NATO Research Fellowship Scheme 1998-2000

Final Report:

Dr Adrian Hyde-Price

NATO Research Fellow 1998-2000

NATO and the Baltic Sea Region:

Towards Regional Security Governance?

Postal Address:

Institute for German Studies

University of Birmingham

Birmingham

B15 2TT

UNITED KINGDOM

Email:

a.g.hydeprice@bham.ac.uk

NATO AND THE BALTIC SEA REGION:
TOWARDS REGIONAL SECURITY GOVERNANCE?

This report presents the result of a study of the role of the NATO alliance in developing new forms of security governance in post-cold war Europe, focusing on the Baltic Sea region. The central argument is that NATO is contributing to the emergence of new and distinctive forms of security relationships in the Baltic Sea region and elsewhere in post-cold war Europe. These new security relationships can be termed *security governance*. The concept of 'security governance' refers to security relations that are not based on formal alliance relationships or security guarantees, but on regularised patterns of behaviour embedded in shared understandings and values. These intertwinning webs of security governance exist at a number of different levels, and constitute a multi-layered structure of shared understandings, partly institutionalised in regularised forms of cooperation. With the end of cold war, NATO has emerged as the most important and influential multilateral institution in the European security system, and thus has a significant role to play in shaping the emerging elements of multi-level security governance in Europe. As this study seeks to demonstrate, these emergent patterns of security governance in post-cold war Europe are particularly in evidence in the Baltic Sea region. For this reason, developments in the Baltic Sea region have a wider significance for Europe as a whole.

The Baltic Sea Region

For the purposes of this study, the Baltic Sea region is defined as the ten countries belonging to the Council of Baltic Sea States (CBSS) – Finland, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Germany, Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia and Russia. Norway is included even though it is not directly located on the Baltic Sea, given its membership of the CBSS, its intimate relationship with its Scandinavian neighbours and its membership of NATO. Reference is also made to Iceland – a member of NATO and the Nordic Council – but given its small size and geographical separation, it is not a significant actor in the international politics of the Baltic Sea region.

The Baltic Sea region consists of a number of distinct groupings of states. First, the five Nordic countries: Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Finland and Iceland. Second, the three Baltic states: Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia. Third, two central European countries: Germany and Poland. And finally, Russia – Eastern Europe's regional great power. These actors exhibit very different social, political and economic characteristics. Around the northern, western and south-western shores of the Baltic are located some of Europe's most prosperous

and socially developed democracies. In stark contrast, the eastern and south-eastern rim of the Baltic is characterised by countries undergoing complicated and demanding processes of post-communist transformation – with varying degrees of success. This cocktail of heterogeneous states and societies generates a distinctive set of security risks and challenges.

PART ONE

THE BALTIC SEA REGION AND EUROPEAN SECURITY

There are five main reasons why a study of NATO's role in the Baltic Sea region is of broader significance for the wider European security system. First: because of the intrinsic interest of security relations in a region which has long been a hub of international activity and exchange, dating back at least to the medieval Hanseatic League. Second: because of the tendancy towards a regional fragmentation of the European security system in the decade since the demise of cold war bipolarity. Third: because the dilemmas of further rounds of NATO enlargement to the East are epitomised by the aspirations of three Baltic Republics to join the Alliance. Fourth: because the Baltic Sea region demonstrates what should be one of NATO's principal roles in a cooperative European security system – as a crucial element and promoter of multi-level security governance. And finally: because the Baltic Sea region epitomises all the complexities and difficulties involved in building a Common European Security and Defence Policy (CESDP) that will complement rather than undermine a transatlantic security partnership.

1.   The Baltic Sea region as a Microcosm of the Wider Europe

During the cold war, the Baltic Sea region was effectively a 'no-man's land' on the periphery of the main axis of confrontation in central Europe. This relative geostrategic marginalisation of the Baltic Sea region facilitated the emergence of a distinctive 'Nordic balance'. This consisted of two neutral states (Finland and Sweden) along with two Nordic NATO states (Norway and Denmark) that had a special status within the Alliance: neither country allowed nuclear weapons or foreign troops to be permanently stationed on their territory. The success of the Nordic balance meant that throughout the years of cold war confrontation, the Baltic Sea region remained a relatively low-tension area[1].

The dramatic events of 1989-91 transformed existing security relationships in the Baltic Sea region, and transformed the pattern of international politics in the region. With the end of the East-West conflict, the waters of the Baltic Sea have potentially become a means of

---

[1] E.Bjøl, *Nordic Security*, Adelphi Paper 181 (London: Brassey's for the IISS, 1983).

uniting rather than dividing its littoral states. The Baltic can now serve to mediate rather than obstruct contacts, and to open up routes of transport and communication previously closed[2]. The unification of Germany and the disintegration of the USSR have also transformed the geopolitics of the region. As a Royal Danish Naval Commander noted, with German unification, one littoral state disappeared from the Baltic and a former Baltic great power re-emerged[3]. With the disintegration of the USSR, the three Baltic Republics have regained their independence and sovereignty, and Russian territory has been reduced to two enclaves, St. Petersberg and Kaliningrad. This Russian presence on the Baltic is particularly significant because this region is now the only place where Russia is really in direct contact with the West. It is in the Baltic Sea region, therefore, that Russia's role as a major ***European*** is truly in evidence. Russia's behaviour in the region will therefore be of great significance for its wider role and acceptance in Europe. In this respect, Russian policy towards the three Baltic republics will be especially important. As Carl Bildt has argued, 'Russia's policies towards the Baltic countries will the litmus test of its new direction', and 'Russia's conduct towards these states will show the true nature of Russia's commitment to international norms and principles'[4].

With the end of the cold war and the peeling back of superpower 'overlay'[5], therefore, traditional patterns of cooperation and conflict have resurfaced in the Baltic Sea region. Historical, cultural and linguistic relationships are being re-established between states on the south-eastern and north-western rims of the Baltic. Yet this does not signify simply that the region is returning 'back to the future'. Rather, traditional cultural links and historical relationships are re-emerging in a very different context than before the onset of the cold war. Europe itself - including much of northern Europe - has been transformed by multilateral institutional integration, economic interdependence and informal networks of societal communication and exchange. Whilst international relations in the Baltic Sea region are strongly coloured by historical patterns of cooperation and conflict, they are also being

---

[2] 'Die Nachricht vom Untergang der Fähre "Estonia" bringt uns schlagartig zum Bewußtsein, daß der Wochenentrip von Stockholm über die Ostsee nach Tallinn für Tausende inzwischen zur Routine geworden ist - das *mare balticum* also wieder als Verkehrs- und Kommunikationsraum'. Karl Schlögel, *Go East oder Die Zweite Entdeckung des Ostens* (Berlin: Siedler Verlag, 1995), p.20. As Karl Schlögel also notes, 'Mit dem Verkehr kam der Handel und mit dem Handl die Kultur'.

[3] Quoted in Axel Krohn, ed., *The Baltic Sea Region* (Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, 1996), p.96.

[4] Carl Bildt, 'The Baltic Litmus Test', *Foreign Affairs*, vol..73, no.5 (September/October 1994), pp.72-85 (p.72).

[5] The concept of 'overlay' can be found in Barry Buzan, *People, States and Fear. An Agenda for International Security Studies in the Post-Cold War Era*, second edition (London: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1991), pp.219-21.

shaped by late twentieth century forces such as integration, globalisation and interdependence[6].

What is intrinsically interesting about contemporary developments in the Baltic Sea region is that they encapsulate many of the problems and opportunities embodied in building a Europe 'whole and free'. It provides a unique example of pan-European relations in microcosm, bringing together as it does some of Europe's wealthiest and most socially developed countries – such as Sweden, Finland, Denmark and Norway – and others undergoing the strains and dislocations arising from the process of post-communist transformation. It also brings together Germany, the dominant structural power in Central Europe, and Russia, Eastern Europe's aspirant great power. Thus as Thomas Siebert (the US Ambassador to Sweden) has observed, '[m]any of the great projects of unifying Europe in the coming century will affect and involve the Baltic region: Russia's new partnership with NATO; the enlargement of the alliance and the EU; the enhancement of PfP and the construction of a collective security structure for Europe; and the building of the New Atlantic Community and the Transatlantic Marketplace'.[7]

2.   The Regionalisation of the European Security System

The second rationale for studying NATO's role in the Baltic Sea region is that with the end of cold war bipolarity, the European security system has increasingly fragmented along regional lines, often reflecting historical fault-lines and traditional patterns of cooperation and conflict. During the cold war, NATO members such as Norway and Turkey shared a common national security concern – a perceived Soviet threat. Whatever differences in the geostrategic situation, this provided them with a common concern that provided the basis for security cooperation within the Alliance. With the end of the cold war and the disappearance of the Soviet Union, the national security concerns of Norway and Turkey are focused on their specific regional concerns – which are very different.

Throughout Europe, the regionalisation of the security agenda is much in evidence. In south-eastern Europe, traditional 'Balkan' rivalries have re-emerged alongside new problems of state and nation-building. This has that give international relations in this troubled region a distinctive – and bloody – character. In central Europe, on the other hand,

---

[6] The significance of this is explored in B. Ståth, 'Neue Verhältnisse im Norden', in B.Henningsen and B.Ståth, eds., *Deutschland, Schweden und die Ostsee-Region* (Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, 1996), pp.16-22.

[7] Thomas Siebert, 'The New Atlantic Community and the Baltic Sea Region', in Bo Huldt and U.Johannessen, eds., *First Annual Stockholm Conference on Baltic Sea Security and Cooperation* (Stockholm: Utrikespolitiska Institutet, 1997), pp.325-51 (p.101).

traditional patterns of economic and political interaction have re-emerged across the former East-West divide, reflecting both the positive legacy of the Habsburg monarchy and the contested concept of *Mitteleuropa*. Here in the heartlands of central Europe, a zone of stable peace is steadily emerging, and security relations are being reshaped under the influence of the dual enlargement process and united Germany's benign hegemony. Distinctive regional patterns of interaction have emerged among the southern European states situated around the north-western littoral coast of the Mediterranean. These countries – Spain, Portugal, France and Italy – have developed new forms of military and political cooperation, reflecting their shared regional security concerns.

