially while it applies to the liberalization of their respective political regimes. Currently Russia appears as a democratic country within CIS territory, even if to take into account loud campaign around "Gusinski affair" and the discussion of danger of the free press in Russia, which it implied. In

¹⁹⁸ Khanbalyan Armen. Obschaya ugroza kak faktor sotrudnichestva. – Nezavisimaya gazeta, May 31, 2000.

¹⁹⁹ Tyler, Patrick E. An Envoy Waits as Russia Policy is Pondered. – The New York Times, April 5, 2001.

other CIS countries situation with democratic freedoms seems to be even more dramatic: total eradication of opposition (Turkmenistan), opposition is imprisoned (Georgia, Kirgizstan), or in exile (Belarus). The free press is jeopardized in practically all CIS countries because of direct government actions manifested in press censure or use of administrative means for influencing electronic media or newspapers. CIS member-States have not become the part of Western world and that's why an idea of position equidistant from Russia and NATO seems to be more and more attractive to them, for it enables conscious bargaining with both sides. It is not at all fortuitous, that in second part of 1990s was signed a number of large-scale bilateral agreements examined above.

NATO is one of the key factors in the post-Soviet area that influences the harmonization of the foreign policies of the CIS member States. That factor influenced the Collective Security Treaty of 1992. During the negotiations on the treaty the position of the CIS member States was very tough, since they felt themselves able to apply for NATO's military assistance and aid. Currently it is not enough for Moscow to point at different abstract threats in the post-Soviet area, when seeking for the ability to deploy troops on the territories of the CIS member States. Now Russia has whether to point at serious threats (such as Talibs in Central Asia) or put pressure on its neighbors, taking into consideration that the latter may hardly be hidden from the international community. Doing so (especially in 1999 - 2000), Russia attempted to meet its national interests in the form that its President and its Government articulate very clearly. However, Russia's neighbors are disable to recognize those interests silently; and that leads to diplomatic conflicts and worsening of the entire situation on the post-Soviet area, as well as between Russia and NATO. Another source of misunderstanding between Russia and NATO is Vladimir Putin's belief that "NATO has to be dismissed. When Moscow represents no threat, it is not necessary to enlarge military blocks".²⁰⁰

A bar for the military cooperation on the post-soviet area exists because of the break of the technological links between the ex-USSR Republics and because of the transfer of the accounts for the delivery of military production and devices to the currency. In the current

²⁰⁰ Citation from: www.top.rbc.ru February 10, 2001. This statement V.Putin made during his visit to Austria on February 9-11, 2001.

situation any step to the recreation of co-operation between the CIS-members attracts great attention of the West and especially of NATO⁶.

More active and aggressive course of Russia towards the CIS-members in 1999-2001 has promptly given concrete results. It can be seen first of all in the reinforcement of the Russian position in Caucasus. The time when Armenia was hesitating if Moscow or Ankara was of more importance for Yerevan has passed by. Georgia has changed the tonality of its discussions with Russia to much more pacific one, stopped to mention the membership in NATO and declared Russia to be an important participant of the peace process in Caucasus. But probably the most impressing results the Putin's policy has had in Azerbaijan. The many years "Cold war" between Moscow and Baku was immediately forgotten and substituted by the pragmatic course of the both countries directed to the co-operation in such important spheres as the struggle against the terrorism and the economic links between the two countries.⁷The problem of dislocation on the Azerbaijan's territory of Gabalin radar installation, very important for Russia, is still unsolved but in the nearest future there is no risk for this installation.

Evidently, the political forces are already born and strengthened in Russia that will oppose in a flat form to the reintegration on the ex-USSR area.⁸ Their position can hardly be changed even by the idea that the reintegration can diminish the depth of the economic and financial crisis in which the Russian economy is involved, because the reinstatement of the former economic links can stimulate the Russian economy.

Addressing to the international conference on security in Munich in February 2001 G. Robertson made, according to the mass-media information, a statement which was important for Russia: "The Transatlantic Community's mission will be concluded when all the States, Russia including, will join the integrated, liberal and prosperous Europe."⁹ From the point of

⁶ ²⁰¹ As an example we may mention visit of the President of Russia Vladimir Putin to Ukraine in February 2001. Immediately after signing several agreements on recreation of cooperation links between Ukrainian and Russian producers US Ambassador in Ukraine made a statement with severe criticism of this developments.

⁷ Ya uveren- alternativny ottsu net. Interview with Ilkram Aliev, son of the President Geidar Aliev of Azerbaijan. - Isvestia, No.87 (25925), May 19, 2001

⁸ Henry E. Hale. The Rise of Russian Anti-imperialism. In: Orbis. A Journal of International Affairs. Volume 43, N. 1, Winter 1999. P. 125.

⁹ Gensek NATO ne iskluchaet sozdaniya voennoy missii aliansa v Rossii. February 4, 2001. - <http://www.strana.ru/world/society/2001/02/04/981289606.html>

view of a scientist, it can't be called a cannon for the NATO's dismissal, because such cannons would be elaborated on, and this is a task for politicians and diplomats. Evidently both, Russia and NATO, will remain the main figures in the post-soviet area for a long time. Their relations in this region may be far from being ideal. And yet taking into account the mutual interests, the correlation between the real possibilities of the parts to pursue their interests in the region and the practical actions will permit to bring certain stability.

