

Nikoloz Vashakidze

THE ROLE OF WASHINGTON SUMMIT DECISIONS IN  
STRENGTHENING COOPERATION BETWEEN NATO AND ITS  
PARTNERS FOR A BETTER EUROPE

INTRODUCTION

During the Cold War NATO played a paramount role in defending the independence of its member states and providing security and stability in Europe. Today NATO remains a cornerstone of European security and a solid transatlantic community of shared values.

The disintegration of the Warsaw pact and Soviet Union marked the end of the Cold War and evoked the emergence of a radically new geopolitical situation in Europe. Indubitably, facing new realities, NATO could not remain unchanged. Allies rapidly realized the necessity of adopting NATO's role and policies and started a process of adjusting the Alliance to the new geopolitical situation. At the NATO 1990 London Summit Allies, admitting that the West and the East were no longer adversaries recognized a distinctive role for the Alliance as an 'agent of change'. Since the early 1990's the Alliance, while retaining its core function of territorial defence, assumed the new function of collective security, which itself required the creation of new institutions and putting forward new initiatives. Following the principle of collective security NATO launched the historic "Partnership for Peace" initiative and linked it with the Alliance's further enlargement. Creation of the North Atlantic Cooperation Council (NACC) and its transformation into the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC), targeting new tasks and missions, emphasis on non Article 5 activities, elaboration of a radically new strategy (reflected in the new Strategic Concept which was issued in 1991 and adapted in 1999), engagement of Russia and assuming the paramount role in peace support operations in Europe have

demonstrated NATO's ability to adapt to the rapidly changing contemporary realities, its practical use, and its crucial role in enhancing peace and stability.

At the same time, since the end of Cold War many opponents of NATO's continued existence have emerged. They argue that as the East-West confrontation is no longer taking place, and so NATO has no strategic enemy there is no necessity to keep the Alliance, which as an institution of Cold War is already an anachronism. 'Given the collapse of the USSR and the Warsaw Pact therefore, it could be argued that NATO has outlived its usefulness. This argument has particular resonance for some opinion makers ... neorealist K.N. Waltz, for example, in evidence before the US Senate Foreign Relations Committee in 1990 said: 'NATO is a disappearing thing. It's a question of how long it's going to remain a significant institution even though its name may linger on''.<sup>1</sup>

The aim of this research is to demonstrate the benefits of NATO and its new policies for Europe. The development and utility of NATO's policies since the end of the Cold War is a vast and informative topic. This research concentrates on one of its most important dimensions – the strengthening of the Alliance's partnership with non-member European states and is based on study of the Washington Summit's decisions on the development of partnership in Europe.

## THE NEW STRATEGIC CONCEPT AND STRENGTHENING PARTNERSHIP IN EUROPE

The title of NATO's main strategic document, given above, reflects a profound change in the Alliance's strategy in the radically new contemporary strategic environment following the end of the Cold War. The formulation of NATO strategy during the Cold War period was set out as 'The Strategic Concept for the Defence of the North Atlantic Treaty Area'. This document was predominantly

---

<sup>1</sup> Graham Evans and Jeffrey Newnham, NATO, *The Penguin Dictionary of International Relations*, p.353.

military in character and its development and adaptation during the Cold War period also served pure defence purposes, developing such military concepts as ‘massive retaliation’ and ‘flexible response’. Omission of the word ‘defence’ from the title of NATO’s current strategy clearly demonstrates ‘the Alliance’s broad approach to security’ to quote the new Strategic Concept.

Another important aspect is that NATO’s Cold War period strategies ‘were enshrined in *classified documents*, which provided guidance to national governments and points of reference for military planning activities’ and ‘they were not addressed to the general public’<sup>2</sup>. The new Strategic Concept, however, is expressly aimed at the public and its openness and transparency, as well as its declaratory style, is intended as an instrument for strengthening confidence, cooperation, security and stability.

A baseline for NATO’s post Cold War strategy was set by the Strategic Concept endorsed by the Alliance’s November 1991 Rome Summit. Responding to the revolutionary changes in the political situation in Europe and worldwide, and bearing little relation to its predecessors, the Strategic Concept which emerged from Rome outlined a new security agenda and emphasized dialogue and cooperation with former adversaries. Assuming a new vision of the Alliance’s security challenges and risks, the Concept noted that ‘risks to Allied security are less likely to result from calculated aggression against the territory of the Allies, but rather from the adverse consequences of instabilities that may arise from the serious economic, social and political difficulties, including ethnic rivalries and territorial disputes, which are faced by many countries in central and eastern Europe. The tensions...could...lead to crises inimical to European stability and even to armed conflicts, which could involve outside powers or spill over into NATO countries, having a direct effect on the security of the Alliance’. Acknowledging, that ‘the new situation in Europe has multiplied the opportunities for dialogue on the part of the Alliance with the Soviet Union and the other countries of Central and Eastern Europe’ the Concept declared that the Alliance ‘will further promote dialogue through regular diplomatic liaison,

---

<sup>2</sup> NATO Handbook, NATO Office of Information and Press, 1110 Brussels – Belgium, 2001, p.43.

including an intensified exchange of views and information on security policy issues'.<sup>3</sup>

The NATO Strategic Concept of 1991 lasted only 8 years (compared with 24 for its predecessor). Rapid changes of political reality in the world and in Euro-Atlantic area, intensive developments inside NATO and new challenges led Allies to conclude that a new strategy was needed for the 21<sup>st</sup> century. As Rob de Wijk observed “Over almost five decades, the Alliance has evolved from a traditional military alliance for collective defence into a political-military organization for security cooperation, with an extensive bureaucracy and complex decision-making processes. Rather than dying off, large organizations usually go through a process of functional transformation. During the 1990s, NATO has evolved to the extent that crisis management and conflict prevention are now its primary missions. However, the Alliance Strategic Concept has been left behind by the reality of this transformation. As a result, the Strategic Concept no longer serves its political purpose, namely expressing what the Alliance stands for at the present time”<sup>4</sup>.

During the 1990s NATO achieved much. Launch of PfP and establishment of EAPS opened a new era of defence and political cooperation in Europe. At the same time, through the creation of the Permanent Joint Council of NATO-Russia (replaced recently by the Council NATO - Russia) and NATO-Ukraine Commission, an unprecedented cooperation process began between the Alliance and the two biggest Western European post-Soviet states. Further enlargement of the Alliance appeared as a significant direction of NATO's policy and development. Practical implementation of peace-support missions in Former Yugoslavia demonstrated NATO's indubitable utility and a new important role. All these and many other processes, their outcomes, and future tasks connected with them had to be reflected in the Strategic Concept.

Thus, in 1997 at Madrid summit “NATO leaders agreed that the Concept should be re-examined and updated to reflect the changes that had taken in Europe

---

<sup>3</sup> The Alliance's Strategic Concept agreed by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council, *Rome, 8 November 1991*, <http://www.nato.int/docu/update/1991/9111e.htm>

<sup>4</sup> Rob de Wijk, ‘Towards a new political strategy for NATO’, NATO Review, No2 – Summer 1998.

since its adoption, while confirming the Allies commitment to collective defence and the transatlantic link and ensuring that NATO strategy is fully adapted to the challenges of the 21<sup>st</sup> century”<sup>5</sup>.

After intensive work undertaken throughout the Alliance, NATO’s new Strategic Concept was approved at the Washington Summit. Approval of the new Strategic Concept is one of the key results of the Washington summit. Reaffirming the Alliance’s fundamental commitment to collective defence, it sets out NATO’s political and military strategy in the context of the main developments in Europe since the end of the Cold War. Building on the approach towards a European security architecture based on cooperation, the new Concept reflects commitments in the fields of crisis management and partnership in order to enhance security and stability in the Euro-Atlantic area.

Defining the importance of the new Strategic Concept for strengthening European stability by developing partnership we should focus on the issue of enlargement, which takes an important place in the Concept.

NATO has always been open to new members. As article 10 of the North Atlantic Treaty declares “The Parties may, by unanimous agreement, invite any other European State in a position to further the principles of this Treaty and to contribute to the security of the North Atlantic area to accede to this Treaty”<sup>6</sup>. Thus, in 1952, Greece and Turkey joined the original twelve members of the Alliance, followed by Federal Republic of Germany in 1955 and in 1982 by Spain. Nevertheless, before the 1990s the Alliance’s enlargement was piecemeal and primarily a means of ensuring a collective defence against the Soviet Union.

During the 1990s NATO’s enlargement became a political strategy in its own right and there is a clear distinction between the Alliance’s expansion before and after the end Cold War. The enlargement has clearly become one of the means to the

---

<sup>5</sup> NATO Handbook, NATO Office of Information and Press, 1110 Brussels – Belgium, 2001, p. 44.

<sup>6</sup> The North Atlantic Treaty, Washington DC, 4 April 1949, NATO Handbook, NATO Office of Information and Press, 1110 Brussels – Belgium, 2001, p. 527.

desired end of enhanced security and stability in Europe. It is viewed now as one of the strongest tools for future European security. The purposes of NATO's post Cold War enlargement, designed as NATO's "open door policy" have gone far beyond the Alliance's traditional tasks and besides collective defence issues include:

- Encouraging and supporting democratic reforms, including civilian and democratic control over the military;
- Promoting good-neighbourly relations, which would benefit all countries in the Euro-Atlantic area, both members and non-members of NATO;
- Reinforcing the tendency toward integration and cooperation in Europe based on shared democratic values and thereby curbing the countervailing tendency towards disintegration along ethnic and territorial lines;
- Strengthening the Alliance's ability to contribute to European and international security, including though peacekeeping activities under the responsibility of OSCE and peacekeeping operations under the authority of the UN Security Council as well as other new missions<sup>7</sup>.