Security developments in the Baltic Sea area exhibit the same tendency: a strong trend towards the regionalisation of European security. Countries around the Baltic Sea share a number of common concerns, even though some of the larger states are affected by developments in other regions that they occupy or that they are close to (the primary example here being Russia, who has distinctive regional security concerns in the Caucasus, Central Asia and the Far East, as well as the Baltic). Nonetheless, the states around the Baltic Sea region share common regional security concerns derived from the distinctive patterns of cooperation and cooperation in the region. In this sense, they are part of a regional 'security complex'.

3. NATO and the Baltic Three: the Dilemmas of Enlargement

The Baltic Sea region is of particular interest and importance because it is here that NATO faces most acutely the dilemmas of enlargement to new members. Having embarked on the process of eastern enlargement with the Madrid decision in May 1997 to offer membership to Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic, NATO now finds itself under tremendous pressure to continue the enlargement process by taking in new members. NATO faces the dilemma of trying to respond to the demands of Central and East European countries for membership, whilst at the same time preserving a cooperative security relationship with Russia. These dilemmas are most acute in the Baltic Sea region.

For historical and political reasons, the three Baltic states – Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia – are desperate to join the Alliance and receive the formal security guarantees under Article V that they feel they need to withstand future Russian threats. The problem, however, is that Russia has made it clear that NATO membership – particularly for Latvia and Estonia with their large Russian minorities – would be viewed as a significant threat to Russian national security. This is a classic example of a 'security dilemma' – a improvement for the security of one state (or in this case three), sought for purely defensive purposes, is seen

(rightly or wrongly) as a threat to the vital interests of a neighbouring state (in this case Russia).

4.   Security Governance in the Baltic Sea region

Throughout the 1990s, much of the debate surrounding NATO's post-cold war role and rationale has focused on its activities in the wars of Yugoslav succession. This is encouraged a discussion of the Alliance's role in military and political crisis-management in conflict situations. However, while this is a function of vital importance for a military alliance like NATO, a study of NATO's role in the Baltic Sea region demonstrates another of its important roles – and one that is arguably of even greater importance for the future peace and security of Europe. This is NATO's role as a vital element in an emerging system of multi-level security governance in Europe.

NATO's contribution to security governance takes place through a number of institutional arrangements and mechanisms that help foster new patterns of behaviour and shared normative understandings. These are the Partnership for Peace programme; the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC); and the NATO-Russia Permanent Joint Council (PJC). The creation of Combined Joint Task Force (CJTF) structures are also important in facilitating new forms of security governance embracing both NATO members and PfP partners, including 'neutral' and non-aligned countries such as Sweden and Finland. The restructuring of the Alliance has strengthened the regional dimension of NATO, and means that it can contribute to security governance at a regional level. As we shall see, this is particularly evident from a study of the Baltic Sea region.

5.   The Complexities of European Security and Defence Cooperation

The final reason for studying security relations in the Baltic Sea region is that it illustrates the problems and complexities of developing a coherent and credible European capability for conducting an autonomous security and defence policy. The aspiration for effective European security and defence cooperation has existing in parts of Europe's political and military elites since the late 1940s, but has never developed to any significant extent given Western Europe's security dependency on the USA. However, the Cologne and Helsinki EU summit decisions to create a Common European Security and Defence Policy constitutes potentially the most important leap forward in European defence cooperation since the failure of the European Defence Community (EDC) in 1954.

The problem at the heart of repeated failures to build a robust European defence and security capability is linked to the transatlantic relationship. For some in Europe (particularly in traditionally 'Atlanticist' countries like Britain, Holland and Norway), Europe can only ever be secure and peaceful if the USA remains militarily and politically committed to Europe. Consequently, nothing should be done in terms of European security cooperation if it weakens, or threatens to weaken, transatlantic ties.   On the other hand there are those in Europe (particularly in France, Belgium and Spain), who believe the Europe's political and security interests are not always coterminous with those of America, and who favour the creation of an autonomous European foreign and security policy, including defence.   In institutional terms, this debate has been focused on the question of whether European security cooperation should take the form of a European Security and Defence Identity (ESDI) within NATO, or a CESDP within the framework of the EU. In the 1980s and for much of the 1990s, this debate revolved around the WEU – should it be the European pillar of NATO, or the military arm of the EU?

The St Malo Declaration and the Kosovo war have changed the terms of the debate, and made a robust CESDP more likely than ever before. However, serious problems remain to be resolved, as can be seen from the constellation of political and security relationships in the Baltic Sea region.   First there is Germany, a country that favours both a strong transatlantic partnership with the USA in the framework of NATO, and a common European foreign, security and defence policy.   Second, there are two of the six non-EU NATO countries, Norway and Poland, both of which are convinced Atlanticists and sceptical of European defence and security initiatives.   Third, there are two of the EU's non-NATO 'neutrals', Sweden and Finland, both of whom want to shape the character and direction of Europe's future foreign and security policy.   Getting agreement on the future of the transatlantic security relationship and a CESDP between these diverse countries within the Baltic Sea region will not be easy, and reflects the difficulties faced in the wider Europe on security cooperation.

PART TWO

THE REGIONAL SECURITY AGENDA

The Changing European Security Agenda

The demise of the cold war – which came about largely peacefully and democratically – generated hopes of the dawn of a new age of pan-European peace and cooperation. Sadly, however, despite the initial hopes and dreams born in the wave of optimism which followed

the *annus mirabilis* of 1989, it soon became apparent that post-cold war Europe faced a new set of security concerns. 'We have slain a large dragon', it was suggested, 'but we live in a jungle filled with a bewildering variety of poisonous snakes' (Mueller 1994: 536). The Soviet threat had been vanquished, but a new security agenda quickly emerged, consisting largely of non-military 'risks' and 'challenges' emanating from post-communist Central and Eastern Europe. Some traditional security concerns remained: for example, managing the build-down of conventional and nuclear forces in Central Europe; consolidating the new regime of arms controls and confidence-building measures; addressing the problem of nuclear proliferation; and responding to the problem of international terrorism, particularly state-sponsored terrorism. By and large, however, Europe's post-cold war security agenda has dominated by non-military risks and challenges.

Many of these security problems derive not from traditional inter-state conflicts, but from the traumas and tensions associated with the 'triple transformation' in the East (the transformation of the economy, political system and external policy). One intractable problem has been the enormous economic and social hardships arising from the dismantling of command economies and the introduction of market capitalism. This has severely complicated the difficult process of state and nation-building which is central to the political agenda in the post-communist East (Vogel 1997: 23). Soon after 1989 it became apparent that transforming and modernising the sclerotic economics which were the legacy of forty years of state socialism was going to be a much more difficult – and painful – undertaking than many had initially imagined. The turmoil and despair that all-too-often accompanied attempts at macro-economic stabilisation and structural reform threatened to undermine the young shoots of political democratisation, and provide fertile ground for unscrupulous populists, xenophobic nationalists and demagogues of all descriptions. At best, this would make international cooperation more difficult. At worst, it could generate new conflicts, up to and including wars.

The dismantling of the iron curtain and the beginnings of the 'triple transformation' thus presented NATO with a new set of security problems. The military threat from the Soviet Union and its allies has disappeared, but in its place has emerged the problems of disorder and upheaval in the post-communist East. Many of these new security problems are thus not a function of the balance of power or geopolitical concerns. Instead, as German Federal President Roman Herzog observed in March 1995,

> Social, ecological and cultural destabilisation present additional security risks, which in the long-term are scarcely less dangerous than military threats. Meanwhile the list of these risks has become well-known: population explosion, climate change, economically-motivated migrants, nuclear smuggling, the drugs trade,

fundamentalists of different colours, genocide, the collapse of state authority (Herzog 1995: 161).

The Changing Security Agenda in the Baltic Region

Compared to the more turbulent and troubled south-eastern parts of Europe (particularly in the Balkans and the Caucasus), the Baltic Sea region is a relatively peaceful and stable area. Nonetheless, there are some potential sources of tension, particularly from the non-traditional security risks and challenges noted above. As Bo Huldt, the Director of the Swedish Institute of International Affairs, has noted, '[t]oday, the region is a historic meeting place between the interests of the Nordics, the Baltics, the European Union, NATO, Russia and "Central Europe". It is a region of old historic divides - now facing new ones' (Huldt 1997, 5). The contemporary security agenda in the Baltic Sea region consists of both 'traditional' political-military issues, and new issues reflecting the 'expanded' concept of security which has developed in the post-cold war era. The main sources of division and tension include:

- *Ethno-national conflicts.* These are concerned with the problems of national identity and minority rights. Around the Baltic Sea there are a number of minority national communities: Poles in Lithuania (and, to a lesser extent, Lithuanians in Poland); Germans in Poland; Swedes in Finland; and Russians in Estonia and Latvia. In the case of the Swedish minority in Finland, this has long ceased to be a source of conflict. However, as regards the large Russian minorities in the Baltic Republics, this is a highly delicate and potentially explosive issue (Arnswald 1998: 28-34).

- *Military deployments.* In contrast to Central Europe, which has seen a substantial reduction in stationed military forces, the situation in the Baltic Sea region is less sanguine. Russian forces have been withdrawn from eastern Germany, Poland and the three Baltic Republics. However, many of these forces have been redeployed to bases in the Kaliningrad Special Defence District, the Leningrad Military District or the Kola Peninsula (Van Ham 1995: 6, and Allison 1998: 98-99). Given the strategic importance of Russian maritime nuclear second-strike forces in the Arctic and Barents Sea region, the Kola peninsula and the Baltic is of great military importance to Russian.