The experts from the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs still are trying to resolve the problem: "Is the plurisideness an artificially constructed and that's why an invented scheme or is it the reality of the modern system of the international relations, determined by many politicians and specialists in this field as transitional?"¹⁰ In practice Russia has always behaved like one of the world's power centers and will always behave in this way. It is necessary for it because this behavior of Moscow was demanded by its near by and far away neighbors. Only the active policy will permit Russia to keep in future its sovereignty, territorial integrity and richest natural resources, possibility to determine by itself the favorable situation in the field of security. The United States and NATO may declare as many times as they wish that Russia has lost for them its significance and is regarded now as an other, a problem, a crisis state.¹¹ This point of view is not only wrong but it is provocative towards Russia. It really means that the other big neighbors of Russia are invited to pursue against Moscow a more strict course. Now we see that the changes in the German foreign policy are caused by this influence. If Japan, China or the European Union begin to build their relations with Russia on this principles, it will be the beginning of the way to a catastrophe. And not only for Russia.

The problem, not yet resolved in Moscow but near to be resolved, is the evaluation of the NATO's possibility to act in the post-soviet area with the same effectiveness as in Europe before NATO has passed to the military phase of the Kosovo crisis. To our mind, the last two years of the Alliance's activity and the discussions about it have shown that we can't expect any effectiveness from the NATO in the conflicts in Karabah, Tajikistan or Pridnestrovie. Nowadays NATO is a convenient alternative to the post-soviet States that like many centuries ago are to decide: with or without Russia. Moscow, it is clear, would prefer the first variant,

¹⁰ Klepatski, Lev N. Dilemmy rossiyskoy vneshney politiki. – Mezhdunarodnaya zhizn. #7, July 2000, p. 27.

¹¹ Graham, Tomas. Voprosy iz Washingtona: Yest li u Rossii dostatochno uverenosti v svoikh silakh, chtoby vesti konstruktivnyj dialog s SSHA. – Nezavisimaya gazeta, March 21, 2001.

but while the ruling leaders of the CIS-members are not sure of their own legitimacy and stability, they believe the balance between Moscow and Brussels to be a guarantee of their own security and of the retention of the interest towards themselves. Truly, this policy can't be of long continuation, besides the balance "Russia-NATO" the post-soviet States have many other important problems, and neither Brussels nor Moscow are interested in them. Many European NATO-members don't want to wait for the improvement of the American-Russian relations. On the scale of their priorities the interests of the European integration are above the interests of the NATO. According to Evstafyev, "only a blind can't see the strategic stalemate where the Europeans and first of all Germany have found themselves assuming the main financial burden of the European integration. Russia, in the end, at the current level of consuming capacity of the most part of the population can wait for some time... choosing its own partners. And Europe can't: the credit of confidence to the pan-European processes is exhausted."¹² Evidently, this difficulties inside the EU wouldn't bring to extrude Washington from Europe. Still they can make the both parts examine more attentively the interests of Russia. And this is the very aim of the Russian authorities!

In the long-termed perspective of the Russia-NATO relations there may be only two options. The first one is now considered the most favorable for Russia, it is the dismissal of NATO because of the absence of the reasons for its existence. The second one is also unfavorable for the Alliance and includes the admission of Russia as a full member. The second scenario can hardly be considered a real one, because such a step can draw many consequences. For example, NATO would assume the responsibility for maintaining the peace on the Russia-Chinese frontier 4200 km long. Nowadays more important is the analysis of the middle-term outlook on the relations in the post-soviet area. The analysis made demonstrates that the role of NATO in the 1990s reinforced gradually, but on the border of the centuries – after the Kosovo crisis and the inauguration of the new Russian President- the place occupied by NATO in the foreign policy of the CIS-members has begun to dwindle. NATO can hardly consider its merit the fact that the new Independent States are making use of it in their permanent bargaining with Russia on the energy resources supplies, on the cost of the lease of military bases, on the possibility of access of the local goods to the enormous Russian market.

¹² Evstafyev, Dmitry. Moskva povorachivaetsya k evropejsam, no oni k etomu ne gotovy. – Nezavisimaya gazeta, March 1, 2001.

The idea of the integrate defensive space and of the common armed forces inherited from the USSR was not realized. The cause of it in the great difference of the state interests on the international arena, in the competitiveness in the wide sphere of the political and economic problems. In the course of time the Tashkent Treaty has become a discussion club for those few CIS-members who really believe that it is better to bridge over the military dangers against their territory together. Nowadays the main danger of this kind is created by terrorism and Muslim radicalism in Caucasus and in Central Asia. Belarus stays apart. The reason for the active collaboration of Minsk with the CIS defensive institutes is the endeavor of the Belarusian President to keep his power in spite of constitutional tort and the violation of the democratic liberties in his own country.

From the point of view of the current policy Russia is for the CIS-members a more convenient partner than the NATO. It can be explained by the readiness of Russia to close the eyes at the violation of the democracy in these countries, that is quite an ordinary thing in nearly all the CIS-members. This means that Russia is less limited in the pursuing its foreign politics than the NATO. There is one more important characteristic of the Russian policy: it is more ready to play an active role in the repulsing the dangers for the CIS, the internal (the activity of the international terrorists in the Central Asia countries) as well as the external (the danger for the South frontier of the CIS from the part of Afghanistan). This Russian readiness can be embodied in the employment of the armed forces dislocated in the CIS members and in the attraction of the new forces. The practice of the last ten years has shown that Russia is ready to sacrifice the lives of its soldiers and officers for its own security even if the danger is far away from the Russian territory. The NATO member-States are not ready for this and will hardly do it in future.