As a result of this new enlargement policy three new members of the Alliance – the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland took their place for the first time at the summit table in Washington. The Washington Summit reaffirmed the strategy of enlargement and developed it farther by endorsing the Membership Action Plan, which "is designed to assist those countries which wish to join the Alliance in their preparations by providing advice, assistance and practical support on all aspects of NATO membership"<sup>8</sup>. The strategy of enlargement is well defined in the Washington Summit Communique: "We reaffirm today our commitment to the openness of the Alliance under Article 10 of the North Atlantic Treaty and in accordance with

---

<sup>7</sup> Sean Kay, *NATO and The Future of European Security*, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc, 1998, p. 98.

<sup>8</sup> NATO Handbook, NATO Office of Information and Press, 1110 Brussels – Belgium, 2001, p. 65.

Paragraph 8 of the Madrid Summit Declaration. We pledge that NATO will continue to welcome new members in a position to further the principles of the Treaty and contribute to peace and security in the Euro-Atlantic area. This is part of an evolutionary process that takes into account political and security developments in the whole of Europe. Our commitment to enlargement is part of a broader strategy of projecting stability and working together with our Partners to build a Europe whole and free. The ongoing enlargement process strengthens the Alliance and enhances the security and stability of the Euro-Atlantic region. The three new members will not be the last”<sup>9</sup>.

Thus, NATO’s “open door” policy transforms enlargement from an option to a clearly stated strategy and broadens its purposes from collective defence to the building of European security architecture and promoting confidence and cooperation in Europe. So, especially after endorsement of the Membership Action Plan, enlargement has become one of the main aims of partnership between the Alliance and its partners. Enlargement as a strategic goal of the Alliance and of its partnership with non-member states had to be properly reflected in the new Strategic Concept to serve as a directing guide and principle for NATO’s practical policies. Accordingly, the new Strategic Concept in its introduction points out, that the Alliance “must deepen its relations with its partners and prepare for the accession of new members”. “Enlargement” appears in the Strategic Concept as subtitle in Part III - The Approach to Security in the 21st Century, which clearly defines its strategic importance, purposes, and how it is to be realized: “The Alliance remains open to new members under Article 10 of the Washington Treaty. It expects to extend further invitations in coming years to nations willing and able to assume the responsibilities and obligations of membership, and as NATO determines that the inclusion of these nations would serve the overall political and strategic interests of the Alliance, strengthen its effectiveness and cohesion, and enhance overall European security and stability. To this end, NATO has established a programme of activities to assist aspiring countries in their preparations for possible future membership in the context of its wider

---

<sup>9</sup>Washington Summit Communique, *Issued by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Washington, D.C. on 24 April 1999*, The Readers Guide to the NATO Summit in Washington 23-25 April 1999, NATO Office of Information and Press, 1110 Brussels, Belgium, 1999, p. 15.

relationship with them. No European democratic country whose admission would fulfil the objectives of the Treaty will be excluded from consideration”.<sup>10</sup>

The new Strategic Concept develops the *broad vision of security* appeared in 1991 and sets a crucial role of NATO as in European and Euro-Atlantic security. Despite references to NATO’s traditional core function of the defence of Allies there is a significant shift of emphasis toward the new missions of crisis management and out-of-area interventions. The section on security challenges and risks begins with the admission that ‘large-scale conventional aggression against the Alliance is highly unlikely’, although a future threat might conceivably emerge. According to the Concept the absence of a large-scale conventional threat doesn’t mean that NATO faces no security difficulties. ‘The security of the Alliance remains subject to wide variety of military and nonmilitary risks, which are multi-directional and often difficult to predict’. The nature of new threats is described in the Concept as following: ‘these risks include uncertainty and instability in and around the Euro-Atlantic area and the possibility of regional crises at the periphery of the Alliance, which could evolve rapidly. Some countries in and around the Euro-Atlantic area face serious economic, social and political difficulties. Ethnic and religious rivalries, territorial disputes, inadequate or failed efforts at reform, the abuse of human rights, and the dissolution of states can lead to local and even regional instability. The resulting tensions could lead to crises affecting Euro-Atlantic stability, to human suffering, and to armed conflicts. Such conflicts could affect the security of the Alliance by spilling over into neighbouring countries, including NATO countries, or in other ways, and could also affect the security of other states’.<sup>11</sup>

Assuming that, though ‘in an uncertain world the need for effective defence remains, but in reaffirming this commitment the Alliance will also continue making full use of every opportunity to help build an undivided continent by promoting and

---

<sup>10</sup> The Alliance’s Strategic Concept, *Approved by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Washington D.C. on 23 and 24 April 1999*, The Readers Guide to the NATO Summit in Washington 23-25 April 1999, NATO Office of Information and Press, 1110 Brussels, Belgium, 1999, pp.47, 54.

<sup>11</sup> The Alliance’s Strategic Concept, *Approved by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Washington D.C. on 23 and 24 April 1999*, The Readers Guide to the NATO Summit in Washington 23-25 April 1999, NATO Office of Information and Press, 1110 Brussels, Belgium, 1999, p.50.

fostering the vision of a Europe whole and free'<sup>12</sup>, the Concept underlines an important role of Partners in resolving the practical problems of European security. So, outlining the purposes and tasks of the Alliance the Concept seeks to 'promote wide-ranging partnership, cooperation and dialogue with other countries in the Euro-Atlantic area, with the aim of increasing transparency, mutual confidence and the *capacity for joint action with the Alliance*'.<sup>13</sup>

The first tangible benefits from the investment in PfP were seen in the NATO-led operations in Bosnia and Herzegovina, where the Partnership made it easier for troops from partner countries to be deployed along-side allied forces as part of IFOR and SFOR. This positive experience was reflected in the strengthening of the Partnership at the Madrid summit in 1997 and led to the more operational focus given to the Partnership since then. As we are seeing again today in Kosovo, the reality is that future NATO-led operations will almost certainly involve partners.

Assuming PfP's success, the Strategic Concept agreed at the Washington summit included partnership among NATO's fundamental security tasks, along with security, consultation, deterrence and defence, and crisis management. The new Strategic Concept reflects the profound geopolitical changes of the last decade and recognizes the increased importance of NATO's partners in facing future security challenges. The Allies remain committed to securing the military capabilities needed to be able to respond on their own to the full range of foreseeable circumstances. But they have also chosen to focus more on developing cooperation with non-members that share the Alliance's objectives, and on engaging them politically and militarily in efforts to promote Euro-Atlantic security.

---

<sup>12</sup> The Alliance's Strategic Concept, *Approved by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Washington D.C. on 23 and 24 April 1999*, The Readers Guide to the NATO Summit in Washington 23-25 April 1999, NATO Office of Information and Press, 1110 Brussels, Belgium, 1999, p.60.

<sup>13</sup> The Alliance's Strategic Concept, *Approved by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Washington D.C. on 23 and 24 April 1999*, The Readers Guide to the NATO Summit in Washington 23-25 April 1999, NATO Office of Information and Press, 1110 Brussels, Belgium, 1999, p.49.

This strategy showed its effectiveness during the Kosovo crisis. Partner countries exhibited a common purpose and shared values in their approach to the conflict and their political support for NATO's operation reinforced its legitimacy. Countries neighbouring the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia also lent practical support to the Allies, including access to their air space. The troop contributions from partner countries are vital to sustain the long-term deployment of forces in the simultaneous, multinational SFOR and KFOR operations.

A key factor of partnership in Europe reflected in the Concept is NATO's cooperation with other European and international organizations. NATO's partnership with these organizations is also another dimension of the Alliance's cooperation with its partners, which are members of these organizations. The strategic Concept mentions in this regard that, 'the United Nations (UN), the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), the European Union (EU), and the Western European Union (WEU) have made distinctive contributions to Euro-Atlantic security and stability. Mutually reinforcing organizations have become a central feature of the security environment ... the United Nations Security Council has the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security and, as such, plays a crucial role in contributing to security and stability in the Euro-Atlantic area ... the OSCE, as a regional arrangement, is the most inclusive security organization in Europe, which also includes Canada and the United States, and plays an essential role in promoting peace and stability, enhancing cooperative security, and advancing democracy and human rights in Europe. The OSCE is particularly active in the fields of preventive diplomacy, conflict prevention, crisis management, and post-conflict rehabilitation. NATO and the OSCE have developed close practical cooperation, especially with regard to the international effort to bring peace to the former Yugoslavia...' <sup>14</sup> and 'NATO recalls its offer, made in Brussels in 1994, to support on a case-by-case basis in accordance with its own procedures, peacekeeping and other

---

<sup>14</sup> The Alliance's Strategic Concept, *Approved by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Washington D.C. on 23 and 24 April 1999*, The Readers Guide to the NATO Summit in Washington 23-25 April 1999, NATO Office of Information and Press, 1110 Brussels, Belgium, 1999, p.49.

operations under the authority of the UN Security Council or the responsibility of the OSCE, including by making available Alliance's resources and expertise'.<sup>15</sup>