- *NATO enlargement.* Resolving both of the above issues has become even more difficult given NATO's enlargement to the east. Poland was one of the three new members admitted in the 'first wave' of enlargement in March 1999. Russia has remained critical of this enlargement, but chose not to jeopardise its relations with the west by taking the counter-measures it had earlier threatened. However, Moscow is vehemently opposed to the Baltic states' membership of NATO, which it would regard as a major threat to its

strategic interests. The issue of future waves of NATO enlargement thus continues to generate tension in the region between Russia and its neighbours (Lieven 1996).

- *Transnational Criminal Organisations*. This has emerged a key issue of the contemporary security agenda in the Baltic region. The problem is particularly acute given the socio-economic inequalities between Baltic countries, and the emergence of organised criminal gangs in Russia, the Baltic states and Poland (Ulrich 1994).

- *Environmental and Ecological Concerns*. Pollution of the Baltic Sea is a major worry for all countries in the region. It is also a problem which has major cross-border dimensions, and which can therefore only be tackled through international cooperation. The problem here is that the economic problems of the post-communist countries mean that they are not able to finance the necessary environmental protection measures. Such environmental problems derive from the legacy of the East-West conflict, including the dumping of chemical substances in the Baltic Sea and contaminated groundwater around former Soviet airfields or military installations (Arnswald 1998, 28)

- *Migration*. A significant concern of all of the wealthier countries around the Baltic Sea is the potential problem of large-scale, economically motivated migration. This has not yet emerged as a pressing problem, but it remains a potential worry, particularly in the light of the dire economic difficulties facing the transition process in Russia. The dilemma facing the Baltic Sea region is how to balance the need for robust border controls (a requirement of the Schengen accords) with the decide to facilitate cross-border cooperation and economic relations. This dilemma has been posed particularly starkly by the case of Polish-Lithuanian relations. More generally, the issue of 'Freedom of Travel whilst fighting abuse' was the hottest item on the agenda at a Council of Baltic Sea States (CBSS) meeting in Kaliningrad (17-18 February 1999)[8].

This multifaceted and diffuse security agenda presents policy-makers with a complicated set of challenges. Experience to date suggests that no one organisation can successfully address this broad security agenda. Rather, the strategic aim should be to coordinate and integrate the work of a number of bodies, thereby forging a network of international structures and multilateral institutions. These include the OSCE, NATO (particularly through the Partnership for Peace programme), the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC), the Council for Europe, the Nordic Union and the Council for Baltic Sea States (CBSS). Of

---

[8] The meeting expressed the hope that the process of European integration and the subsequent adherence of some of the member states to the Schengen agreements would not create new obstacles to freedom of movement in the region. *Baltinfo*, nr.18 (March 1999), p.5.

particular importance to the security agenda in the Baltic Sea region, however, is NATO. It is the only organisation with a capacity for exercising 'hard' power in the region, and remains the focus of the security hopes and fears of all states around the Baltic. In addition, however, the European Union's role in the region is growing, and its 'soft' power gives it the opportunity to exercise what has been termed 'soft governance' in Central and Eastern Europe. Moreover, as a largely 'civilian power' consisting of institutionalised forms of pooled sovereignty, inter-governmental cooperation and multi-level governance, the EU is best placed to address many of the non-military dimensions of contemporary security. It can thus play a key role in developing greater international trust and cooperation in the Baltic Sea region, thereby strengthening the foundations of regional security goverance.

PART THREE

NATO'S QUEST FOR RELEVANCE IN A CHANGING WORLD

'The North Atlantic Alliance remains the backbone for peace and stability in Europe. It will be more than ever the core and motor of a new European peace order. The Alliance is directing itself in spirit and structure towards the new demands of today and tomorrow – crisis prevention and crisis resolution, projecting stability and cooperation with new partners....
German Defence Minister Rudolf Scharping, Hamburg, 11 November 1998.

This third section considers debates on NATO's role in Europe. It concentrates on two central issues: enlargement of the Alliance to the East and non-Article V military crisis-management operations. For much of the 1990s, controversies over NATO enlargement obscured discussion of an even more important set of questions: the function – if any – of NATO in the post-cold war era, and the role of military force in the reshaping of European order. The Kosovo war came like a bolt of lightening for both these questions, throwing into stark relief the choices and dilemmas facing late modern Europe. NATO's 'Operation Deliberate Force' was a pivotal event in the post-cold war evolution of the European security system. It heralded a further break with the principles and practices of the Westphalian states' system, and pointed to a paradigm shift in the very nature of European order. The consequences of the war for NATO, transatlantic relations and a European Security and Defence Identity (ESDI) will be discussed well into the twenty-first century.

The emergence of a new regional and European security agenda raised an important but difficult set of questions for NATO members concerning the utility and legitimacy of

military force in reshaping post-cold war European order. The end of the cold war has had a paradoxical affect on European and Baltic security. On the one hand, it has reduced the saliency of military threats and transformed the security agenda. On the other, it has created a number of situations where the option of military crisis-management is called for. European states, including non-NATO EU 'neutrals' like Sweden and Finland, have therefore had to grapple with the demands posed by 'Military Operations Other Than War' (MOOTW), i.e., humanitarian intervention, peace-keeping and peace-support operations. With the end of the cold war, traditional questions of strategy – the use of military power for political means – is thus firmly back on the security agenda, despite the reduced saliency of military security threats. Consequently what can be termed 'the agenda of Clausewitz' ('war as the continuation of politics by other means') is firmly back on the European security agenda, after it had been largely displaced by the advent of nuclear deterrence and the East-West military stand-off. This means that all Baltic Sea states have had to confront a series of tough moral and political questions about the legitimacy and utility of military force as an instrument for reshaping European order.

A catalyst for thinking about the implications of military crisis-management in Europe was the Kosovo war. This raised a question that touches deep political nerves and historical sensitivities in many European countries: the role of military force in reshaping European order. The future institutional contours and policy dimensions of the European security system will be decisively shaped by the answers given to what is the key question of European order in the late modern era: is there, or is there not, a right to humanitarian intervention? If so, there are four specific questions to be addressed: on what grounds is human intervention justified? (what counts as 'genocide' or 'gross violations of human rights'?). Second: who can intervene? (one country, an alliance or ad hoc grouping of states?). Third: with what authority? there is, who has the right to intervene, and on the basis of what legitimate authority? (that of the UN or OSCE, or can states or alliances mandate themselves?). Finally: with what instruments or methods is humanitarian intervention to be allowed? (bombing from 15,000 feet?, or through the deployment of lightly armed ground forces?).

Controversies surrounding these questions are likely to fuel a major debate on the goals and instruments of Europe security policy for much of the next decade or more. They also have important implications for Baltic Sea security, given both Russian concerns that NATO may intervene in its 'internal' affairs, and concerns in Latvia or Estonia that Russia may justify intervention in their domestic affairs on the grounds that the human rights of ethnic Russians are been abused. Even if neither of these two regional 'doomsday' scenarios occurs, all Baltic Sea states will have to consider these issues, not least because of their participation in NATO's Partnership for Peace programme.

NATO's Role in European Security

The second question generated by the new security agenda concerned the role of NATO in European order. This question was linked to the first about military force, but raised a larger and more diverse bundle of political and strategic issues. One important consequence of the end of the cold war and the emergence of a radically new security agenda has been the changed importance of NATO for the national security of its established European member states. In the context of the East-West conflict, when the BRD was a frontline state in a divided continent, NATO was of existential military and geopolitical importance for member states like Denmark, the Federal Republic of Germany and Norway. Today, however, these countries are surrounded by friends, and no longer face a 'clear and present danger' in the shape of an identifiable military threat to their territorial integrity. Instead, they are seeking to address a new security agenda, one that is dominated by non-military security issues for which NATO is not so obviously suited.

Thus for many existing members such as Germany, Denmark or Norway, NATO's utility is more political than military. Article V security guarantees are no longer as vital as they were during the cold war. Consequently the relative significance for Baltic regional security of other institutions such as the EU and the OSCE has grown. In the immediate wake the fall of the Berlin Wall, the then German Foreign Minister, Hans-Dietrich Genscher, even floated the idea that the CSCE (as the OSCE was then known) could provide the core of a new pan-European system of collective security (Rotfeld 1991). This idea received little support from other NATO members and was quietly discarded. Nevertheless, it is clear that the place of NATO in Baltic Sea security has changed fundamentally since the end of the cold war. For many European alliance members, NATO's primary importance will be that it institutionalises the transatlantic partnership with America and provides a multilateral context for their security policies. In the Baltic Sea region, NATO will have a crucial role to play in fostering regional security governance.

NATO Enlargement

After a brief flirtation in 1989-90 with ideas of a pan-European collective security system based on an invigorated and institutionalised CSCE (Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe), a growing number of Central and East European states began to voice a desire to join NATO. Hungary led the way here, closely followed by Czechoslovakia and Poland. NATO was seen by the new post-communist democracies both as a community of shared values and institutions which they wanted to join, and as the only viable source of credible security guarantees against a recidivist Russia (Pradetto 1997).

Initially, there was little significant support within NATO for enlargement to the East, not least because of a despite to preserve security cooperation with Russia (which had proven invaluable in the Gulf and in the Balkans). However, as Russia became a more prickly partner in 1993/94, and some critical voices questioned the purpose of NATO in the post-cold war context, some influential voices began pressing for enlargement. The key here was transgovernmental partnership between the German Defence Minister Volke Rühe and a group of officials in the Clinton Administration around Anthony Lake (Clinton's national security adviser). As the inter-ministerial debate on NATO enlargement intensified in the course of 1993, the German Chancellor, Helmut Kohl, mindful of the need to preserve a good working relationship with his coalition partner, the FDP, initially supported Foreign Minister Klaus Kinkel's more cautious approach towards enlargement. Kohl also shared the Foreign Ministry's concern that early NATO enlargement would place a serious strain on German-Russian relations. In addition, Rühe's advocacy of NATO enlargement had received a lukewarm response from senior Bundeswehr officers. Given the constellation of domestic political and institutional forces arrayed against him, Rühe focused on cementing trans-governmental alliances with the USA and the East Central Europeans.