From the other side, trying to receive the economic aid for the reforming of their economy, as well as to guarantee the keeping of the sovereignty and the territory integrity, the CIS members place their hopes on the most developed states united in the NATO. This international organization, which possess the highest authority in the field of military security, may play an equalizing role on the CIS area. In this way the same fact of keeping the relations of the post-soviet States with NATO must not be considered by Moscow as an action directed against its interests. The problem is far more complicated. Will the NATO be able to act in this region with the same effectiveness as the Alliance acted in Europe during the Kosovo

crisis ? The answer is not clear. It is not also clear if NATO has sufficient knowledge about the specific character of the region, its political and cultural traditions, decision-making process, history. The CIS-members are burdened not only with the anticommunist ideas but also by the anti-European and anti-Western spirits inherited from the pre-soviet times and forced by the anti-American and anti-NATO propaganda of USSR epoch.

The analysis of the first steps of the new American Administration, as results from the dominating in Russia point of view, shows that Washington wants to give less attention to the post-soviet countries than the Clinton's Administration. As one of the experts noted recently, "Washington seems to have decided to strict its politics towards the post-soviet States. And it seems also that its politics towards Russia is of no more importance."¹³ One of the possible conclusions that can be done concerning this change of the United States course is that Russia has now a chance to become a dominating force in the CIS, because any other State or any bloc of States would hardly risk to interfere stratagem of the political and other contradictions on the vast territory of the ex-soviet empire. Though Russia has never declared officially its growing interest to the interference into the CIS affairs (as it is mentioned above, S.Ivanov made quite opposite statement), in fact in 2000-2001 we can see the activation of the Moscow policy. This is not but the very beginning of the change of the tendency which is now quite convertible, but in the course of time it is seen more clearly. The Russian politicians and the diplomats are convinced by the experience of the contacts with NATO and the relations with the Alliance in the post-soviet area that " nobody will take you into consideration if you are weak. In fact it is of no importance that your weakness is the result of your trying to adapt yourself to the new situation in the world and to observe the conventional rules of the game, in other words is the result of your attempt to become better."¹⁴ Now Russia is realizing this belief in practice.

Constructing its relations with the nearest neighbors and with the European States Russia takes into a serious account the NATO factor. To our mind Moscow in the last years has been actively creating a situation favorable to conclude a "Big Deal" with NATO. It is now difficult to draw the scope of such a deal. It is clear it will concern the security in Eurasia

¹³ Khanbabyan, Armen. Washington ochen nedovolen postsovetskimi stranami. – Nezavisimaya gazeta, March 28, 2001.

¹⁴ Arbatova, Nadezhda. Otnosheniya Rossii i Zapada posle Kosovskogo krizisa. – Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya. # 6, June 2000, p. 16.

and probably the mutual guarantees of the security of the Eurasian States. Russia is interested in keeping the frontiers of the existent States inviolable, i.e. is against the further split of the region. It is also interested in the recognition of its special influence on the ex-USSR States, the Baltic States including. In this way it is possible that this “Big Deal” will concern the formalization of the relations between NATO on one side and the States of the Treaty on the Collective Security on the other, and also the mutual guarantees of security for the States geographically located between these two alliances. Now such a prospective looks like an utopia. Nevertheless the goal-seeking behavior of the Russian diplomacy and militaries shows that in the nearest time Moscow will begin to speak with the NATO-members on behalf of the Treaty on the Collective Security as nowadays it is speaking on behalf of Belarus.

Bibliography

1. Airapetova, Natalia. "Sdast" li Vladimir Putin Pridnestrovye? – Nezavisimaya gazeta, March 28, 2001.
2. Airapetova, Natalia, Vladimir Voronin: Vopros o statuse Pridnestrovya zhelatelno reshit v etom godu. – Nezavisimaya gazeta, April 18, 2001.
3. Aivazovski, Ivan. Azerbaijan khochet v NATO. Baku uvazhaet chechentsev. – Nezavisimaya gazeta, February 19, 2000.
4. Akopov, Petr and Krutikov, Evgeniy. Kogda RAG agore svisnet. Vozmozhen li rossiysko-armyano-grechskiy voennyi soyuz? – Izvestiya, June 28, 2000, p. 3.
5. Aliev, Geidar. Interview. //Nezavisimaya gazeta, June 20, 2000, p. 5.
6. Aliev, Ilkham. Ya uveren – alternativy otsu net. Interview. In: Izvestia, No. 87 (25925), May 19, 2001.
7. Altynbayev, Mukhtar, (Minister of Defence of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Colonel-General), Interview. The Military Parade magazine. – www.milparade.com, Issue 30, November-December 1998.
8. Arbatov Alexey, and Petr Romashkin. Kakie voiny Rossii po karmanu? – Nezavisimoye voennoye obozrenie, April 27, 2001.\
9. Arbatova, Nadezhda. Paradoksy bezopasnosti v Baltiyskom regione. //Nezavisimaya gazeta, January 30, 2001, p. 3.
10. Arbatova, Nadezhda. Otnosheniya Rossii i Zapada posle Kosovskogo krizisa. – Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya. # 6, June 2000, p.16, 18-19.
11. Armenia: Security Pact Signals Concern Over Russia. Global Intelligence Update. 24 November 1999.
12. Asmus, Ronald D. And Robert C. Nurick. NATO Enlargement and the Baltic States. Survival, Volume 38, No. 2, Summer 1996.
13. Atovullo, Dodo. Tadzhiiki razglyadeli uzbekskih boevikov. //Kommersant-daily, January 19, 2001, p. 11.
14. Avakova R.M., and A.G.Lisova. Rossiya i Zakavkazye: realii nezavisimosti i novoe partnerstvo. Moscow, 2000, p. 22, 30, 35.
15. Babayeva, Svetlana. Pochti kak v Evrope. Sozdayetsya Evraziyskoe ekonomicheskoye soobshchestvo. //Izvestiya, October 11, 2000, p. 3.
16. Babayeva, Svetlana. Evraziyskoye NATO.//Izvestiya, October 12, 2000, p. 3.