A very important aspect of the new Strategic Concept is that it tightly links European security with strengthening and promotion democracy. Stating that 'the Alliance will ... continue making full use of every opportunity to help build an undivided continent by promoting and fostering the vision of a Europe whole and free'<sup>16</sup> the Concept presents NATO's one of the main security tasks as 'to provide one of the indispensable foundations for a stable Euro-Atlantic security environment, based on the growth of democratic institutions...'<sup>17</sup> and sets the Alliance's practical policy as to 'promote peaceful and friendly international relations and support democratic institutions'<sup>18</sup>. The Concept's chapter 'Partnership, Cooperation, and Dialogue', distinctly links Euro-Atlantic security with promotion democratic development: 'Through its active pursuit of partnership, cooperation, and dialogue, the Alliance is a positive force in promoting security and stability throughout the Euro-Atlantic area. Through outreach and openness, the Alliance seeks to preserve peace, *support and promote democracy*, contribute to prosperity and progress, and foster genuine partnership with and among all democratic Euro-Atlantic countries. This aims at enhancing the security of all, excludes nobody, and helps to overcome divisions and disagreements that could lead to instability and conflict'.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> The Alliance's Strategic Concept, *Approved by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Washington D.C. on 23 and 24 April 1999*, The Readers Guide to the NATO Summit in Washington 23-25 April 1999, NATO Office of Information and Press, 1110 Brussels, Belgium, 1999, p.52.

<sup>16</sup> The Alliance's Strategic Concept, *Approved by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Washington D.C. on 23 and 24 April 1999*, The Readers Guide to the NATO Summit in Washington 23-25 April 1999, NATO Office of Information and Press, 1110 Brussels, Belgium, 1999, p.60.

<sup>17</sup> The Alliance's Strategic Concept, *Approved by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Washington D.C. on 23 and 24 April 1999*, The Readers Guide to the NATO Summit in Washington 23-25 April 1999, NATO Office of Information and Press, 1110 Brussels, Belgium, 1999, p.48.

<sup>18</sup> The Alliance's Strategic Concept, *Approved by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Washington D.C. on 23 and 24 April 1999*, The Readers Guide to the NATO Summit in Washington 23-25 April 1999, NATO Office of Information and Press, 1110 Brussels, Belgium, 1999, p.49.

<sup>19</sup> The Alliance's Strategic Concept, *Approved by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Washington D.C. on 23 and 24 April 1999*, The Readers Guide to the NATO Summit in Washington 23-25 April 1999, NATO Office of Information and Press, 1110 Brussels, Belgium, 1999, p.53.

This conceptual approach is transferred into Alliance's practical policies and documents, such as, for example, the Membership Action Plan, where NATO aspirant countries are expected to 'demonstrate commitment to the rule of law and human rights ... to establish appropriate democratic and civilian control of their armed forces ... strengthening their free institutions ... to show a commitment to promoting stability and well-being by economic liberty, social justice ...'.<sup>20</sup>

NATO's vision of continuity between security and democracy distinctly expressed in its Strategic Concept and its active policy of promotion democratic development is a crucial factor in building a better Europe.

## ENGAGING RUSSIA

Undoubtedly no issue is more central to the Alliance's goal of building a peaceful political order in Europe than relations with Russia. "A Europe without Russia cannot be peaceful, undivided and democratic. If Russia remains on the outside, it will be a destabilizing presence for the Baltic countries, for Ukraine and the Caucasus and for Western interests in central and south-eastern Europe"<sup>21</sup>. As Dr. Javier Solana during his time as NATO Secretary General mentioned, 'Russia may be a country of many contradictions; it may be uncertain in this emerging new Europe; but one thing is clear: there can be no security in Europe without a stable Russia'<sup>22</sup>.

Despite Russia's strong resistance to NATO's enlargement NATO-Russia cooperation has been thoroughly developing. In 1991 Russia joined the newly created North Atlantic Cooperation Council and subsequently the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, which replaced the NACC in 1997. Whatever the Russian assumptions Russia joined Partnership for Peace in 1994 by signing the PfP Framework Document

---

<sup>20</sup> Membership Action Plan (MAP), The Readers Guide to the NATO Summit in Washington 23-25 April 1999, NATO Office of Information and Press, 1110 Brussels, Belgium, 1999, p.49.

<sup>21</sup> Daalder H.I. and Goldgeier M.J. "Putting Europe First". Survival, vol.43.no.1, Spring 2000. pp 83.

<sup>22</sup> Javier Solana, 'NATO: 50<sup>th</sup> Anniversary – The Washington Summit – The Next Century', Speech, The international conference on 'The 50<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the Atlantic Alliance: 'A New NATO for a New Europe', Rome, 25 January, 1999, <http://www.nato.int/docu/speech/1999/S990125a.html>

and approved a PfP Individual Partnership Programme in 1995. One of the significant aspect of the relationship is the fact that NATO and Russia institutionalized their partnership by signing the NATO-Russia Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security in May 1997, which itself established the NATO-Russia Permanent Joint Council (PJC).

The Kosovo campaign appeared as a serious examine for the NATO-Russia relationship. As a result of the NATO's air campaign Russia suspended its cooperation in the PJC and suspended its cooperation in PfP. Russia's refusal in taking part in Washington summit appeared as an impressive demonstration of serious deterioration of NATO-Russia relationship. As a leading expert of London's International Institute for Strategic Studies Oksana Antonenko mentions: 'NATO's air campaign against Yugoslavia precipitated the most dangerous turn in Russian-Western relations since the early 1980s ... in the Kosovo crisis, Russia's political elites faced the strongest evidence yet of their own isolation and inability to influence NATO policies, even on matters close to Russian territory ... in this context, Kosovo was a worrying watershed, the first time since the end of the Cold War that Russia and NATO found themselves on opposite sides of an armed conflict'.<sup>23</sup>

In this difficult situation the Washington summit made a wise and important decision regarding to the Alliance's relations with Russia and reflected in its documents a strong commitment to maintaining and strengthening NATO-Russia cooperation. As NATO's Secretary General of that time Dr. Javier Solana mentioned, 'even if Russia did not choose to attend the meetings, Allied leaders expressed their desire and interest in maintaining strong patterns of consultation and cooperation with Russia through the NATO-Russia Permanent Joint Council. They made clear that NATO and Russia are too important to ignore each other'.<sup>24</sup>

The Washington Declaration stated that 'working together, Allies and Partners, including *Russia* and Ukraine, are developing their cooperation and erasing the divisions imposed by the Cold War to help to build a Europe whole and free,

---

<sup>23</sup> Oksana Antonenko, 'Russia, NATO and European Security after Kosovo', *Survival 41-4, Winter 1999-2000*, p. 124.

<sup>24</sup> Javier Solana, Secretary General of NATO, 'A defining moment for NATO: The Washington Summit decisions and the Kosovo crisis', *NATO Review*, vol.47, No2, Summer 1999.

where security and prosperity are shared and indivisible'.<sup>25</sup> The NATO's Heads of State and Government mentioned in Washington Summit Communique that they 'remain firmly committed to [their] partnership with Russia under the NATO-Russia Founding Act. NATO and Russia have a common objective in strengthening security and stability in the Euro-Atlantic area. Throughout the Kosovo crisis, NATO and Russia have shared the common goals of the international community: to halt violence, to avert a humanitarian catastrophe, and to create the conditions for a political solution. These goals remain valid. Consultation and dialogue are even more important in times of crisis. NATO and its member countries are determined to build on the areas of common ground with Russia concerning the international response to the crisis in Kosovo and remain ready to resume consultations and cooperation in the framework of the Founding Act ... Close relations between NATO and Russia are of great importance to stability and security in the Euro-Atlantic area. Since the conclusion of the Founding Act in May 1997, considerable and encouraging progress has been made in intensifying consultation and cooperation with Russia. The NATO-Russia Permanent Joint Council has developed into an important venue to consult, to promote transparency and confidence-building, and to foster cooperation. Russia's participation in the implementation of the peace agreement for Bosnia and Herzegovina was a significant step towards a new co-operative relationship. We have developed an extensive dialogue on such matters as disarmament and arms control, including the adaptation of the CFE Treaty; peacekeeping and nuclear weapons issues. Strategy, defence policy and doctrines, budgets and infrastructure development programmes, and non-proliferation, are further examples of this increasing co-operation'.<sup>26</sup> The importance of cooperation with Russia was clearly reflected in the Alliance's Strategic Concept: 'Russia plays a unique role in Euro-Atlantic security. Within the framework of the NATO-Russia Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security, NATO and Russia have committed themselves to

---

<sup>25</sup> The Washington Declaration *signed and issued by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Washington D.C. 23 and 24 April 1999*, The Readers Guide to the NATO Summit in Washington 23-25 April 1999, NATO Office of Information and Press, 1110 Brussels, Belgium, 1999, p.12.