The key actor in the enlargement debate was, of course, the USA (Goldgeiger 1998). Rühe worked closely with Richard Holbrooke, who was appointed US Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs in the summer of 1994, with special responsibility for 'enforcing' policy on NATO enlargement within the Clinton Administration. German Defence Minister Volker Rühe had forged a good relationship with Richard Holbrooke during the latter's stint as US Ambassador to Bonn. Rühe also took the novel decision to commission a study on public attitudes towards NATO enlargement by the California-based US think tank, the Rand Corporation. He recognised that in doing so, he would indirectly exert influence on the US Senate, whose support for a future enlargement of NATO would be crucial. In addition, the German Defence Ministry worked closely with NATO Secretary General Manfred Wörner[9] and US Secretary of State Les Aspen in the autumn of 1993 to draw up proposals for the Partnership for Peace programme. This, they hoped, would be an instrument for preparing the ground for a future Eastern enlargement of NATO. The Partnership for Peace idea was subsequently agreed at a NATO Ministerial Meeting in Travemünde, and later adopted as NATO policy at the Brussels NAC in January 1994 (NATO 1994).

---

[9] NATO Secretary-General Wörner, a former German Defence Minister, was also a keen advocate of enlargement. In September 1993, for example, he gave a speech at the International Institute of Strategic Studies in Brussels in which he stated that: 'NATO is not a closed society. We have always said that the option for membership is open. My view is that the time has come for us to offer a concrete perspective to the countries of Central and Eastern Europe who want to join NATO, and whom we regard as possible candidates for future membership' (Hampton 1998: 88).

Partnership for Peace was widely regarded as a compromise between those who favoured enlargement and those opposed to it. It provided for the development of new forms of functional military cooperation, aimed at facilitating future multilateral peace-support and non-article V operations involving both NATO and non-NATO members. Along with Russia, CIS states and the East Central Europeans, it included neutral and non-aligned countries such as Austria, Finland and Sweden. PfP members were invited to send permanent liaison officers to NATO headquarters in Brussels, and a separate Partnership Coordination Cell (PCC) was established at Mons in April 1994. In this way, Partnership for Peace was to provide one of the key planks of a new system of post-cold war security governance in Europe.

Whatever PfP's intrinsic merits (and they were manifold), its political function was to provide 'the necessary smoke-screen for an essentially political debate which was conducted within the alliance' on the question of NATO enlargement (Eyal 1997: 703). Between late 1993 and early 1994, the balance of opinion within the Alliance on the question of NATO enlargement shifted perceptibly in favour of enlargement. The change of opinion in the US Administration was apparent shortly after the January 1994 Brussels summit, when President Clinton declared that 'the question was no longer whether NATO will take in new members, but when and how'. The debate raged throughout 1994 – largely behind closed doors – and by December 1994, enlargement had become inevitable. In early 1995 NATO prepared a 'Study on Enlargement', which was published in September 1995. This spelt out the political criteria governing NATO's 'opening' to the East. Sensing the shift in the middle ground on the issue – particularly the changed mood in Washington - Chancellor Kohl revised his stance, and in April 1995 instructed Foreign Minister Kinkel to formally endorse NATO enlargement. During his visit to Poland in July 1995, Kohl formally de-coupled the processes of EU and NATO enlargement, thereby making clear his support for an early enlargement of NATO (Hampton 1998: 90).

With the clear triumph within NATO of the US-German trans-governmental coalition in favour of enlargement, two further questions needed to be resolved. The first was which states to invite to join the Alliance. This was clearly of vital importance for security and cooperation in the Baltic Sea region. Denmark was particularly keen to ensure that the three Baltic states were not excluded from the enlargement process, even though most Danish policy-makers recognised that it would be too sensitive to include the Baltic three in the first round of enlargement. Consequently, in the lead-up to the Madrid NATO Summit in July 1997, two additional contenders emerged alongside the three front-runners (Poland, Czech Republic and Hungary): Romania, which enjoyed strong French backing, and Slovenia. In the end, US insistence on a limited enlargement was accepted by other NATO members, and invitations were issued to the three Central European aspirants. Nonetheless, the Madrid

Communique offered indirect encouragement to Romania and Slovenia, along with the three Baltic states (Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia), by commentating on the 'positive developments' and 'progress' achieved by these 'aspiring members' (NATO 1997: paragraph 8).

The second key issue associated with enlargement was how to minimise Russian opposition (Ruehl 1994). NATO hoped that by offering a strategic partnership between the Alliance and Russia, Moscow's opposition to NATO enlargement would be diluted. Chancellor Kohl was particularly concerned to bring the Russians on board, and played a leading role in diplomatic initiatives designed to cement a new partnership between Russia and NATO. The result was the Founding Act of May 1997, which provided for the creation of a Permanent Joint Council (PJC). The Founding Act was very much a product of US-German cooperation. Germany and the USA provided the 'greatest stimuli for negotiations and for the agreement's wording', and the Act's 'decisive passages were formulated in Washington's State Department and in the Foreign Office in Bonn in collaboration with NATO headquarters in Brussels' (Kamp 1997: 317). The precise role and powers of the PJC were left deliberately ambiguous, given the different aspirations of the parties involved. NATO believed it would offer Russia a voice in European security issues, without giving them a veto over NATO's policy. The Russians, however, hoped it would provide them with effective leverage over NATO's actions – particularly in terms of future enlargements.

The decision to offer invitations to join NATO to Poland, Czech Republic and Hungary was finally taken at the NATO Summit in Madrid in July 1997. These three countries became full members on 12 March 1999. For NATO, however, future enlargement poses some difficult questions. The second and subsequent rounds of enlargement are likely to be much more difficult and controversial than the first round. There is no consensus within NATO on which aspirant countries to invite, although individual members have their preferred candidates. Russia would react strongly if an invitation were offered to Estonia or Latvia. More importantly, further enlargement could weaken the political coherence of the Alliance, and make its more difficult to reach consensus on future NATO policy. Yet not to continue with the enlargement process would generate enormous disappointment in aspirant countries, and raise equally difficult questions about NATO's ultimate purpose.

In Germany, a key actor in the enlargement process, Chancellor Schröder's government has not yet reached a clear position on the next wave of NATO enlargement. The previous government had been divided on the issue. Volker Rühe insisted that he would support on a 'southern round' of enlargement (Romania and Slovenia), but argued that it was essential not to further disrupt cooperation with Russia by offering NATO membership to any of the Baltic three. Klaus Kinkel, on the other hand, has seen himself an 'advocate' of the Baltic states, and was more concerned to address their security concerns. In early 1998, however, both ministries and the Chancellor's Office agreed to a common position: they

would oppose an early commitment to a new round of enlargement, and – if the US insisted on a second round – seek to confine it to as few candidates as possible (Kamp 1998: 178).

This view on future NATO enlargement reflects a growing consensus within NATO more generally. It is widely recognised that a public commitment to a continuation of the enlargement process is essential in order to encourage an on-going process of reform in aspirant countries. It is also felt that NATO's standing would suffer if it were seen to offer membership to three Central European countries. On balance, there is a strong body of opinion within the Alliance that favours a process of consolidation and internal restructuring within NATO rather than a new round of enlargement. This will probably result in a slowing-down of the NATO enlargement process and its re-coupling to the process of EU enlargement. A consensus might then emerge in NATO for an offer of membership to Slovenia and Romania, and possibly Lithuania, which has no Russian minority. But it is widely recognised in Berlin that the offer of NATO membership to Estonia and Latvia would precipitate a major crisis in relations with Russia that few in the Alliance would welcome. This would undermine the system of cooperative security governance in Europe that is a primary goal of NATO policy. Finally, there are tough questions about the future size and membership of the Alliance, given that the larger NATO becomes, the more problematic it becomes to reach consensus on key issues. Alliance members are therefore likely to advocate a cautious approach towards subsequent rounds of NATO enlargement, preferring instead to concentrate diplomatic time and energy on strengthening security governance on a regional and pan-European basis.

PART FOUR

COOPERATIVE SECURITY GOVERNANCE AND MILITARY CRISIS MANAGEMENT

NATO enlargement dominated debates on the European security for much of the 1990s. In doing so, it largely obscured a more important question: the nature and purpose of the NATO, and the role of military force in Europe.

The first question to consider is the role and function of the Atlantic Alliance in a post-Soviet world. Given the central role NATO has traditionally played in the European security system, this question has far-reaching implications for the future reshaping of European order in the twenty-first century.

'NATO the Elephant'

According to the parable of the blind men and the elephant, there was once a group of blind men who set themselves the task of trying to understand the 'essence' of the elephant. The problem was that as they explored the elephant with their hands, they reached very different

conclusions. Some were most struck by the tusks, and formed an impression of the elephant as a fierce beast. Others were struck by the enormous ears, or the trunk, and formed other impressions of the elephant as a gentle, if not comical, creature. The result was a lively, but inconclusive debate about what constituted the 'essence' of the elephant (Lindfors 1999: 1; see also Puchala 1972).

The metaphor of the elephant is particularly apt when it comes to the contemporary debate on NATO's essential 'role' or 'purpose'. The fact that NATO's eastern enlargement took place days before the Alliance embarked on its first offensive military campaign raised an awkward question for its members, old and new – what was the essential purpose of NATO? What was the rationale of an Alliance created, in the words of its first Secretary General, Lord Ismay, 'to keep the Russians out, the Americans in, and the Germans down'? This fundamental question had been largely obscured by the controversies surrounding NATO enlargement (Vogel 1997), but was laid bare by the Kosovo campaign.