17. Babichev, Nikolay and Yuri Chubchenko. Ushla s bazy. Rossiya vyvodit voyska is Gruzii. – Kommersant-daily. April 26, 2000, p. 11.
18. Badrak V. Batalyonotvorchestvo, ili novaya filosofiya voennogo sotrudnichestva. (Batalyonotvorchestvo or new philosophy of military cooperation). //Zerkalo nedeli. Kiev. January 22, 2000.
19. Bauwens, Werner, Clesse, Armand, and Knudsen, Olav F., eds. 1996. Small States and the Security Challenge in the New Europe. London: Brassey's..
20. Bendikov, M., and E.Khrustalev. Integrastija voennoj industrii stran SNG. – Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya. 1998, #12, p. 135,138,140
21. Black, J.L. 2000. Russia Faces NATO Expansion, Bearing Gifts or Bearing Arms? Rowman & Littlefield: New York..
22. Bonvicini, Gianni, Tapani Vaahtaranta, and Wolfgang Wessels (eds.) The Northern EU, National Views on the Emerging Security Dimension. The Finnish Institute of International Affairs, Helsinki.
23. Broladze, Nodar. Gogi Topadze: “My ne mozhem schitatsya polnotsennymi evropeitsami”. – Nezavisimaya gazeta, December 27, 2000.
24. Broladze, Nodar. Shevardnadze boitsya oshibitsya. Gruzija mozhet stat neitralnym gosudarstvom. – Nezavisimaya gazeta, February 10, 2001.
25. Brzezinski, Zbigniew. Velikaya shahmatnaya doska. M.: Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya. 1998. P. 147.
26. Bushkov, Valentin, Igor Mazharov, Aleksandr Sobyenin. Rossiya v Sredney Azii. – Nezavisimaya gazeta, January 31, 2001.
27. Chachia, Aleksandr. Gruzija na poroge katastrofy. //Nezavisimaya gazeta. February 2, 2001, p. 5.
28. Charodeev, Gennadi. Severoatlanticheskaya ottepel. Otnosheniya Rossii s NATO budut vosstanovleny v polnom objeme. //Izvestiya, December 15, 2000, p. 4. The Center was opened in February 2001.
29. Chernogaev, Yuri, Michailov, Vasili. Tsentralnaya Aziya ne hochet byt krayney. //Kommersant-daily, June 15, 2000, p. 11.
30. Chernogaev, Yuri, Gankin, Leonid. Mirotvortsev vyvodyat iz Tajikistana. Tam nuzhny antiterroristicheskie podrazdeleniya. //Kommersant-daily, June 21, 2000.
31. Chernogaeva, Gulfira. Turkmeniya dala otpor NATO. George Robertson uehal ni s chem. //Kommersant-daily, January 19, 2001, p. 11.

32. Chernogorski, Dmitry. Interview with Vaira Vike-Freiberga, the President of Latvia. – Nezavisimaya gazeta, February 1, 2001.
33. Chernyavsky, Stanislav I. Yuzhny Kavkaz v planah NATO. Mezhdunarodnaya zhizn, N9, 1998.
34. Chubchenko, Yuri. Sodruzhestvo otkazyvaetsya platit Moskve. – Kommersant-Vlast. February 4, 1999, #13 (1657).
35. Chubchenko, Yuri. Sovbez Rossii vossoedinyayet SNG.//Nezavisimaya gazeta, June 15, 2000, p. 11.
36. Clover, Charles. Ukraine looks east. The Financial Times, January 21, 2001.
37. Clover, Charles, and Guy Dinmore. Iran and Russia to discuss Caspian shares. – The Financial Times, March 1, 2001.
38. Danilin, Sergey. Tsentralnaya Aziya – zona osobogo vnimaniya. //Nezavisimaya gazeta. April 20, 2000.
39. Degoev Vladimir V., Proekt-XXI. Globalizatsiya dlya SNG. Modeli obschekavkazskoi bezopasnosti: pro et contra. – Nezavisimaya gazeta, April 25th, 2001.
40. Dneprov, Andrey. Kiev prinimaet Sovet NATO. – Nezavisimaya gazeta, February 18, 2000.
41. Dubnov, Arkadi. Interview with Islam Karimov. – Vremya, October 1998, #19 (96).
42. Dubnov, Arkadi. Uzbekistan vyhodit is Tashkentskogo dogovora. //Vremya-MN, February 2, 1999.
43. Dvali, Georgi. Gruziny poehali v Kiev za oruzhiem. //Kommersant-daily, February 6, 2001, p. 11.
44. Dzhilavyan, Arman. Rossijskij faktor v Armyanskoj politike. – Nezavisimaya gazeta, February 3, 2000.
45. Ermolin, Vladimir. Ne Gruziiy edinoj. Voennoe prisutstvie Rossii v Zakazkazye prodolzhitsya.//Izvestia, April 28, 2000.
46. Evstafyev, Dmitry. Moskva povorachivaetsya k evropejtsam, no oni k etomu ne gotovy. – Nezavisimaya gazeta, March 1, 2001.
47. Falichev, Oleg. Russia and Ukraine Hold Joint Naval Exercise on the Black Sea. – The Military Parade, January-February 1998. www.milparade.com.
48. Falkov, Viktor. Prezidenty Rossii i Larvii vstretilis v Avstrii. – Nezavisimaya gazeta, February 14, 2001.
49. Finally, NATO tests A Resurgent Russia – in Kiev. – www.stratfor.com Global Intelligence Update, March 2, 2000.