<sup>26</sup> Washington Summit Communique *Issued by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Washington, D.C. on 24 April 1999*, The Readers Guide to the NATO Summit in Washington 23-25 April 1999, NATO Office of Information and Press, 1110 Brussels, Belgium, 1999, pp.19-20.

developing their relations on the basis of common interest, reciprocity and transparency to achieve a lasting and inclusive peace in the Euro-Atlantic area based on the principles of democracy and co-operative security. NATO and Russia have agreed to give concrete substance to their shared commitment to build a stable, peaceful and undivided Europe. A strong, stable and enduring partnership between NATO and Russia is essential to achieve lasting stability in the Euro-Atlantic area', and 'the potential participation of Partners and other non-NATO nations in NATO-led operations as well as possible operations with *Russia* would be further valuable elements of NATO's contribution to managing crises that affect Euro-Atlantic security ... Alliance military forces also contribute to promoting stability throughout the Euro-Atlantic area by their participation in military-to-military contacts and in other cooperation activities and exercises under the Partnership for Peace as well as those organized to deepen NATO's relationships with *Russia*...' <sup>27</sup>

Further developments proved the rightness of the policy chosen by Washington Summit. Russia's new leadership headed by president Putin chose a path of rapprochement with NATO.

Putin's KGB background caused a lot of concerns about the future of Russia's democracy and Russia's relationship with the West. A number of observers treat Putin's ascension to power as a negative phenomenon. Ariel Cohen argued that due to his links to the KGB, Putin's presidency does '...not bode well for Russian democracy' <sup>28</sup>. Amy Knight says that if we judge Putin by his past then '...it does not bode well for the future of Russian democracy or for Russia's relations with the West' <sup>29</sup>. Zbigniew Brzezinski eloquently assumes this view: 'Although Putin displays a picture of Peter the Great in his office, his reliance on a KGB entourage and his professed admiration for his KGB predecessor, Yuri Andropov, indicate that Putin is

---

<sup>27</sup> The Alliance's Strategic Concept, *Approved by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Washington D.C. on 23 and 24 April 1999*, The Readers Guide to the NATO Summit in Washington 23-25 April 1999, NATO Office of Information and Press, 1110 Brussels, Belgium, 1999, pp.53, 56.

<sup>28</sup> Cohen, A., 'The Rise of Putin: What it Means for the Future of Russia', Backgrounder, March 28, 2000, The Heritage Foundation.

<sup>29</sup> Knight, A., 'The Two Worlds of Vladimir Putin: 1 the KGB', *The Washington Quarterly*, Spring, 2000, pp.32-37.

no Russian Atatürk. His geopolitical mindset reflects the thinking of the last Soviet generation and not of the first post-Soviet generation' and 'The present Russian government has made clear that its central goal is the restoration of Russia's power and not democratic reform'<sup>30</sup>. Stephen J. Blank in his recent article even calls Russia 'Putin's neo-imperialist police state' and draws rather gloom picture of Putin's totalitarian plans.<sup>31</sup>

Accusing Putin of old thinking authors of such statements are inadvertently deluded by old stereotypes themselves. Being worried about the threat of restoration of totalitarianism and anti- Western hostility in Russia they unconsciously consider Russia's strength of Soviet times.

Indeed reality is very different. Russia is too weak to play old games. Russia's GDP is just 25% of former the USSR<sup>32</sup> and its population about half of it (146 versus 270 million) diminishing by 0.5 million per year<sup>33</sup>. Russia faces heavy economic and social problems and its future is highly dependent on good and cooperative relationships with developed countries. Only unrealistic dreamer facing these realities can think about suffocation of democracy and hostility with the West.

Putin, on the contrary, demonstrates pragmatism and an open mind. He is undoubtedly aware of the real condition and objectives of his country. As long ago as 1999, in one of his public statements assessing Russia's condition, he mentioned that Russia would need annual GDP growth of 8% for 15 years to catch up with the living standards of Portugal and emphasized the necessity of close cooperation with western developed countries<sup>34</sup>. Right in the beginning of his presidency he set the main priorities of his foreign economic policy as improvement of Russia's prospects for integration into the global economy through World Trade Organisation (WTO)

---

<sup>30</sup> Zbigniew Brzezinski, *The Geostrategic Triad: Living with China, Europe, and Russia*, The Center for Strategic and International Studies, Washington, D.C., January 2001, pp.63, 65-66.

<sup>31</sup> Stephen J. Blank. 'Putin's Twelve-Step Program', *The Washington Quarterly*, Winter 2002, pp.147-158.

<sup>32</sup> Centre for Analysis of Strategies and Technologies, <http://www.cast.ru/english/publish/2001/may-june/gornostaev.html>.

<sup>33</sup> Demography of Russia, <http://demography.narod.ru.maine.html>.

<sup>34</sup> *The Economist*, April 20<sup>th</sup>-26<sup>th</sup>, 2002, p.50.

membership, elimination of trade barriers with the US and the EU and removal of the debt burden that had been inherited from the Soviet Union<sup>35</sup>. Certainly, without political rapprochement with the West achieving these goals would be questionable.

So, doubtlessly, Putin's firm political move immediately after September 11 tragedy was not spontaneous. Steps followed this move are quite impressive: intensive cooperation with the US on security matters and valuable practical support of operation in Afghanistan; rapprochement with NATO and creation of Council NATO-Russia; and even changes in such a sensitive for Russia sphere of foreign policy as relationship with post-Soviet countries. Deployment of US military units in Central Asia and Georgia and Russia's consent on US participation in resolution of conflicts in post-Soviet countries<sup>36</sup> indicates on serious strategic reorientation of Russia's foreign policy. The EU-Russia relationships are also remarkably developing and have already reached a status of 'strategic partnership'<sup>37</sup>.

The NATO's Secretary General has reaffirmed the same approach: "We may not convince Russia fully. But I am optimistic that if realistic attitude in Russia prevails, Moscow will see that NATO is not "moving East", but that Central and Eastern Europe – and Russia itself – are gradually moving West".<sup>38</sup>

Creation of the Council NATO-Russia is evidently important. By involving Russia in NATO procedures and discussions, the Council addresses Russian concerns that the Alliance might be used against it. The Council creates transparency for Russia in NATO's intentions and plans and so allays Russia's suspicions about the Alliance's policies. At the same time, establishing the Council strengthens NATO's military effectiveness. By involving Russia in NATO's discussions and activities regarding

---

<sup>35</sup> Oksana Antonenko, 'Putin's Gamble', *Survival*, vol.43 no.4, Winter 2001-02, p.49.

<sup>36</sup> *The Monitor: A Daily Briefing on the Former Soviet States*, "CIS space' and 'near abroad' ruled out at US-Russia summit', by Vladimir Socor, 28 May 2002 – Volume VIII, Issue 103.

<sup>37</sup> European Commission President Romano Prodi: a Meeting with Vladimir Putin will Contribute to Russia-EU Partnership. Romano Prodi said his meeting with President Putin would help promote strategic partnership between Russia and the European Union, Strana.ru; <http://www.therussianissues.com/stories/02/05/29/1089/15452.html>.

<sup>38</sup> Robertson, G. "NATO's Challenges: Illusions and Realities". <http://www.nato.int/docu/speech/2001/21/06/01.p.5>.

counterterrorism, arms control and non-proliferation, and peacekeeping, the Alliance will have a better chance to effectively deal with these problems. To be effective in eliminating terrorist assets and networks, NATO allies will need cooperation with Russia in the form of bases, overflight rights, and intelligence.

As the Ambassador of US in Russian Federation Alexander Vershbow mentioned ‘a stronger NATO-Russia partnership would complement NATO's other efforts over the past decade to extend security and stability across the entire Euro-Atlantic area through cooperation and integration in the political and military spheres. The establishment of the North Atlantic Cooperation Council, the Partnership for Peace, and the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council were important initiatives to this end, as was NATO's admission of new democracies willing to assume the full responsibilities of membership. We hope that a new spirit of cooperation ‘at 20’ will help complete the historic process of Russia's full integration into the Euro-Atlantic community ... Russia and NATO - working together as close partners with other freedom-loving nations of the world - have the opportunity to make the decades ahead an era of peace and progress. This does not mean that there will not be problems that will test our relationship. There is continued concern, for instance, about the actions of Russian troops in Chechnya and recent steps that threaten the future of independent mass media in Russia ... there is a solid foundation for a new relationship between Russia and NATO. Our cooperation against terrorism and the ongoing talks about new areas of collaboration have created a dynamic in which we can seriously begin to think about Russia and NATO as allies in meeting the challenges of the 21st century. Our common challenge is to make this ‘alliance with the Alliance’ a reality’.<sup>39</sup>

Nevertheless, facing such a dramatic change in Russia's foreign policy the West has to elaborate much bolder approach to its strategy towards Russia. Further integration of Russia into European and Euroatlantic security architecture has to

---

<sup>39</sup> Ambassador Alexander Vershbow, *U.S. Ambassador to the Russian Federation*, ‘TRANSFORMING NATO-RUSSIA RELATIONS’, <http://usinfo.state.gov/journals/itps/0302/ijpe/pj71vershbow.htm>

become a priority. Though, the West and Russia do not treat each other as enemies anymore, excluding Russia from NATO membership makes current stance of the Alliance regarding Russia rather ambivalent if to consider that initially NATO was created to stand against the Soviet Union. Probably, inclusion of Russia into the NATO will require further transformation of an Alliance, but the logic of development of Russia-West relationship demands to finally remove the barrier, which personifies an outgoing reality of confrontation. Inclusion of Russia in NATO would undoubtedly play a wholesome role for security and stability in Eastern Europe and whole post-Soviet area. Certainly, it would not be an easy decision, and not only for NATO but also for Russia, but Russian side already indicated their general readiness for such possibility. In one of its interviews president Putin arguing for the necessity of indivisible security space in Europe said: ‘The simplest [solution] is to dissolve NATO, but this is not on the agenda ... the second *possible* option is to include Russia in NATO. This also creates a single defence and security space ... the third option is the creation of a different, new organization which would set itself these tasks and which would incorporate the Russian Federation’<sup>40</sup>. The possibility of Russia’s inclusion to the NATO seems to become realistic and a real issue of a political agenda in few years and trustworthy western experts already indicate that<sup>41</sup>.