Like the elephant, NATO has a number of distinct features, each of which is accorded different weight by different observers. First: NATO offers collective territorial defence guarantees, enshrined in Article V of the Washington Treaty. Second: it institutionalises a permanent US security presence in Western Europe, thereby providing the organisational buckle of the transatlantic relationship. Third: it has created a multilateral system of defence cooperation designed to prevent conflict through institutionalised cooperation (historically important given concerns about Germany, and of more contemporary relevance given continued tensions between Turkey and Greece). Fourth: it provides an institutional basis for developing forms of cooperative security governance in post-communist Central and Eastern Europe. Fifth: it institutionalises a 'community of values' (*Wertegemeinschaft*) based on human rights, democratic government, the rule of law and the peaceful resolution of disputes (Schimmelfennig 1998). It is thus the organisational embodiment of the 'Western Community'. Finally, it facilitates practical military cooperation for non-Article V contingency operations such as the Gulf War, peace support operations such as Bosnia, and offensive campaigns such as the aerial bombardment of Serbia (March-June 1999). This has been dubbed the 'IFOR/SFOR model of NATO' (Schulte 1997).

In the course of the 1990s, the relative importance of these six key roles changed significantly. NATO began to mean different things to different people as the consensus on NATO's post-cold war security rationale began to fragment (Sloan and Forrest 1997). For its original cold war members, the Article V collective defence guarantee lost its over-riding importance. However, for the Central and East Europeans who aspired to NATO membership, Article V security guarantees were what they most coveted. They saw Article V as very raison d'etre of the Alliance, and were little interested in military crisis management operations in the Balkans or the Gulf. By contrast, the USA increasingly came to see in

NATO a potential instrument for global power projection in defence of 'common interests', and as the primary forum for exerting influence over European developments (Dembinski 1999).

For most West European NATO members like Germany or Denmark, on the other hand, NATO's primary utility no longer stems from its Article V security guarantees. NATO remains important to West European countries because it provides a multilateral framework for their security and defence policies. The US link remains important, but its no longer has the existential importance it had during the cold war. As regards NATO's future role, most West European Alliance members' preference is for NATO to function as an instrument for building cooperative security governance in the post-communist East. They have also welcomed the development of the 'IFOR/SFOR' model of NATO, above all because it provides a way of reconciling a range of discrete foreign and security policy objectives.[10]

For much of the 1990s, serious discussion of NATO's post-cold war rationale was over-shadowed by the controversies stirred up by the enlargement debate. Stanley Horelik of the RAND Corporation made clear in his evidence to the US Senate that the end of the cold war had left NATO in a torpor. 'In the presence of this conceptual vacuum', he argued, 'virtually the entire burden of reviving NATO has been laid on enlargement. Frankly, this burden is a lot heavier than enlargement can bear' (quoted in Haslam 1998: 123). As is usually the case with NATO, the agenda on NATO's post-cold war purpose was driven by US concerns. Within the Clinton Administration, a number of influential figures wanted to use NATO as the key instrument for restructuring European order. They believed this would reinforce US leadership in Europe and stimulate the transformation of NATO into an instrument for US-led military crisis management in defence of 'common interests'.

The testing-ground for this new US conception for NATO was the Balkans. The US-brokered Dayton Accords established a clear military role for the Alliance as the organisational core of IFOR. With the perceived success of the IFOR/SFOR mission in Bosnia, American confidence in the ability of NATO to act as an instrument of crisis management grew. At the same time, many Europeans actively sought greater US

---

[10] As Marie-Janine Calic has argued, this IFOR/SFOR model of NATO has a number of advantages from a West European (particularly German) perspective. First, participation in the multinational stabilisation force has helped legitimise out-of-area deployments for the Bundeswehr, and thus been an important part of the 'normalisation' of post-unification German foreign policy. Second, 'this model has reconciled divergent, namely pro-American and pro-French, foreign political objectives. Through the deployment of US troops in Bosnia, it has, on the one hand, addressed Germany's strategic interest in a strong and visible American commitment to European security matters. It has, on the other hand, been conducive to strengthening the German-French core through the establishment of the German-French brigade in Bosnia. Generally, French agreement to participate in IFOR under US command has been interpreted as a big step forward for the new European security architecture'. Third, it has provided a practical manifestation of security cooperation with Russia, to which Germany in particular is committed. 'In summary, from the German point of view there are many reasons to believe that the IFOR/SFOR model is, for the time being, more efficient in serving simultaneously military and institutional interests than a pure EU-WEU model' (Calic 1998: 18).

engagement in the Balkans. In early 1998, for example, at a time of growing conflict between the UCK (the Kosovo Liberation Army) and the Serbian security forces, the German Foreign Ministry lobbied Washington to provide 'political leadership'. This reflected their growing frustration at the EU's continued failure to develop a coherent foreign and security policy towards the region (Pradetto 1999: 810). By the end of 1998 it was evident that Washington had decided to use NATO as an instrument for exercising US leadership in reshaping European security. One indication of this new resolve came in early March 1999, when NATO Secretary General Solana argued in *The Economist* magazine that a 'key role for NATO will be to establish long-term stability in the Balkans' (Solana 1999: 29). Shortly afterwards, NATO responded to Serbian brutality in Kosovo by launching 'Operation Deliberate Force', an intensive air campaign against the rump Yugoslav Federation.

Kosovo and the Dilemmas of Humanitarian Intervention

The Kosovo operation has been NATO's most ambitious effort to date to define a new role for itself, and constituted a watershed in the reshaping of post-cold war European security. After four decades of priding itself that it had achieved its goals through without ever firing a shot in anger, the 'most successful Alliance in history' embarked on a massive aerial bombardment of a sovereign state. For some, this presaged an ambitious attempt to redefine the basis of European order and the instruments with which it would be forged. The new basis of European order, it seemed, was to be human rights, as understood and practised in the West, not state sovereignty, as it had been since Westphalia (Habermas 1999). The vehicle for enforcing these human rights standards would be NATO, and its instrument would be military force. Consequently, as the political sociologist Ulrich Beck suggested, Kosovo represented a new defining moment in European history: the end of the Westphalian system and the birth of 'postnational war' based on a 'militaristic humanism'. Rather than war as a continuation of politics by other means, war was now to be a continuation of human rights by other means (Beck 1999).

'Operation Deliberate Force' - the sustained aerial assault on Yugoslav military and special police units, along with the civic infrastructure of the Yugoslav Federation that supported them – constituted a decisive watershed in post-cold war Europe. NATO's intervention took place without a UN Security Council mandate, and with an ambiguous status under international law (Preuß 1999; and Bring 1999). It was bitterly condemned by Russia, and precipitated the worse crisis in Russia's relations with the West since the end of the cold war. The questionable success of the operation, combined with the lack of political will to commit ground troops, places a question mark over the future of such operations. It certainly does not suggest that NATO has succeeded in defining a new role for itself. On the

contrary, Kosovo demonstrates that the Alliance continues to face a series of questions about its future rationale and purpose.

The Kosovo campaign generated a lively debate in Europe that revolved around three key questions. First: the lack of a UN mandate. This was clearly problematical from the start, and violated a widespread assumption that any NATO intervention would need 'an unequivocal mandate under international law'[11]. Even if there is a 'right' to humanitarian intervention, self-mandating by NATO sets a dangerous precedent internationally. German Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer subsequently stressed the 'exceptional' character of Kosovo, and argued that it did not set a precedent for NATO to abrogate to itself the role of 'world policeman'.

Second: the relationship of means to ends. If the end of this military intervention was to prevent genocide and ethnic cleansing, why was there such opposition in many NATO countries to committing ground troops? If the prevention of another Holocaust was the moral justification for this intervention, why were so few Europeans and Americans willing to risk casualties in order to achieve this end? How effective was bombing as a means of humanitarian intervention? Did bombing prevent a human catastrophe, or precipitate one? These questions remain unanswered and will hang over any future humanitarian crisis in or around Europe.

Third: was a more effective European Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) and a distinctive European Security and Defence Identity (ESDI) more or less necessary after Kosovo? US leadership was clearly crucial to the bombing campaign, but it also raised concerns in some quarters about America's 'arrogance of power'. Such concerns were fuelled by the US Senate's subsequent rejection of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) in October 1999, along with indications that the USA was becoming more and more frustrated by the slow and ponderous decision-making processes of multilateral bodies such as the UN, WTO and even NATO. This points to a future source of tension in transatlantic relations. On the one hand, many West Europeans have sought to cultivate a close transatlantic partnership with Washington, particularly the British, Germans and Dutch. On the other, these countries – particularly Germany which regards itself as a *Zivilmacht* ('civilian power') – are committed to multilateral cooperation and the rule of international law. Given its dominant international power position, the USA seems less and less willing to constrain itself by multilateral structures – be the UN, the CTBT or NATO. If in the future the US chooses to

---

[11] At the Wehrkunde conference in Munich on 6 February 1999, Chancellor Schröder made the German position clear: 'But the readiness to assume more responsibility also means that international, out-of-area military missions must be based on an unequivocal mandate under international law. As a rule, this would be a mandate from the UN Security Council or action under the aegis of the OSCE. A community defined by values, such as our transatlantic Alliance, cannot afford to be complacent on this issue. This principle may only be abandoned in exceptional cases: to prevent humanitarian catastrophes and grave violations of human rights, i.e., when immediate action is urgently called for on humanitarian grounds' (quoted in Assembly of the WEU 1999: 9).

by-pass multilateral institutions and treaties and calls on its allies to support it, West European countries like Germany may find themselves caught in a dilemma between acting as a 'loyal ally' for America, or working to strengthen international law and multilateral cooperation.