50. Frantz, Douglas. Central Asians Brace for Islamic Offensive. – The New York Times, May 4, 2001.
51. Gadzhizade, Asya. Mezhdru Rossiey i NATO. Aktivnost Severoatlanticheskogo aliansa na yuge Sodruzhestva vozrastayet. Nezavisimaya gazeta, January 19, 2001, p. 5.
52. Gafarly, Mehman. Vozvrashchenie v Azerbaidzhan. – Nezavisimaya gazeta. January 31, 2001.
53. Gensek NATO ne iskluchaet sozdaniya voennoy missii aliansa v Rossii. February 4, 2001.
<http://www.strana.ru/world/society/2001/02/04/981289606.html>
54. Georgiev, Vladimir. “Taliban” – glavnyi faktor nestabilnosti. – Nezavisimaya gazeta, February 8, 2001
55. Georgiev, Vladimir. Rossiyskih desantnikov poshlyut v Tajikistan? – Nezavisimaya gazeta, March 3, 2001.
56. Gerasimov, Michail. Uzbekistan dobilsya stabilnosti. Itogi uhodyaschego goda vnushayut optimism. Nezavisimaya gazeta, January 19, 2001, p. 5.
57. Gerasimov, Michail. Chto Vynuzhdaet Tashkent smyagchit svoje otnosheniye k talibam? Kommersant-daily, January 30, 2001, p. 5.
58. Global Intelligence Update. Armenia: Security Pact Signals Concern Over Russia. 24 November 1999.
59. Godin. Yuri. Dilemma Rossii v postsovetskom prostranstve. – Nezavisimaya gazeta, January 31, 2001.
60. Godin, Yuri. Slavyanskaya solidarnost i evroatlanticheskiye orientiry: Vstupit li Ukraina v Soyuz Rossii i Belarusi? – Sodruzhestvo // Nezavisimaya gazeta. February 23, 2000.
61. Gornostaev, Dmitry. Interview with Igor Ivanov, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Russia. – Nezavisimaya gazeta, October 12, 1999.
62. Gornostaev, Dmitry. Posle simboliki. O novykh marshrutah rossiyskoy diplomatii. – Nezavisimaya gazeta, January 18, 2001.
63. Gornostayev, Dmitry. Opyat problemy s NATO: Ekspansiya Aliansa plyus sozdaniye sistem PRO? - Nezavisimaya gazeta, February 1, 2001.
64. Graham, Tomas. Voprosy iz Washingtona: Yest li u Rossii dostatochno uverenosti v svoikh silakh, chtoby vesti konstruktivnyj dialog s SSHA. – Nezavisimaya gazeta, March 21, 2001.
65. Gruzija hochet vyiti iz SNG. - www.rbc.ru, 6 March 2001.
http://top.rbc.ru/policy/index.shtml?news/policy/2001/03/05/05092245_bod.shtml.
66. Hale, Henry E., The Rise of Russian Anti-imperialism. In: Orbis. A Journal of International Affairs. Volume 43, N. 1, Winter 1999.

67. Hand, Jessica, and Hand, Robert. Belarus & Foreign Relations: Slavic Cooperation Or Competition? In: Graeme P. Herd. European Security & Post-Soviet Space: Integration or Isolation? Conflict Studies Research Centre. UK Ministry of Defence. December 2000. P. 65.
68. Heikka, Henrikki. 1999. The Evolution of Russian Grand Strategy and Its Implications on Finnish Security. In: The Northern Dimensions.
69. Heisler, Martin O. And G. Quester. 1999. International Security Structures and the Baltic Region: The Implications of Alternative Worldviews. In: O. Knudsen (ed.) Stability and Security in the Baltic Sea Region. Russian, Nordic and European Aspects, pp. 55-77. London and Portland, OR: Frank Cass.
70. Holsti, Kalevi J. 1996. The State, War, and the State of War. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
71. Ilyasov, Farhad. Kto mozhet prijti k vlasti v Turkmenii? – Nezavisimaya gazeta, December 27, 2000.
72. Ismailov, I. Voенно-politicheskaya otsenka obstanovki v Afganistane i islamskogo dvizheniya Taliban. – <http://www.impulse.kz/mif/Toleb.html>
73. ITAR-TASS, August 28, 1999. Press conference of the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Georgia Irakli Menagarishvili and the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Estonia Toomas Hendrik Ilves. Tbilisi, August 28, 1999.
74. Ivanov, Igor. Interview. Nezavisimaya gazeta, October 12, 1999.
75. Jack, Andrew. Moldova ‘welcome’ in Belarus-Russia Union. – The Financial Times, March 1, 2001.
76. Joop, Matias, and Riku Warjovaara, eds. 1998. Approaching the Northern Dimension of CFSP: Challenges and opportunities for the EU in the merging European security order. The Finnish Institute of International Affairs and the Institut fuer Europaeische Politik: Helsinki and Bonn.
77. Karimov, Islam. Interview. Vremya, October 1998, #19 (96).
78. Kasaev Alan. Lis gotovitsya k pryzhku. In: Nezavisimaya gazeta. October 26, 1999.
79. Kasaev, Alan. Sovet bezopasnosti Rossii reshil zakryt SNG. – Nezavisimaya gazeta, February 7, 2001, p. 5.
80. Katzenstein, Peter (ed.), The Culture of National Security. New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1996.
81. Kay, Sean. NATO and the Future of European Security. 1998. Lanham, Maryland, and Oxford, UK: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