Criticizing Yeltsin’s policy of ‘counteralliance’ with China Zbigniew Brzezinski among other arguments adduced following: ‘China would be the senior partner in any serious Russian effort to jell such an ‘antihegemonic’ coalition. Being more populous, more industrious, more innovative, more dynamic, and harboring some territorial designs on Russia, China would inevitably consign Russia to the status of a junior partner, while at the same time lacking the means (and probably any desire) to help Russia overcome its backwardness’<sup>42</sup>.

The realities listed in these words witness that if future status of such a fast growing giant as China is indeed one of the main challenges of 21<sup>st</sup> century, first of all it is a challenge for Russia. Despite intensively developing bilateral and regional

---

<sup>40</sup> James A. Baker III, ‘Russia in NATO?’, *The Washington Quarterly*, Winter 2002, p.101.

<sup>41</sup> James A. Baker III, ‘Russia in NATO?’, *The Washington Quarterly*, Winter 2002, p.102.

<sup>42</sup> Zbigniew Brzezinski, ‘The Grand Chessboard, *American Primacy and its Geostrategic Imperatives*’, Basic Books, New-York, 1997, p.117.

cooperation between Russia and China, Chinese challenge is one of the serious concerns for Russian political thought. Well-known Russian specialist in Asian and Pacific studies Viacheslav Amirov points that ‘for Russia, after the end of cold war and with much reduced military capabilities, China with its rapidly growing economy is now the most important reason for feelings of insecurity in the East ... despite the continuing improvement of the relationship between China and Russia in recent years, fear of China has increased in Russia, aggravated by the fact that Russia has less choice and flexibility in its relations with China because of its relative weakness’<sup>43</sup>.

At the same time The US has a long-term concerns about Chinese growing strength<sup>1</sup> and set as one of the main foreign policy priorities – promotion a peaceful and integrated in global economic and political system China.<sup>44</sup> To achieve this task it is necessary to avoid a perspective of a grand strategic vacuum (which can be Russia in case slow development of its economy and detachment from Euroatlantic security architecture) near China. So, the long-term rapprochement of strategic interests between Russia and US in Asian Pacific region seems very real. There are also many other very important issues promoting US-Russia rapprochement. As a prominent Russian analyst Dmitry Trenin mentions ‘fighting terrorism and containing instability require military and intelligence cooperation between the two countries at different levels - from efforts to stabilize the situation in Afghanistan and cooperation in resolving the Arab-Israeli conflict to coordination between the two countries’ armed forces in Central Asia. With Asia now geographically the source of many new threats, it is becoming increasingly difficult for the United States and Russia to ensure their security without close cooperation. Moreover, on a number of issues Russia is the only effective partner for the United States, and vice versa’ and ‘the character of triangular relations between the United States, Russia and China has changed fundamentally from what it was in the 1990s. The traditional tripartite game of playing on contradictions between the parties has now become a thing of the past – and Russian abandonment of the foreign policy concept of ‘multipolarity’ has cemented this turn. At the start of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, the United States and Russia have

---

<sup>43</sup> Russia and Asia – The Emerging Security Agenda, edited by Gennady Churfin, SIPRI, Oxford University Press, 1999, p.284.

<sup>44</sup> Interpreting China’s Grand Strategy, Michael D. Swaine, Ashley J. Tellis, RAND, 2000, p.198; ‘Ramsfeld’s Defence Vision’, Michael O’Hanlon, Survival, vol.44, no2, Summer 2002, p.107.

an interest in successful continuation of the de facto post-communist transformation of China (initiated long ago), and its transformation into a responsible and predictable player on the international stage'.<sup>45</sup>

Thus, if Russia will be successful in its reforms, integration with the West and also gain NATO membership we may see appearance of 'trans-Pacific' link, together with a transatlantic. This possible development would mark the 'End of the West and its transformation into the North'. It would also guarantee a reliable global stability and balanced and constructive integration of China into a global community of peaceful democratic states.

#### NATO-UKRAINE COOPERATION

Independent and democratic Ukraine and its integration in European and Euro-Atlantic structures is an issue of paramount importance for European security and stability. Europe-oriented and integrated into Euro-Atlantic community Ukraine is a guarantee of irreversible end of the Cold War realities. Zbigniew Brzezinski gives a cogent argument for this view: 'the loss of Ukraine was geopolitically pivotal, for it drastically limited Russia's geostrategic options. Even without the Baltic states and Poland, a Russia that retained control over Ukraine could still seek to be the leader of an assertive Eurasian empire, in which Moscow could dominate the non-Slavs in the South and Southeast of the former Soviet Union. But without Ukraine and its 52 million fellow Slavs, any attempt by Moscow to rebuild the Eurasian empire was likely to leave Russia entangled alone in protracted conflicts with the nationally and religiously aroused non-Slavs ... the loss of Ukraine was not only geopolitically pivotal but also geopolitically catalytic. It was Ukrainian actions – the Ukrainian declaration of independence in December 1991, its insistence in the critical negotiations in Bela Vezha that the Soviet Union should be replaced by a looser Commonwealth of Independent States, and especially the sudden coup-like imposition

---

<sup>45</sup> Dmitry Trenin, 'Sealing a New Era in U.S.-Russian Relations', The Moscow Times, Monday, May. 27, 2002. p.10.

of Ukrainian command over the Soviet army units stationed on Ukrainian soil – that prevented the CIS from becoming merely a new name for a more confederal USSR'.<sup>46</sup>

Ukraine's great importance for Euro-Atlantic security and NATO's strategy of intensive cooperation with Ukraine are clearly expressed in the Alliance's Strategic Concept: 'Ukraine occupies a special place in the Euro-Atlantic security environment and is an important and valuable partner in promoting stability and common democratic values. NATO is committed to further strengthening its distinctive partnership with Ukraine on the basis of the NATO-Ukraine Charter, including political consultations on issues of common concern and a broad range of practical cooperation activities. The Alliance continues to support Ukrainian sovereignty and independence, territorial integrity, democratic development, economic prosperity and its status as a non-nuclear weapons state as key factors of stability and security in central and eastern Europe and in Europe as a whole'.<sup>47</sup>

As part of the Washington meetings, Allied leaders met with Ukrainian President Leonid Kuchma - the first NATO-Ukraine Summit. The Declaration of the Heads of State and Government Participating in the NATO-Ukraine Commission Summit, emphasizing importance of this event stated that 'the President of Ukraine reaffirmed his country's determination to continue its efforts to implement democratic political, economic and defence reforms as well as to pursue its goal of *integration in European and transatlantic structures* ... NATO Allies acknowledged Ukraine's important contribution to the NATO-led peacekeeping operations in Bosnia and Herzegovina and to the OSCE Kosovo Verification Mission ... we welcomed the progress achieved in the implementation of our Distinctive Partnership since the signing of the Charter in Madrid and look forward to the realization of its full potential. We are satisfied with the development of a wide range of consultations and cooperation between NATO and Ukraine, at Summit, Ministerial, and Ambassadorial levels, as well as at the level of appropriate Committees and government bodies such

---

<sup>46</sup> Zbigniew Brzezinski, 'The Grand Chessboard, *American Primacy and its Geostrategic Imperatives*', Basic Books, New-York, 1997, pp.92-93.

<sup>47</sup> The Alliance's Strategic Concept, *Approved by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Washington D.C. on 23 and 24 April 1999*, The Readers Guide to the NATO Summit in Washington 23-25 April 1999, NATO Office of Information and Press, 1110 Brussels, Belgium, 1999, p.53.

as Ukraine's State Interagency Commission for Relations with NATO ... we reviewed Ukraine's participation in the Partnership for Peace Programme and in the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, and expressed our common desire to see Ukraine progressively take full advantage of the opportunities offered therein. We noted the progress that has already been made towards the implementation of the NATO-Ukraine Work Plan for 1999. Ukraine's State Programme of Cooperation with NATO until 2001 outlines potential additional for cooperation, and we look forward to further discussions at the Ministerial and Ambassadorial level on how to improve and prioritise future Work Plans ... we requested the NATO-Ukraine Commission in Ambassadorial session to oversee the implementation of the measures embodied in this declaration and the further development of the NATO-Ukraine distinctive partnership under the terms of the Charter'.<sup>48</sup>

In their 1997 Charter on a Distinctive Partnership, NATO and Ukraine agreed to consult in areas such as conflict prevention, crisis management, peace-support and humanitarian operations and to cooperate in areas such as civil emergency planning and disaster preparedness, Ukrainian defence reform, science and technology issues and economic aspects of security. The NATO-Ukraine Commission meets at least twice a year to review progress.

The signing of the Charter on a Distinctive Partnership in Madrid in 1997, which shifted cooperation between NATO and Ukraine on to a new plane, formally recognizes the importance of an independent, stable and democratic Ukraine to Europe as a whole.