'Cooperative Security Governance' in Europe

In the context of the debate on NATO's future role, a strong body of opinion in Europe has emerged with a clear preference for NATO to develop its role in security governance. As has already been noted, there is a broad consensus across much of the political spectrum in many European NATO countries that the Alliance can best contribute to European order by functioning as an integral element of a cooperative European security system, rather than as an instrument of global military crisis-management. This reflects Europe's geostrategic interests, the broadly positive experience of multilateralism in the continent and a recognition of engaging Russia in a web of pan-European cooperation. Karsten Voigt (1997: 39) has argued that such a cooperative security system should be based upon interlocking and functionally diverse institutions, consisting of the OSCE, the EU, the Council of Europe and regional or sub-regional organisations. An important element of such a cooperative security system is the network of arms control agreements and confidence-and security-building measures (CSBMs) agreed in the late 1980s and early 1990s, together with their intrusive verification regimes (Croft 1996: 129-31). Within this cooperative security system, NATO's role is to provide the hub of an emerging network of what can best be called 'security governance'.

The concept of security governance draws from the 'new institutionalism', regime theory and ideas concerning security communities. Regimes themselves constitute the 'building-blocks of international governance' (Rittberger 1993: 9). 'Security governance' thus refers to the broader corpus of regimes and informal governing arrangements within a regional security complex. These security arrangements generate 'patterned behaviour' based on implicit rules and understandings. They are governed by a distinct set of norms, in the sense of 'collective expectations about proper behaviour for a given identity' (Jepperson, Wendt and Katzenstein 1996: 54). The notion of security governance thus refers to patterns of behaviour that are not simply a function of the balance of military forces or the 'hard' security guarantees of military alliances. Cooperative security governance is based on negotiation and policy co-ordination in a non-hierarchical environment, and consensual decision-making without coercive means of compliance (Rosenau 1997: 146). Such security governance can help reinforce cooperative patterns of behaviour and shared understandings, thereby generating the degree of trust and social capital upon which a stable peace order depends (Adler and Barnett 1998).

NATO contributes to cooperative security governance in Europe through fostering functional military and security cooperation, primarily in the framework of PfP, the EAPC (Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council), the Russia-NATO PJC (Permanent Joint Council) and the NATO-Ukrainian Charter.[12] This functional military and security cooperation derives from, and helps generate and reinforce, shared values and common interests. It also extends beyond the existing nineteen members of NATO to include both EU 'neutrals' and the new democracies of Central and East Europe. This was exemplified by the IFOR deployment in Bosnia, where a Nordic Brigade was created comprising NATO Danish and Norwegian troops, non-NATO Swedish, Finnish and Polish forces, and contingents from the Baltic States. This Nordic Brigade operated along-side Russian troops, 'all under US command and Alliance auspices' (Asmus and Nurick 1996: 136). This form of functional military cooperation reflects a widely shared view in Europe that the 'most important task facing the transatlantic alliance after the Madrid Summit [is] to ensure that the barriers between NATO membership and non-membership become increasingly blurred' (Francke 1997: 19).

The nature of the new system of security governance emerging in post-cold war Europe can be illustrated by reference to the Baltic Sea region (Scharioth 1997: 34). The restructuring and 'Europeanisation' of NATO around the concept of Combined Joint Task Forces (CJTF) is strengthening the regional dimension of the Alliance (Lepgold 1998: 100-02). This is evident in the Baltic Sea region, where regionally based PfP exercises involving Partner countries are being organised by the regional CJTF (Heurlin 1997: 6, 10). One interesting development is the suggestion that Sweden – as a non-NATO member and EU 'neutral' – could play a role in organising regional PfP exercises involving, inter alia, the Baltic States and Russia. This would address strengthen NATO's security cooperation with the Baltic States without isolating Russia and fuelling further mistrust in Moscow.

If PfP and the EAPC were to be developed along such lines, NATO could be used to facilitate new forms of security cooperation and dialogue within a broader system of security governance involving other multilateral structures. These include the OSCE, the Council of Europe and the EU, along with regional organisations such as Council of Baltic Sea States (CBSS), the Central European Free Trade Association (CEFFTA) or Black Sea Economic Cooperation (BSEC). The OSCE and the Council of Europe provide an important set of political and legal instruments for addressing the problems of democratic transition and minority rights throughout Central and Eastern Europe (Maeder-Metcalf 1997: 5). The EU,

---

[12] In his comments to the Hanns Seidel Stiftung in Munich on 4 November 1997, NATO Secretary-General Solana argued that the Alliance 'has assumed the role of catalyst for increased cooperation and integration in Europe. Through the Alliance's cooperative approach, almost all countries in the Euro-Atlantic area are now bound together in a common commitment to a more peaceful, stable future'. In this regard he stressed the importance of the Partnership for Peace programme, which has 'created a pattern of interaction, cooperation and joint activity among the military and defence structures of Allies and 27 Partner countries in Europe (*Atlantic News* 31: 2963, 7 November 1997).

for its part, facilitates trade and deepening economic relations and provides a powerful stimulus for a comprehensive reform process. Finally, regional organisations such as the CBSS encourage functional cooperation on issues such as environmental protection, trade, policy harmonisation and transnational crime. Such functional diversity within an interlocking arrangement of multilateral organisations could provide the foundation for a new system of cooperative security governance in Europe.

The development of such a system of cooperative security governance is feasible in the Baltic Sea region given its regional and historical identity (often associated with the concept of a 'new Hansa'); the influence of the Nordic countries; and the success in managing regional ethno-national tensions. Similar forms of cooperative security governance have also emerged in Central and Eastern Europe – embracing the Visegrad countries and Slovenia; and extending into Bulgaria and Romania in the South-East, and Ukraine in the East. In some respects, the first round of NATO enlargement has reinforced cooperative security governance in Central and Eastern Europe, in particular, because of Poland's key role as a bridge between the Alliance and its strategic partners, Lithuania and Ukraine (Feldman and Gareis 1998; Tedstrom 1997: 18). Russia's relationship to these nascent forms of security governance is more ambiguous, particularly after Kosovo. Despite a wave of anti-Western sentiment, Russia has not excluded itself from these developing forms of security governance – most notably in the Baltic Sea region, the one point at which Russia is in direct geographical contact with the 'West' (more specifically, the EU).

Despite its obvious preference for security governance, however, tough questions remain which NATO members need to confront more directly. What happens when security governance breaks down? How should the Alliance and its partners deal with areas (such as the Balkans or the Caucasus) where intractable conflicts make the emergence of security governance highly problematic? How should the West respond to ethnic cleansing, atrocities and widespread violations of human rights? Is there now a right to humanitarian intervention, superseding the Westphalian principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of sovereign states (Brock 1999)? If so, who has the right to act, and under what authority? Should humanitarian intervention only take place with a UN Security Council mandate, or does NATO have the right to mandate itself to intervene? The fact that these questions are now at the heart of the European security agenda illustrates the extent to which the pillars of the Westphalian system (based on the principle of state sovereignty) have disintegrated, and suggests that a new 'neo-medieval' system of order based on human rights and ethical concerns may be beginning to evolve.

NATO's New Security Concept

Questions of humanitarian intervention and military crisis-management were central to the debates surrounding the historic fiftieth anniversary summit of NATO in Washington in April 1999. This was initially billed as the occasion for a triumphant anniversary celebrations, at which its three new members would be formally welcomed welcomed into the fold. In the event, however, the mood in Washington was decidedly sombre. The summit took place at a moment when NATO was engaged in major military operations against a sovereign state, and any anniversary celebrations were overshadowed by unfolding tragedy in Kosovo.

The most important outcome of the Washington summit was the long-awaited 'New Strategic Concept', which was to provide a clear definition of NATO's post-cold war mission. The debate on the new Strategic Concept had revolved around three key issues. First: the core functions of the Alliance. There was a broad consensus that collective defence, transatlantic partnership and reinforcing security should remain core tasks. However, Washington favoured giving military crisis management, if not an equal weight with collective defence, then at least a prominent place in the ranking of NATO's core tasks. Indeed, some influential US security analysts advocated giving NATO a key role in tackling threats to global energy sources, proliferation and terrorism (Dembinski 1999: 789). Linked to the question of its core tasks was the second question, the geographical reach of the Alliance. Should NATO be an instrument for world-wide crisis management, or confine itself to crises in and around Europe? Madeline Albright advocated the transformation of NATO into a 'force for peace from the Middle East to Central Africa'. On the other hand, the majority of Europeans – including the Germans – favoured a more limited and regionally-focused role for the Alliance (Kamp 1998). Third, the problem of mandating non-Article V operations: could NATO mandate itself, or could the legitimacy of such operations only be provided by a UN Security Council resolution. Whilst the US resisted any restrictions on the Alliance's freedom of action, Germany, France and most European democracies argued that an international mandate was essential for non-Article V operations (Pradetto 1999: 806; Assembly of the WEU 1999: 5).

In the end, the New Strategic Concept agreed at the Washington summit was a classic compromise document which sought to shroud underlying policy differences in ambiguous diplomatic formulae. The Alliance's 'fundamental security tasks' were defined as follows: first, providing 'one of the indispensable foundations for a stable Euro-Atlantic security environment' based on democratic institutions and the peaceful resolution of disputes. Second: transatlantic 'consultation' on their 'vital interests'. Third: 'deterrence and defence'. In addition, NATO was to 'enhance the security and stability of the Euro-Atlantic area' through 'crisis-management' and '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' (i.e., what has been termed above, *cooperative security governance*). The precise geographical borders of the 'Euro-Atlantic area' were, however, not defined. It was also noted that the security interests of members could be adversely affected by developments in distant regions. The document skirted around the thorny question of the mandate, arguing that crisis response activity must be 'consistent with international law', without explicitly mentioning the need for a UN mandate. In conclusion, whilst the new Strategic Concept sought to provide some broad definitions of 'NATO's enduring purpose and nature and its fundamental security tasks', in practice the Alliance's future role in European order will be determined by the lessons Alliance members draw from the Kosovo war.