82. Kazakhs Need help. – International Gerald Tribune, May 4, 2001.
83. Kazennov Sergey Yu., Kumachev Vladimir N. Kakoy “soyuz nerushimyi” nuzhen Rossii? Moskva: Institut natsionalnoy bezopasnosti i strategicheskikh issledovaniy, 1998.
84. Khanbabyan, Armen. Obschaya ugroza kak faktor sotrudnichestva. – Nezavisimaya gazeta, May 31, 2000.
85. Khanbabyan, Armen. Washington ochen nedovolen postsovetskimi stranami. – Nezavisimaya gazeta, March 28, 2001.
86. Khisamova, Zarina. Gde vshodit gruzinskoye solntse? “Ruka Moskvyy” vypisyvaet vizi. In: Ekspert, N 47, December 11, 2000, p. 86.
87. Khodarenok, Michail. Rossiya i Belorussiya ob’edinyayut voennuyu mosch. Nezavisimaya gazeta. April 18, 2001.
88. Klepatski, Lev N. Dilemmy rossiyskoy vneshney politiki. – Mezhdunarodnaya zhizn. #7, July 2000, p. 27.
89. Kljuev, Igor. Estonia upuskaet svoi shans. – Nezavisimaya gazeta, April 19, 2001.
90. Klochkov, Andrey, and Goryunov, Vladimir. Ukrainskaya “oboronka” polnostyu zavisit ot Rossii. – www.nns.ru May 19, 1997.
91. Korendovich, Viktor, Pavlenko Anatoly, and Chumak Vladimir. Ukraina – GUUAM – Turtsiya: sostoyanie i perspektivy dalneishego razvitiya otnosheniy. – Zerkalo nedeli, Kiev, January 2001.
92. Korotchenko, Igor. Sudbu RLS reshat Putin i Aliev. – Nezavisimaya gazeta, December 27, 2000.
93. Kosyrev, Dmitry. Kakoy Ivanov nuzhen na Smolenskoy? – Nezavisimaya gazeta, April 19, 2001.
94. Kozin, V.P. Kreml and NATO: perspektivy vzaimodeistviya. – Mezhdunarodnaya zhizn, #4, April 2000.
95. Kozin, V.P. Kreml and NATO: perspektivy vzaimodeistviya. – Mezhdunarodnaya zhizn, #4, April 2000.
96. Kremenyuk, Viktor A. Zapad ischet predely otnosheniy s Rossiey. – Mezhdunarodnaya zhizn, # 10, October 2000, p. 70.
97. Kuznetsova, L.I., and V.P.Kuzmenko. Integratsionnye i dezintegratsionnye faktory mnogovektornyh protsessov na evropeiskom i postevropeiskom prostranstvah. – Polityka i chas. Kiev, 1998, No. 9, P. 17-18.
98. Kvasov, Alexey. Izbavlenie ot “kompleksa nepolnotsennosti”. – Nezavisimaya gazeta, February 17, 2000.

99. Levitin, Leonid. Uzbekistan na istoricheskom povorote. Moscow: Vagrius, 2001.
100. Maksimenko, Oleg. NATO primiyut v Armenii. - Kommersant-daily, January 16, 2001, p. 11.
101. Maksimenko, Oleg and Movsun Mamedov. Gensek NATO obletel Kavkaz. Vo imya mira. – Kommersant-daily, January 17, 2001, p. 11.
102. Maksimenko, Oleg. Armeniya poluchit gaz, uran, otpuscheniye dolgov i rossiyskih pogranichnikov. //Kommersant-daily, January 31, 2001, p. 11.
103. Malashenko, Alexey. Ob Uzbekistane s pristrastiem. – Nezavisimaya gazeta, March 23, 2001.
104. Manilov Valeri L. O voennoy doktrine Rossii. - Mezhdunarodnaya zhizn, N 5, 2000, p. 42.
105. Mashin, Yuri. Yastrzhembsky provel ucheniya. Kommersant-daily. April 11, 2000.
106. McNeil, Donald G. Estonia's President: Un-Soviet and Unconventional. The New York Times, April 7, 2001.
107. Mekhdied, Anvar. Eduard Shevardnadze vernulsya iz turetskogo pohoda. //Kommersant-daily, January 31, 2001, p. 11.
108. Mezhdometija. Itogi Magazine, May 22, 2001, p. 8.
109. Minister of Defence of Armenia: Till the threat from Turkey exist, Russian troops stay on the Armenian soil. www.rbc.ru January 29, 2001, 20.58.40.
110. Ministerstvo inostrannyh del Rossii. Departament informatsii i pechati. Informatsionnyj bulleten. August 7, 2000 (2000-08-05-001).
111. Ministerstvo inostrannyh del Rossii. Departament informatsii i pechati. Informatsionnyj bulleten. October 5, 2000.
112. Ministerstvo inostrannyh del Rossii. Departament informastii i pechati. Informatsionnyj bulleten. December 29, 2000 (1547-29-12-2000).
113. Ministerstvo inostrannykh del Rossii. Departament informatsii i pechati. Informatsionnyi bulleten. April 10, 2001.
114. Ministry oborony stran SNG obuczhdayut voprosy sotrudnichestva v borbe s mezhdunarodnym terrorizmom. – www.ort.ru/owa/ort_win/ORT_NEWS1, December 21, 2000, 12.51.
115. Mukhin Vladimir. Voennye ministry SNG vstretyatsya v Moskve. //Nezavisimaya gazeta, December 21, 1999.
116. Mukhin, Vladimir. Odobren plan voennogo sotrudnichestva SNG. – Nezavisimaya gazeta, December 22, 2000