'A self-confident, democratic Ukraine is a strategic benefit for the whole of this continent. We share a common interest in making Ukraine strong, stable and secure'<sup>49</sup>, Lord Robertson said in a speech to the diplomatic academy in Kiev during an earlier visit on 27 January 2000.

---

<sup>48</sup> Declaration of the Heads of State and Government Participating in the NATO-Ukraine Commission Summit, Washington, 24 April 1999, The Readers Guide to the NATO Summit in Washington 23-25 April 1999, NATO Office of Information and Press, 1110 Brussels, Belgium, 1999, pp.89-90.

<sup>49</sup> Speech by NATO Secretary General, Lord Robertson at the Diplomatic Academy of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Kiev, Ukraine, 28 Jan. 2000, <http://www.nato.int/docu/speech/2000/s000128a.htm>

With the creation of 'NATO at 20', the alliance's relations with Russia have almost overnight surged far ahead of NATO-Ukraine relations in political terms. Ukrainian officials are concerned lest this development translate into a Russian voice in the new forum on matters affecting Ukraine, in the latter's absence. The sudden dynamic of NATO-Russia political cooperation contrasts with the long-standing dynamic of NATO-Ukraine functional cooperation. From 1997 to date, Ukraine has shown incomparably greater initiative and openness than Russia ever has or does in developing both functional and political relations with NATO. Without seeking to become a member of the alliance, Kiev pioneered on military cooperation with it, ahead of many countries in the region.

The meeting of the NATO-Ukraine Commission, held on May 15, may partly have alleviated Kiev's concern over the growing discrepancy between the level of Ukraine-NATO practical cooperation, and the level of its political expression and institutionalization. The allied ministers and Secretary General George Robertson held out the prospect of a significant upgrading, within the next few months, of NATO-Ukraine political relations.

The commission, meeting in a foreign affairs ministers' session attended by the nineteen allied ministers and their Ukrainian counterpart, Anatoly Zlenko acknowledged and 'commended Ukraine's practical contribution' to a wide range of allied endeavors.

To illustrate, the commission's communique listed the active involvement of Ukraine's long-range military transport aviation for deployment of allied troops in Afghanistan; the opening of Ukraine's airspace to allied planes en route from NATO Europe to Central Asia and Afghanistan; Ukraine's participation in NATO-led peacekeeping operations in the Balkans; the successful development of the Polish-Ukrainian joint battalion (the only joint unit created by a non-candidate country and a member country of NATO); and the ongoing implementation of the NATO-Ukraine Work Plan for 2002, which encompasses NATO-assisted military reforms in Ukraine. The allied ministers also welcomed Kiev's support for NATO's eastward enlargement.

The commission scheduled a special meeting in Kiev in July to mark the fifth anniversary of the NATO-Ukraine Distinctive Partnership Charter. 'Paying tribute to the strategic nature of the Partnership, the commission at the ministerial level tasked the nineteen plus one ambassadors at NATO, building on the Charter, to develop a deepened and broadened NATO-Ukraine relationship... a reinforced relationship'. That upgraded relationship is to be defined in time for, or prior to, NATO's summit in Prague this coming November. The presidents and prime ministers of Russia and of Ukraine are expected to attend that summit as guests, formalizing the upgraded relationships of NATO-Russia and NATO-Ukraine.

Kiev's activities, listed by the commission, meanwhile continue to develop closer cooperation with the alliance and its individual member countries. Ukraine provides the main air route for allied military flights - mainly American ones involved in the antiterrorist operations. As of May 13, more than 1,900 such flights had crossed Ukraine's airspace, assisted by Ukrainian military and civilian air space control and traffic control systems. Ukraine is renting its heavy-duty Antonov military transport planes to such major NATO countries as Germany, which for years underspent on defense and now lacks strategic airlift capacity.

Meanwhile, on a visit to Estonia on May, 2002, Zlenko publicly expressed strong support for NATO's Baltic enlargement, along with hope that the Baltic states would be able to meet the admission criteria and join NATO soon. Zlenko also told the Estonian press in oblique terms that Ukraine itself hopes to join NATO in the future. Ukraine had all along openly supported the Baltic states aspirations to join NATO, during the years when Russia strongly opposed the Alliance's enlargement.

## THE MEMBERSHIP ACTION PLAN AND THE POLICY OF ENLARGEMENT AFTER WASHINGTON SUMMIT

To allow the applicant countries to better prepare for assuming the responsibilities of membership, NATO has provided a solid mechanism, ‘one of the most dynamic initiatives launched in Washington’,<sup>50</sup> – the Membership Action Plan (MAP) – to assist the applicants in preparations for eventual accession. The MAP assists aspirant countries in their practical preparation for NATO membership and in mobilizing national financial and human resources essential for integration into the Alliance and in developing forces and capabilities that could operate with NATO under its new Operational Capabilities Concept (OCC). The MAP was designed to incorporate lessons learned in the accession of Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic and went further than the 1995 Study on NATO Enlargement in defining that the aspirant countries needed to accomplish for their membership. As Dr. Javier Solana mentioned ‘the MAP ... provides clear guidance and feedback to help prepare Partners countries for future membership’,<sup>51</sup>

The MAP includes: 1) submission of a tailored Annual National Plan (ANP) covering political, economic, defence, resource, security, and legal aspects of membership; a feedback mechanism through a NAC 19+1 Partner progress assessment; 3) a clearing house for coordinating security assistance; and 4) enhanced defence planning that establishes and reviews agreed planning targets.

Among NATO candidate countries, it is the Baltic states of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania that lead the way in meeting the wide range of criteria for membership in the alliance. Does their small size, or exposed location, mean - as some have suggested - that these states are ‘indefensible’? No assumption could be more mistaken. For one thing, the alliance's Baltic enlargement would rule out military

---

<sup>50</sup> Remarks by Mr. Toomas Hendrik Ilves, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Estonia, EAPC Foreign Ministers meeting, Brussels, 16 Dec., 1999, <http://www.nato.int/docu/speech/1999/s991216d.htm>

<sup>51</sup> Speech by Dr. Javier Solana, NATO Secretary General, at the XVIth International NATO Workshop, Budapest, Hungary, 21 June 1999, <http://www.nato.int/docu/speech/1999/s990621a.htm>.

aggression in the region, guaranteeing its peace along with that of all Europe. Just as importantly, the Balts themselves are preparing and training for territorial defense, which can effectively deter a hypothetical aggression - or turn it into a very costly affair for the aggressor, pending the arrival of friendly forces to turn the tide. For such contingencies, the Baltic states - in close consultation with NATO - are developing their capacity to provide what is called Host Nation Support for allied forces.

Does it mean, then - as some have fretted - that the Balts intend to be mere 'security consumers', and not 'security contributors', if admitted to NATO ? In fact, with little Western public notice, the Baltic states are well along in becoming security contributors to the alliance even before their accession. Their direct contribution - as with almost any country - is proportionate to their size. But, in the Balts' case, the contribution is disproportionately high in terms of costs to their societies, while they recover (and they are robustly recovering) from the Soviet Russian economic morass.

As one measurement of that contribution, the Baltic states have committed themselves - politically and legally - to spend 2% of their respective gross national products on defense, mostly on NATO-related programs. This 2% is NATO's benchmark, but many current members fail chronically to meet it, and turn a deaf ear when urged. The Balts are meeting it already, and once in NATO, they - along with some of the other aspirant countries - will be a good example to older and more blase member countries.

"Military homework" for NATO is the motto in the Baltic states' governments, parliaments, and of course their rapidly maturing military establishments. The Baltic naval squadron, Baltron, is a mine-hunting and - sweeping flotilla, NATO-interoperable, and training with NATO forces constantly. In the current exercise period alone, Baltron is taking part in the U.S.-led Baltops and Baltic Eye exercises, in the German-led Open Spirit, in NATO mine-countermeasures training in the Baltic sea, and in Danish-led search-and-rescue exercises, among other events. Baltron's ships, mostly donated by Germany and Scandinavian countries, are ageing but fully operational, their technical equipment modernized, and their national crews - Estonian, Latvian, Lithuanian - training to NATO standards.

The Baltic Air Surveillance Network, Baltnet, with radars in the three Baltic states, by now provides the air picture of the entire Baltic region to NATO operations centers. NATO recently gave political approval for Baltnet-NATO data exchanges to begin shortly on a regular basis. Baltnet's hub, the Regional Air Surveillance Coordination Center at Karmelava in Lithuania, is the easternmost NATO-interoperable surveillance center. The equipment and technical assistance at RASCC are mostly from the United States and Norway. It will become part of NATO's Integrated Air Defense System when Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania officially become members of the alliance, or perhaps even during the accession process.

The Baltic Peacekeeping Battalion, Baltbat, regularly deploys platoon - and company-size units with NATO forces in the Balkans. As its Estonian, Latvian and Lithuanian components rotate there, a growing number of Baltic soldiers gain invaluable experience operating with NATO allies. Baltbat's training - much of it by Denmark - prepares this unit not only for peace-support operations, but also for wartime defense of the homelands. The upcoming major international exercise, Baltic Eagle, will be watched for evidence of Baltbat's progress.

The joint Baltic Defense College, in Estonia's city of Tartu, trains army staff officers and battalion-level commanders mainly for the three Baltic states, but also for other NATO aspirant and partner countries. Baltdefcol's faculty consists largely of senior officers from NATO and Nordic countries. Once the Baltic states become NATO members, all these joint programs - Baltron, Baltnet, Baltbat and Baltdefcol--are to become part of the NATO Integrated Military Structure.