Thus despite the advent of the long-awaited New Strategic Concept, the debate on NATO's post-cold war role and purpose will remain. The Kosovo operation posed as many questions as it settled, and has therefore not given a precedent for future Alliance policy. The main lesson of 'Operation Deliberate Force' has been the enormous problems and dilemmas associated with humanitarian intervention. Rather than heralding the advent of a new system of European order based on the categorical imperative of human rights, Kosovo indicates that the Europeans have entered uncharted territory. European order is no longer solidly based on Westphalian principles of territorial sovereignty, but neither is it clear who has the authority to respond to gross violations of human rights, and how. As German Defence Minister Rudolf Scharping has written (1999: 222-23), a 'new balance between two principles of international law needs to be worked out namely state sovereignty and the universal validity of human rights. The conflict over Kosovo, the intervention against genocide and major crimes against humanity, is hopefully the start of such an international learning process'. Given the problems NATO faced in trying to achieve its objectives by bombing, and the fact that it now finds itself committed to a long-term presence in the Balkans, Alliance members are likely to be much more cautious before embarking on similar forms of humanitarian intervention. At best, 'coalitions of the willing' involving selected groups of NATO members may be formed to deal with specific security problems.

There are also some indications that one consequence of Kosovo will be intensified efforts to develop a more effective and coherent European Security and Defence Identity (ESDI). The British, French and German governments has certainly signalled a strong interest in developing an EU capacity to conduct a robust Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP), including a military option. This will probably involve using NATO assets under a WEU 'hat' on the basis of the CJTF concept, although what this means in practice is still not clear. The Europeans new-found interest in reinvigorating the CFSP was evident at the Cologne EU Summit in June 1999, which outlined a strategy for absorbing the WEU into the EU in order to give the latter the capability to conduct 'Petersberg tasks' (i.e., conflict

prevention and peace support operations). As we shall see in the following section, this opens the way for the EU to play a potentially more active foreign policy role in the reshaping of European order in the twenty-first century.

PART FIVE

THE EU AND BALTIC SEA SECURITY

Despite dire predictions to the contrary, the NATO Alliance has responded successfully to the challenges to the post-cold war world, and succeeded in maintaining its dominant place in Europe's security architecture. Nonetheless, the more diffuse and multi-faceted nature of the contemporary European security agenda means that NATO is unable to tackle all aspects of Europe's security risks and challenges. Nor can it contribute alone to the task of extending the transatlantic zone of stable peace into Central and Eastern Europe, including the Baltic Sea region. For these reasons, NATO's security governance must be developed in cooperation with other institutions in Europe. First and foremost amongst these is the European Union, which – especially since enlargement to include, inter alia, Sweden and Finland in 1995 – has come to exercise a strong and growing presence in the Baltic Sea region. In this section, therefore, we shall briefly consider the security role played by the EU in the Baltic area.

The EU and European Order

In a speech given in Brussels at the Palais des Académies in September 1993, the then Swedish Prime Minister Carl Bildt argued that there had been four main sources of conflict in Europe since the Napoleonic wars: French-German relations; Poland's relations with its neighbours; Russia's place in the European states system; and security in the Balkans. The first two, he argued, no longer threatened European security, whilst the last two remained major sources of concern. The key to the solution of all these conflicts was the European Union. It was the 'motor and heart of the new efforts to guarantee security and stability in Europe' (quoted in Agrell 1994: 46).

The EU's importance stems from role it has played in facilitating the emergence of a 'zone of stable peace' in post-war Western Europe (Singer and Wildavsky 1996). The EU is not the only factor leading to the emergence of this zone of stable peace, which has been 'over-determined' by a series of related but distinct processes[13]. Nonetheless, it is its most

---

[13] For example, a Nordic zone of stable peace or security community has emerged in the absence of the EU, or of an integration project comparable in scope and ambition to that of the original ECSC/EEC (Archer 1996). For an analysis of the forces that have transformed post-war Western Europe and facilitated the emergence of a security community, see Hyde-Price (1997). As Dieter Senghaas has noted, much more research is needed on the processes and casual mechanisms leading to the emergence of zones of stable peace (Senghaas 1997: 9-13).

significant institutional expression, and helps ensure its continued stability and cohesion. It does this by helping to reduce the 'friction' generated by the interaction of sovereign states in international society. It also provides a means of balancing institutionalised cooperation and multilateral integration with continuing national diversity and the heterogeneity of political communities in Europe. In other words, it facilitates a balance between European unity and diversity - which (in Deutschian terms) is the defining feature of a <u>pluralistic</u>, rather than <u>amalgamated</u> security community (Deutsch 1957).

The EU has helped foster a more peaceful and stable peace order in post-war Western Europe in five main ways. First, it provided an institutional framework for post-war reconciliation - especially, although not exclusively, between France and Germany. The Schuman Plan (signed into life on April 18 1951) was partially conceived as a de facto Franco-BRD peace treaty, whilst the ECSC itself was seen as a 'peace project' (Judt 1996: 17). In this way, the EU integration process has contributed to the solution of the 'German question', the cause of three major wars in Europe.

Second, multilateral integration has helped change EU member states' perception of their interests and preferences. By providing fora and mechanisms for exchanges of information, multilateral institutions such as the EU can help states identify common interests and thereby facilitate international cooperation. Robust multilateral institutions such as the EU 'constrain opportunistic behaviour, and they provide focal points for coordination. They make a difference not by imposing order "above the nation-state" but by creating valued networks of ties between states. Among potential adversaries they may alleviate the security dilemma. In short, institutions provide a common reference for leaders trying to struggle with turmoil and uncertainty' (Keohane 1993: 3).

Third, the EU has helped change the process of collective identity formulation in Western Europe (a process theoretically analysed by Wendt 1994). This is particularly marked in countries located in the cultural and geographical terrain once occupied by the Carolingian Empire, where the EU has helped foster a sense of common purpose and identity (a 'we-feeling', in Deutschian terms). The EU has helped tame nationalism, and has created a situation in which 'there is nothing especially controversial today about being "European"' (Judt 1996: 76). Indeed,

In western Europe..., except in the most extreme nationalist circles of France, Austria, and among subsections of the British political class, there is nothing especially controversial today about being "European" -- it carries no suggestion of the lack of properly "national" sentiment. To be "European" does not entail casting aspersions upon your fellow citizens, nor does it imply keeping one's distance from them. This

is a real and significant achievement for the European Union, and one worth emphasizing (Judt 1996: 76).

Fourth, in the 1980s, the EU helped the process of democratisation in southern Europe, thereby helping to lay the foundations for building a stable peace in southern Europe (although these foundations are somewhat weak in the case of Greece and Turkey).

Finally, the EU exercises a 'presence' in the international system as a 'civilian power': it is widely seen as embodying a community of stable and prosperous democracies, cooperating peacefully together in multilateral institutions. It therefore provides an important role model and pole of attraction for many in Central and Eastern Europe.

The European Union and the Baltic Sea Region

With the enlargement of the EU in 1995 to include two Scandinavian countries, Sweden and Finland (along with their fellow former-EFTA member Austria), the centre of gravity of the Union has shifted perceptibly northwards. The Baltic is now effectively an 'EU lake'. To its east and north, it is surrounded by EU member states (Germany, Denmark, Sweden, Finland). Poland and Estonia, along the southern coast of the Baltic will be 'first-wave' new members. Lithuania and Latvia have Europa Agreements, and hope for future membership. And Russia has signed a Partnership and Cooperation Agreement (PCA) which came into force on 1 December 1997. Since 1995, therefore, the Baltic has become an area of significant interest for the EU.

The EU's growing role in the Baltic has been reflected in a number of ways. First, the EU Commission, at the request of the European Council, has launched a 'Baltic Sea Region Initiative'. This provides funding to the tune of ECU 935m until 1999, primarily drawn from TACIS and PHARE programmes. Its aim is to strengthen cooperation among all the countries in the region, in order to try to overcome the imbalances between states of the Baltic Sea. EU money is being used to facilitate the development of a regional infrastructure, and to help consolidate the processes of democratisation and marketisation. The EU has come to realise the importance of regional integration and cooperation, and since 1997, this has been reflected in the priorities of the PHARE programme. Finances have been increasing directed towards projects that will strengthen regional cooperation in energy, environmental protection, transportation and cross-border relations (Ozolina 1998: 136).

Second, the Northern Dimension initiative seeks to build on the success of the 'Baltic Sea Region Initiative'. The Northern Dimension initiative has been developed by Finland, which assumes the EU Presidency in the second half of 1999. The EU Commission issued a report in November 1998, which was subsequently endorsed by the European Council in

Vienna in December. The Northern Dimension has been developed in recognition of the fact that with the accession of Sweden and Finland, the EU has assumed a major political and economic role in the Baltic region. In particular, the EU now has a 1,324km border with Russia. The Northern Dimension has two primary aims: first, to emphasise the potential benefits arising from the interdependence between Russia, the Baltic region and the EU; and second, to help integrate Russia into European and global structures through increased cooperation. The function of the Northern Dimension is to better coordinate and interlink existing programmes and frameworks. Rather than establishing new institutions or seeking to raise new EU funds, it will use PHARE and TACIS, the PCA with Russia, and Europe Agreements with Poland and the Baltic three[14]. In this way, Finland hopes to develop the Northern Dimension as the regional equivalent to the EU's Mediterranean programme (Jopp and Lippert 1998, 13).

Third, the EU has been actively involved in the process of regional cooperation in the Baltic. Representatives of the EU Commission regularly participate in meetings of the CBSS. For example, at the CBSS Meeting of Heads of Government in Visby on 3-4 May 1996, both the President of the European Council and the President of the European Commission attended. Similarly, at the Meeting of Foreign Ministers in Riga on 2-3 July 1997, the European Commission was represented by the Minister for Environment of Luxembourg. From the perspective of the EU Commission and Member States, the CBSS is important because it helps ensure that cooperation does not stop at EU borders. Regional cooperation thus provides a key instrument for linking the European integration process to wider forms of pan-European cooperation.