117. Muhin, Vladimir. Gruzija vstupat v NATO ne namerena. – Nezavisimaya gazeta, Decembbber 26, 2000.
118. Mukhin, Vladimir. Uchastniki DKB gotovyatsya k ucheniyam. – Nezavisimaya gazeta, March 18, 2000.
119. NATO Leader Visits Azerbaijan, Sees Closer Ties. Agence France Press. Reprinted in Kommersant-daily, January 19, 2001, p. 11.
120. Naumann, Klaus, Chairman of the Military Committee, ‘A New NATO for a New Century’, Address to the Konrad Adenauer Stiftung Group, Brussels, 15 October 1997, at www.nato.itn/docu/speech/1997/s97101b.htm
121. Nikolaev, Dmitry. Ferganskaya dolina pod pritselom. – Nezavisimoye voennoye obozreniye. March 2, 2001.
122. Novaya igra Geidara Alieva. – Nezavisimaya gazeta, April 24, 2001.
123. Novye Izvestia, Sammit, kotoryj ustroil vseh. November 2, 1999.
124. Olson, Lyndon L. Jr. 1999. The U.S. Stake in Northern Europe. P. 56, 58.
125. Panfilova, Viktoria. Interview with Emomali Rahmonov, President of Tajikistan. – Nezavisimaya gazeta, April 24, 2001.
126. Pereplesnin, Michail, Yashin, Egor. Ispytatelnyi srok dlya chinovnikov. Kadrovaya peretryaska v Turkmenii na fone liderstva po rostu VVP. Nezavisimaya gazeta, January 19, 2001, p. 5.
127. Pereplesnin, Michail, Yashin, Egor. Ne podstraivayas pod drugih. Saparmurat Niyazov – svoj sredi chuzhikh ili initsiator novovvedeniy v Sodruzhestve.//Nezavisimaya gazeta. June 20, 2000, p. 5.]
128. Plotnikov, Nikolay. Pochemu Tajikistan ne mozhet prinyat bezhentsev? Kommersant-daily, January 30, 2001, p. 5.
129. Pomper, Miles A.. Georgia Presents Challenges to Bush Administration. In: Houston Chronicle. Reprinted in Russian in Kommersant-daily, January 16, 2001, p. 11.
130. Putin i Karimov: neprazdnichny dialog. – www.rbc.ru, May 3, 2001.
131. Putin privetstvuet zayavleniye Moldovy o vozmozhnosti vstupleniya respubliki v Soyuz Rossii i Belorussii. – www.strana.ru, March 6, 2001, at 19:52.
132. Razumovski, Kirill. Rossiya zabiraet Ukrainu u NATO. //Kommersant-daily, January 24, 2001, p. 11.
133. Rauchhaus, Robert W. (ed.) Explaining NATO Enlargement, Special Issue, Contemporary Security Policy, Vol. 21, No. 2, August 2000.