Because of their small size, the three states have to plan creatively on how they might proportionately contribute to NATO Article Five operations. This would mean rushing to the aid of an attacked allied country that invokes the alliance treaty's article on common defense, NATO's bedrock. By year's end, Lithuania will have a NATO-interoperable, deployable mechanized infantry battalion, able on 30-day readiness to participate in Article Five operations. Latvia and Estonia are considering alternative options for their contributions to such operations--for example, by their special troops.

Military specialization is also now on the order of the day, in NATO and for the Balts. Almost all countries, but especially small ones - member and candidate countries alike - can maximize the returns on their defense spending by focusing on certain specialized activities, “niches” in which they perform best, as part of a division of labor with alliance members, and an effective new form of burden-sharing. For the Baltic states, the military niches can best be used in joint efforts by the three countries. The Baltic niches of special skills are already emerging: they include mine-hunting at sea, naval divers (they are being trained at Liepaja in Latvia), explosive ordnance disposal on land, military medicine, and crack special troops for anti-terrorist operations.

With the Baltic states already on a firm track toward membership in the alliance, Romania and Bulgaria now look increasingly likely to also receive invitations this year to commence the NATO accession process.

According to the view of the Romanian MFA there are several very important arguments for Romania’s inclusion into NATO:

Romania is a functioning pluralistic democracy with the main instruments of a market economy already in place and a substantial growth potential. The new Romanian Government is committed to a radical economic reform programme which pursues to give a new impetus to the economic growth, the fight against poverty and unemployment, the rebuild the state institutions authority, reduction the birocracy, fight against corruption and criminality, continuation and speeding up the process of integration into EU and NATO;

The progress achieved so far in consolidating the democracy and the state of law emphasizes that Romania has assimilated and promotes the democratic principles and the values shared by all NATO member states. The irreversibility of this trend will be confirmed through the Romania’s integration into NATO.

The democratic transfer of authority following the legislative and presidential elections which took place in 1996 and 2000 represents another proof of the maturity of the political establishment and for the of public opinion level of

participation in the democratic process. Romania's integration into NATO could be an asset for European stability and security, since the democratic security is a long term investment for the stability of our continent and beyond.

The building up of a secure and stable Europe can be achieved only with the involvement of all states which belong to this area of culture and civilisation. Romania is part of this process and can further contribute to its success.

The new security risks need a common approach and a united endeavor of the states which have the necessary capabilities and political will to approach them. Romania proved its involvement in this process through the setting up of the SECI Center in Bucharest and on active participation in the Stability Pact.

Romania can not afford to waste another decade without a Western anchor, as Europe will not be "whole and free" without the integration of Romania within Euro-Atlantic community. Romania has the capability and the availability to promote the NATO interests and values in the adjacent areas.

Romania's integration into NATO will give us the opportunity to better promote effective patterns of cooperation, with neighbouring countries, as a credible model for the all countries in transition from South-East-Europe.

Taking into account its regional importance, due to the geographic location, territory, size of population, political and military potential, Romania will enhance –at a political and military level – the Alliance's capability to prevent and to manage crisis in the region.

The South-Eastern Europe passes a difficult process from security perspective. In this respect, Romania has the chance to be a catalyzer for bilateral relations of the countries from the region, facilitating, at the same time, the identification of lasting solutions for the tensions which may occur. The regional policy promoted by Romania can further facilitate the establishment of a framework for reconciliation and cooperation compatible with with the European spirit.

There are also serious arguments for Bulgaria's joining the Alliance. As Bulgaria's MFA mentions:

The government's efforts aimed at Bulgaria's integration in NATO are based on a broad consensus of the major political forces in the country and are supported by Bulgarian public opinion as a categorical choice and strategic priority of the foreign policy and the national security policy of the country.

After the Union of Democratic Forces won the parliamentary elections in April, 1997, as early as in May of that year, Parliament approved the Bulgaria 2001 Program which highlighted joining NATO as a strategic priority in Bulgaria's foreign policy. In May of 1997 Parliament adopted the Declaration of National Unity, which expressed unequivocal support for membership in NATO. Bulgaria's strategic choice for NATO membership was further confirmed in the declarations of the National Assembly of October 23, 1998 and March 25, 1999, adopted in connection with the crisis in Kosovo.

The correctness of the choice to seek full membership in NATO and to join the Euro-Atlantic security and stability zone was confirmed by the crisis in Kosovo and the decisions of the Washington Summit of April 1999 which proved in actual practice NATO's decisive role for the security of the countries of Southeastern Europe.

In 1994 Bulgaria joined Partnership for Peace. After entering into office, in March of 1997 the Provisional Government appointed by the President adopted the Bulgarian National Program for Preparation and Accession to the North Atlantic Treaty, which is subject to regular updating in the context of the dialogue and cooperation with NATO.

The Government has mobilized considerable resources and efforts for the implementation of the strategic goal of full membership in NATO within the shortest possible timeframe. The main elements of the Euro-Atlantic policy of the Republic of Bulgaria are the formation of relationships of actual alliance with the Treaty and its members as early as during the pre-accession stage and the promotion of awareness of the need to pursue, in a consistent and continuous

manner, the process of NATO enlargement with those countries of Central and Eastern Europe that have declared their desire and are capable of assuming the obligations and responsibilities of NATO membership.

The National Security Concept, adopted by a large parliamentary majority on April 16, 1988 is of foundation-laying significance in that it defines accession to NATO and the European Union as the main guarantee for Bulgaria's national security and sets it as a national priority. The country's degree of readiness and resources, the efficiency of its foreign and domestic policies, Bulgaria's participation in the collective security and economic development systems are listed among the main factors of national security. The general principles of national security declare that Bulgaria has no territorial claims and will recognize no such claims in respect to its territory; the country will not build its security at the expense of other countries and communities and that national security is based on a defensive military doctrine.

The new defensive Military Doctrine, adopted by the National Assembly on April 13, 1999, outlines the development of the armed forces on the basis of the principle of reasonable sufficiency and in conditions of transparency and efficient civilian control. The military doctrine is entirely defensive. It served as a basis for the Plan for the Organization and Development of the Ministry of Defense by the Year 2004, which envisages radical reduction, restructuring and modernization of the armed forces with a view to achieving readiness for accession to NATO within three or four years. At the end of this period the armed forces will number 45,000.

The President's Consultative National Security Council and the Security Council with the Council of Ministers, established in 1998, play important coordinating functions in the decision-making process regarding the security of the nation.

Pursuant to the Program for Preparation and Accession to NATO a mechanism was created for planning, coordinating and controlling activities pertaining to the country's efforts for more intensive cooperation and integration with the alliance. Central to this mechanism is the Interdepartmental NATO Integration

Committee, chaired jointly by the ministers of foreign affairs and defense. The Committee has established flexible mechanisms for interdepartmental cooperation (working groups and sub-groups in various areas). The Prime Minister has attended sessions of the Interdepartmental NATO Integration Committee on particularly important issues. The experience and results of the operation of the Committee have been instrumental for the development of the Annual Program of the Republic of Bulgaria in implementation of the Action Plan for NATO Membership.

The new strategy for accession to NATO includes not only active dialogue and consultations with the alliance's political and military leadership, but also bilateral political consultations with NATO member-states. An intensive dialogue is under way with the three new members of NATO from Central and Eastern Europe, Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic. The first meeting of experts on preparatory work for NATO membership of candidates for accession from Southeastern Europe and the three new NATO members from Central Europe was held in Sofia in September, 1999.

Bulgaria was among the candidates for NATO membership most active in promoting the idea of the adoption of an action plan for NATO membership as an instrument in the preparatory work for accession.

Bulgaria will continue to support the open doors policy of the alliance after becoming member of NATO. Bulgaria was one of the initiators of joint positions and diplomatic actions of candidates for membership on the eve of the Washington Summit. Bulgaria has repeatedly emphasized its position that all countries that have the will and potential to assume the responsibilities of membership should be provided with an opportunity to join NATO on the basis of uniform and objective criteria. An important element of our approach to NATO enlargement is our view that Southeastern Europe should be a priority focus of attention in view of its key importance for European security and stability.

The 'Big Bang' enlargement scenario, encompassing the three Baltic states, Slovakia and Slovenia in Central Europe, and Romania and Bulgaria on the Black

Sea scenario that looked unrealistic only a few months ago has now become a distinct possibility, termed ‘robust enlargement’ in recent statements by U.S. and some other allied officials.

The new focus on the Black Sea stems from four main factors. First, that region's strategic value to the U.S.-led current and planned antiterrorism operations. Second, a growing awareness that the Black Sea region is closely linked with the South Caucasus and the Caspian basin, the whole area being indivisible in terms of security. Third, vocal support by pivotal NATO ally Turkey in an unusual tandem with Greece in this case for Bulgaria’s and Romania’s inclusion in NATO, so as to close the gap between the alliance’s Southeastern and Central European tiers. And, fourth, as a corollary, American leadership in all the processes - antiterrorism campaign, NATO enlargement, Caspian basin energy development that have made the Black Sea region into a strategic prize.

It was U.S. President George W. Bush who broadened NATO’s enlargement agenda to include the Black Sea direction in his June 2001 address in Warsaw. On that occasion, Bush chose to underline historic considerations and common values as the basis for enlarging the alliance ‘from the Baltic to the Black Sea’.<sup>52</sup> Soon afterward, September 11 provided the strategic impetus behind Black Sea enlargement. The post-September dynamics have underscored the value of the Black Sea region to U.S. and NATO strategies in a vast area from the Balkans to the Caspian and beyond.

---

<sup>52</sup> President Bush speech in Warsaw, June 15, 2001,  
<http://fvi.cnn.com/2001/ALLPOLITICS/06/15/bush.warsaw.trans>

Representing the United States at the Bucharest meeting of the Vilnius Ten Group on March 25-26, 2002, U.S. Deputy Secretary of State Richard Armitage called for a 'robust enlargement', 'the fullest, widest possible enlargement' of the alliance, when it holds its summit in Prague this coming November. Armitage also announced that he would travel from Bucharest directly to NATO headquarters in Brussels in order to brief the European allies, 'to make sure that there is no mistake in Brussels about the position of the United States regarding the widest possible NATO membership'.

A substantial enlargement of NATO at the Prague Summit is unthinkable without a Southern dimension including Bulgaria and Romania. The stability and security in South East Europe is an integral part of the overall Trans-Atlantic security.

Despite evident benefits and practical use of the Membership Action Plan there are serious concerns among experts about some negative outcomes of the policy of NATO's enlargement via MAP. As, for example, senior fellow at the Institute for National Strategic Studies of the US National Defense University Jeffrey Simon mentions, 'western leaders need to recognize, however, that as NATO moves down the MAP road, it is entering into an implicit contractual relationship with the nine aspirants that will increasingly limit its future political choices. In other words, by encouraging MAP aspirants to implement political, economic, and defense reforms, NATO takes on a steadily increasing obligation to invite candidates who fulfill these criteria. Eventually it will not only be difficult not to invite a MAP partner that has implemented serious reforms, but also to invite a partner that has not. If NATO were to disregard its own criteria, it would undermine the credibility and legitimacy of MAP for those partners (probably the majority) that implement defense reforms but are not invited, thus destabilizing the process'.<sup>53</sup>

There is a logical sense in such kind of judgments. Nevertheless, the issue of the NATO enlargement requires much broader, strategic approach. It has to be viewed in the context of building 'a Europe whole and free'.

---

<sup>53</sup> Jeffrey Simon, 'NATO's Membership Action Plan and Defense Planning, *Credibility at Stake*', *Problems of Post-Communism*, vol. 48, no. 3, May/June, p.34.

Gradually NATO's enlargement policy reached the point of no return. We can clearly see three pillars of this no return policy. Firstly, the enlargement is more a political issue than a military one – to enhance overall European security and stability. Obviously Poland, Czech Republic and Hungary have not been militarily developed to meet one hundred percent of the requirements to join NATO, but as the Alliance's Secretary General stated "...Admission of the Czech Republic, Poland and Hungary represented a fresh start for a new, re-shaped Europe". However, "work in NATO is continuing as hard as ever. Through the Membership Action Plan, the Alliance is working closely with the Governments and militaries of aspirant countries, to improve their ability to take care of their own defence, and their ability to work with NATO forces on joint missions. That way, we will ensure that by the time they join, they will be net contributors, not simply consumers, of security".<sup>54</sup>

Secondly, geographical limits of enlargement are certainly taken off from the agenda. Such an approach has gradually become common in NATO's parlance and undoubtedly, having solid experience with enlargement already, it will be leading "eastward and southward, northward and onward". After the first meeting on 13 June, 2001 of NATO Presidents and Prime Ministers since the 1999 Washington Summit, NATO leaders in line with the Alliance new roles reaffirmed the NATO's "open door" policy in a most assertive way, that "in the new Europe of the 21st century, geography can no longer be destiny",<sup>55</sup> and therefore, "no state should be excluded on the basis of history or geography".<sup>56</sup>

And thirdly, no third state can have a veto on NATO enlargement. "... No nation which is not a member of NATO will have veto or droit de regard over the future enlargement of the Alliance".<sup>57</sup>

---

<sup>54</sup> Robertson, Lord. NATO Secretary General. Presentation "NATO and Europe. Key Steps for European Integration – Promoting Peace and Prosperity in Europe". [http://www.nato.int/docu/speech/2001/04/06/01\\_pp3-4](http://www.nato.int/docu/speech/2001/04/06/01_pp3-4).

<sup>55</sup> Robertson, G. "NATO's Challenges: Illusions and Realities". [http://www.nato.int/docu/speech/2001/21/06/01\\_p\\_5](http://www.nato.int/docu/speech/2001/21/06/01_p_5).

<sup>56</sup> Bush, G.W. Excerpted remarks to the North Atlantic Council. [http://www.nato.int/docu/speech/2001/14/06/01\\_p\\_2](http://www.nato.int/docu/speech/2001/14/06/01_p_2).

<sup>57</sup> Robertson, G. "NATO's Challenges: Illusions and Realities". [http://www.nato.int/docu/speech/2001/21/06/01\\_p\\_5](http://www.nato.int/docu/speech/2001/21/06/01_p_5).

At the same time, there is a very important dimension of the NATO enlargement which serves as a significant instrument of building more democratic and prosperous better Europe. If before the end of the Cold War for the enlargement process democracy was not the decisive factor, since the end of the Cold War it has become the key factor. “During the Cold war, military and geopolitical considerations mainly determined NATO’s decisions. Promoting democracy within NATO states and good relations among them was only complementary – desirable but not the primary motive for bringing in new members. But today, with the end of the Cold War, other, non-military goals can and should help shape the new NATO”. One could yet think that such rhetoric only serves NATO’s expansionism to the East, but the reality has already proved the real substance of NATO’s aspiration. “The prospect of NATO membership serves as an incentive for aspirants to get their houses in order. Just look at Central and Eastern Europe today. NATO’s decision to take new members has sparked a wave of bilateral treaties, and supported the resolution of border disputes. It has also encouraged many serious attempts to resolve minority issues, and to establish proper democratic control over militaries. Why? Because all aspirants know that if they want to join NATO they need to do their homework. In short, NATO’s willingness to open its doors has brought Europe closer together – in spirit and in practice”.<sup>58</sup>

In this regard an importance of the Membership Action Plan is more than clear, because it tightly links the NATO enlargement process with democratic and economic development of aspirant countries.

#### FROM WASHINGTON TO PRAGUE

The next NATO summit will take place in Prague on November 2002 – more than 3 years after Washington summit. As Czech Republic Government Commissioner for NATO Summit Preparation Alexandr Vondra mentioned ‘it will be

---

<sup>58</sup> Speech by SG of NATO at the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations, 19 June 2001. <http://www.nato.int/docu/speech/2001/21/06/01>.

the first summit held behind the former Iron Curtain, and what is more in the same city in which the Warsaw Treaty was definitively abolished'<sup>59</sup>.

There are a lot of discussions about possible agenda of the summit. Many details of the agenda are not elaborated yet. Nevertheless, one is clear – many crucial decisions of Washington summit and their developments will be an important part of the Prague summit discussions.

Seemingly, the agenda will be focused on the themes outlined by the US Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs Marc Grossman, when he was presenting US view about the Summit's agenda:

'The first theme - new capabilities. We believe that the Alliance needs new capabilities to deal with the new threats to our people and to our countries.

Second theme - new members. We believe that the Alliance should continue to expand to the new democracies in Europe. As President Bush said last year in Warsaw, we want to make sure that we're doing as much as we possibly can to promote the cause of freedom, and not as little as we can.

And third theme - issues of new relationships - the new relationship with Russia, the new relationships with other countries interested in NATO, the Ukraine, Mediterranean partners and partners in Central Asia'<sup>60</sup>.

One of the main purposes the Prague summit is inviting new countries to join the alliance. While NATO decides which of the candidates - Albania, Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Macedonia, Romania, Slovakia, and Slovenia - will be asked to join, analysts and diplomats have spoken mostly about two possible expansions of the alliance: a five-country enlargement that would include the three Baltic states plus Slovenia and Slovakia, or a so-called seven-out-of-seven expansion, which would enlarge that group with Bulgaria and Romania. The Vilnius Group, an

---

<sup>59</sup> Alexandr Vondra, 'Welcome to the Internet pages of the NATO Summit in Prague,' <http://www.natosummit.cz/en/view-id.php4?vid=72>

<sup>60</sup> Under Secretary Grossman Discusses Agenda for NATO Prague Summit, <http://usinfo.state.gov/topical/pol/nato/02041711.htm>

informal grouping that includes the candidate countries and Croatia, says that an enlarged alliance would be more effective in fighting global terrorism and would benefit Europe's security. The United States - whose opinion has decisive influence within the alliance - is said to favor a large-scale expansion. This is the first NATO expansion since 1999, when the Czech Republic, Hungary, and Poland joined the alliance.

The President of the Czech Republic Vaclav Havel expressing current general position of in the Alliance about further expansion believes, 'that Alliance membership should be offered to the three Baltic Republics, Bulgaria, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia, as well as to other states, particularly those in Southeastern Europe. Although it will probably not be possible to admit all these countries at the same time, and some of them are not yet prepared for membership, the Alliance should declare at the Prague Summit which nations could potentially become members in the future'.<sup>61</sup>

---

---

<sup>61</sup> Vaclav Havel, 'Prague predictions', *NATO Review*, Spring 2002.