134. Rokotov, Valery. Esche odin faktor vliyaniya. Vizovyi rezhim s Gruzией menyaet situatsiyu na Severnom Kavkaze. //Nezavisimaya gazeta, January 16, 2001; http://www.ng.ru/cis/2001-01-16/5_factor.html
135. Romanov, Petr. V Baku budet otkryt informatsionnyi tsentr NATO. – Nezavisimaya gazeta, February 22, 2000.
136. Romanova, Ludmila, and Vladimir Mukhin. Sozdaetsya Tsentralnoaziatskaya sistema bezopasnosti. – Nezavisimaya gazeta, October 11, 2000.
137. Rontoyanni, Clelia. Russia-Belarus Union: The Role of NATO and The EU. In: Graeme P. Herd (ed.) European Security & Post-Soviet Space: Integration or Isolation. Conflict Studies Research Centre. UK Ministry of Defence. December 2000. P. 87.
138. RosBiznesConsalting (www.rbc.ru), May 19, 2000. 12.25.34.
139. RosBiznesConculting (www.rbc.ru), September 12, 2000, 16.20.36.
140. Rossiya predpochitaet OBSE NATO – www.rbc.ru, February 4, 2001, 15.43.
141. Rudenko, Grigori. Marshal i Prezident vstretyatsya po delu. //Kommersant-daily, January 19, 2001, p. 11.
142. Safikanov, Salavat. Professionalny nahodyat obschiy yazyk. Nezavisimaya gazeta, April 10, 2001.
143. Sborov, Afanasiy. Posle tyazhely, prodolzhitelnoy bolezni. Smert SNG, o kotoroy tak dolgo govorili, nastupila. – Kommersant-vlast. #21, May 30, 2000.
144. Sergeev, Dmitry. Azerbaijan: novye nadezhdy. Geidar Aliev nadeetsya, chto emu udastsya dogovoritsya s Vladimirom Putinyom o rasshirenii sotrudnichestva Rossii i Azerbaijana. – Izvestia, July 22, 2000, p. 5.
145. Shevardnadze, E. Sotrudnichestvo Gruzii s NATO ne napravleno protiv interesov Rossii. – www.rbc.ru, September 11, 2000, 15:55:00.
146. Shevardnadze, E.: Uglubleniye svyazey Gruzii s NATO ne napravleno protiv Rossii. – www.rbc.ru September 25, 2000, 14.52.00
147. Shporlyuk, Roman. Russkiy vopros i imperskaya ekspansiya. In: Makeev, Sergey (ed.) Demony mira i bogi voyny. Sorsialnye konflikty v postkommunisticheskom mire. Kiev: Politychna Dumka, 1997, p. 267.
148. Shumilin, Aleksandr. Mnogopolyarny egoizm. Ekspert, N 49, December 25, 2000, p. 61.
149. Sodruzhestvo. Informatsionnyj vestnik SNG. No. 1, 1995. Minsk.
150. Sokolov, Viktor, and Vladimir Mukhin. NATO khochet pomiritsya s Moskvoy. – Nezavisimaya gazeta, February 16, 2000.

151. Sokolova, Viktoria. Putin ischet podderzhku v SNG. Strany Sodruzhestva gotovy pomoch Rossii razobratsya s Chechnei. – Izvestia, March 13, 2000, p. 3.
152. Sokolovski, Maksim. Vykapyvaya topor vojny, Rossiya brosaet vyzov Zapadu. – Zerkalo nedeli, Kiev, January 22, 2000.
153. Statement of S.Sestanovich at the U.S. Senate Hearings on April 30, 1998. Mezhdunarodnaya zhizn, N9, 1998.
154. Tesemnikova, Ekaterina. Tbilisi “ischet podhody” k Moskve. //Nezavisimaya gazeta, March 7th, 2001.
155. Timoshenko, Viktor. Robinson inspektiruet Ukrainu. – Nezavisimaya gazeta, January 28, 2000.
156. Timoshenko, Viktor. NATO sobralos v Kieve. – Nezavisimaya gazeta, March 1, 2000
157. Timoshenko, Viktor. NATO poluchila poligon v SNG. – Nezavisimaya gazeta, March 4, 2000.
158. Tkachuk, Tatyana, Mekhman Gafarly, Vladimir Georgiev. Rossiya-Uzbekistan: nastupaet epokha potepleniya. – Nezavisimaya gazeta, May 5, 2001.
159. Trenin, Dmitri. Vneshnepoliticheskie proekty dlya Rossii. – Nezavisimaya gazeta, February 17, 2000.
160. Tyler, Patrick E. An Envoy Waits as Russia Policy is Pondered. – The New York Times, April 5, 2001.
161. Ulyanov, Nikolai. Reviving joint industry is to tie Ukraine to Russia. – <http://russia.strana.ru/stories/2001/02/12/981971026/981986777.html>, February 12, 2001.
162. Utochneny perspektivy voennogo sotrudnichestva RF i Armenii <http://strana.ru/state/foreign/2001/04/01/986134379.html>
163. Uzbekistan opasaetsya letnego vtorzheniya terroristov. [www.strana.ru http://strana.ru/state/kremlin/2001/05/04/988972498.html](http://strana.ru/state/kremlin/2001/05/04/988972498.html). Vavilov, Nikolay. Rossiya na Gruzii ne davit. – Nezavisimaya gazeta, January 10, 2001.
164. Vavilov, Nikolay. Blizitsya vesennee nastupleniye. V Kirgizii resheno zaminirovat granitsu s Tajikistanom. – Nezavisimaya gazeta, January 19, 2001, p. 5.
165. Voronov, Konstantin. Rossiya i Baltiya: Sleduyuschiy raund – ot politiki k ekonomike. – Nezavisimaya gazeta, October 6, 2000.
166. The West Loses Its Grip on Georgia. In: www.stratfor.com, Russia/Georgia, January 25, 2000.
167. Where worlds collide. – The Economist, August 19-25, 2000.

168. Yost, David S. 1998. NATO Transformed: The Alliance's New Roles in International Security. Washington, DC: U.S. Institute for Peace Press.
169. Yusin, Maksim. Shevardnadze menyaet aktsent. Gruzija bolshe ne hochet v NATO. //Izvestia, February 7, 2001, p. 7.
170. Zatulin, Konstantin, and Alexander Sevastyanov. "Druzhiba, sotrudnichestvo i partnerstvo" mezhdou Rossiei i Ukrainoy. Dva goda spustya posle obmana v proshlom veke. – Nezavisimaya gazeta, January 31, 2001.
171. Zemskiy, Vladimir V. Kollektivnaya bezopasnost na prostranstve Sodruzhestva. //Mezhdunarodnaya zhizn, 1998, N 11-12.
172. Zueva, Kira. Rossii i Evrope nuzhna sobstvennaya bezopasnost: OBSE, a ne NATO. – <http://strana.ru/state/foreign/2001/03/07/983964662.html>.