The growing importance of the EU for the Baltic region has been regularly underlined in CBSS declarations and statements. For example, the Visby Presidency Declaration stressed 'the importance for European stability of ever closer links between the Baltic Sea Region and the European Union'. The first two items on the Visby Summit's 'Agenda for Action' were 'support for Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and Poland in their preparation for membership of the European Union', and 'support for the early ratification of the Partnership and Cooperation Agreement between the Russian Federation and the European Union' (CBSS 1996, 1-2). An explicit link between regional cooperation in the Baltic and the process of European integration was made in the communiqué of the Riga Summit. This emphasised that 'the ongoing process of EU enlargement, which includes the Baltic states and Poland, will further contribute to the consolidation of security and stability in the Baltic Sea region

---

[14] For details see the interviews with Hans van den Broek and Günter Verheugen in *Baltinfo*, nr. 18 (March 1999).

and will provide possibilities for even closer cooperation in the framework of the Council of Baltic Sea States' (CBSS 1997, 3).

The European Union, the Baltic States, and Central and Eastern Europe

Along with its role as a bulwark of stable peace in Western Europe, the EU exerts a significant degree of political influence (or 'soft governance') on its neighbours in Central and Eastern Europe, including the three Baltic States. The EU is able to exercise this soft governance primarily because of the desire of the new democracies to join the Union. The EU's influence on the three Baltic States is manifested in a number of ways. First, the EU embodies the 'idea' of Europe for many in the new democracies, and is the focus of their 'return' to Europe. Second, it has generated a 'new national myth' in many of the new democracies, which is altering the process of identity formation. 'It is the myth of belonging to European culture, the myth of return to real or imaginary European roots, the myth of normal development brutally interrupted by the Bolshevik experiment or the Russian aggression or both' (Zaslavsky 1992: 110). Third, the 'conditionality' of EU aid has helped reinforce the democratisation process and respect for human rights (Pinder 1991: 30-31) [15]. Fourth, the EU has become the major trading partner for the new democracies of East Central Europe. Despite continuing problems with EU restrictions on CEE exports of agricultural products, steel and textiles, market access is an important precondition for security and stability in the region, and will aid the transition process (Mayhew 1998). Finally, the EU-sponsored 'Pact for Stability' in 1994 has helped diffuse some of the minority and border disputes that bedevil the post-communist east. It included a Baltic Round Table, designed above all to facilitate discussions and negotiations between Russia and the three Baltic States. Whilst it did not solve all the problems in the region, it did help reduce some of the tensions surrounding the border and citizenship questions (Ehrhart 1996).

EU eastern enlargement will have a number of benefits for security and cooperation in Europe. To begin with, EU enlargement will strengthen the foundations of European order and facilitate the development of a stable peace in the wider Europe. As European Commissioner Hans van den Broek has argued, 'Enlargement to the East is in the very first place a political issue relating to security and stability on our continent' (*Guardian*, 5 November 1994). Second, integrating the new democracies of CEE into the EU will reinforce the 'new nationalist myth' in the region, and help diffuse 'European values' (such as respect

---

[15] The Copenhagen European Council in June 1993 stipulated the following conditions for EU membership: 'Membership requires that the candidate country has achieved stability of institutions guaranteeing democracy, the rule of law, human rights and respect for and protection of minorities, the existence of a functioning market economy as well as the capacity to cope with competitive pressures and market forces within the Union. Membership presupposes the candidate's ability to take on the obligations of membership, including adherence to the aim of political, economic, and monetary union' (for further analysis see Rose and Haerpfer 1995 and Pridham, Herring and Sandford 1994).

for human rights and the peaceful settlement of disputes) throughout the wider Europe. It will also help the consolidation of democratic government in the region (as it did in southern Europe) and stimulate further economic development. Last but not least, it will provide a multilateral context for German economic power and political influence in *Mitteleuropa* and the Baltic region, reassuring Germany's neighbours in both East and West.

Whatever the overall advantages of EU eastern enlargement for the stability and security of the Baltic Sea region and the post-communist east more generally, there are also some potential problems that need to be addressed. One of the reason is the implications of Schengen border controls for existing cooperation in Central and Eastern Europe. This is particularly pertinent for the Baltic Sea region because of Kaliningrad, which depends on cross-border 'shuttle trade' to keep its fragile economy afloat. Schengen border controls will also affect Poland's strategic partnership with Lithuania and the Ukraine. EU Enlargement thus threatens to create new divisions within Central and Eastern Europe, between new and potential members, and those outside the EU. The Schengen agreement and EU trading regulations will undoubtedly affect relations between 'ins', 'pre-ins' and 'outs', as aspirant members prepare for accession by applying Schengen border controls and EU trading regulations. This may become a particularly source of aggrevation for Russia's relations with the EU. From this perspective, therefore, Russia has perhaps been too concerned with NATO enlargement, and has not given sufficient attention to the implications of EU enlargement.[16]

Given the danger that EU enlargement will create new lines of division and exclusion in Central and Eastern Europe, the Union needs to develop a dual-track strategy. On the one hand, member states need to overcome the resistance of narrow sectional interests and short-term national thinking in order to push forward with the enlargement process. Only in this way can the EU fulfil its historic post-cold war mission. On the other hand, the EU must forge new forms of multilateral cooperation with countries in the wider pan-Europe excluded from the integration process - particularly Russia and the Ukraine. It is in this context that the Northern Dimension initiative is so important (Jopp and Arnswald 1998). The Northern Dimension will have important and potentially far-reaching implications for the integration of Russia into wider European and global structures.

Towards a Common European Security and Defence Policy
One of the most important developments in European integration in the late 1990s has been the strengthening of the CFSP and the development of a European Security and Defence

---

[16] Olga Alexandrova has spoken of the 'Euro-ignorance' in Russia concerning the EU and the nature of the European integration process. 'It seems', she argues, 'that Russian leaders still have not comprehended the essence of EU enlargement and its impact on the whole security architecture in Europe'. She also warns that 'as the security dimensions of EU membership for the Baltic states become clear, Russia may in turn become less benign in regard to the EU membership of the Baltics' (Alexandrova 1998: 94).

Policy. In the course of 1999, Europe made more progress in forging a robust European defence capability than at any time since the failure of the European Defence Community (EDC) in 1954. The catalyst for this change has been the Kosovo war, which marks a defining moment in the brief history of post-cold war European security.

The political conditions for a qualitative leap forward in forging a credible European Security and Defence Identity (ESDI) were a convergence in the security policies of France and the UK around that of Germany. Germany has long argued that there is no inherent contradiction between NATO and an autonomous European defence capability. Both France and the UK, however, argued that there was – from opposite positions. However, from the mid-l990s onwards France has been inching closer to NATO and now accepts that an ESDI can be constructed *within* the Atlantic Alliance. In the case of the UK, the Blair Government now recognises that a credible CFSP with a defence component will not undermine NATO. The symbolic landmark here was the Franco-British St Malo Summit of 3-4 December 1998 (Mathiopoulos and Gyarmati 1999). With positive signals emanating from Washington, Germany used the opportunity of its combined Presidency of the EU and the WEU in the first half of 1999 to drive forward the process of closer European defence and security cooperation.

The EU Cologne Summit (3-4 June 1999) was the occasion for some landmark decisions on CFSP. First, former NATO Secretary-General Javier Solana was appointed as the EU's High Representative for Foreign Policy ('Herr GASP'). A German proposal that he also be appointed as the new Secretary-General of WEU was approved at the same time. Unfortunately, the division of responsibilities between him and the EU Commissioner for External Affairs, Chris Patton, was not completely clarified.[17] The Cologne Summit also approved a German Presidency 'Report on the Strengthening of Common Defence and Security Policy', which proposed giving the EU credible means for taking autonomous action in response to international crises. Cologne built on earlier decisions taken at the Bremen WEU Summit in May 1999, when it was agreed that WEU would be incorporated into the EU Treaty structure, probably by the end of 2000.

The Helsinki EU Summit (10-11 December 1999) witnessed further important decisions on CFSP. Most importantly, EU leaders agreed to create a European rapid reaction corps of fifteen brigades (50-60,000), with attached naval and air assets, capable of being deployed within sixty days. The aim was to give the EU an 'autonomous capacity to take decisions where NATO as a whole is not engaged', in order to conduct 'EU-led military operations' within the framework of the Petersberg Declaration (Van Ham 2000). In addition, discussions are underway about possible EU 'convergence criterion' for defence spending and

---

[17] See Friedbert Pflüger, 'Es Bleiben Zwei Nummern', *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 18 October 1999, and 'Nur Ein Missverständnis', *Der Spiegel*, nr.39, 27 September 1999, p.220.

interoperability. These political and institutional developments have been underpinned by a series of mergers in the European defence industry, which are laying the industrial and technological foundations for a European Security and Defence Identity.[18]

The convergence of French and British security policy around that of Germany seems to vindicate the latter's policy of *sowohl als auch* – i.e., their refusal to choose between the transatlantic alliance and the aspiration for a robust ESDI. More importantly, it seems to presage the emergence of a 'New EU'. The 'old' EU (the 'EEC model'), was a civilian power which exercised 'soft governance' in CEE and a 'presence' in the wider international system. The 'New EU', it appears, will not only have substantial economic, financial and political power resources at its disposal (strengthened by a single currency), it will also have an autonomous capability to project deliberative military power. We are, it seems, on the verge of a 'brave new world'.

However, EU member states have a long way to go before they translate the Cologne and Helsinki decisions into practical military and security cooperation. In the words of T.S.Eliot, 'Between the idea and the reality, Between the motion and the Act, Falls the Shadow'. The practical difficulties involved in creating an effective rapid reaction corps are enormous, and will demand a tremendous expenditure of time, resources and political will. There are also a host of institutional and architectural questions that will need to be addressed, and which have been exacerbated by the de-coupling of NATO and EU enlargement. The 1995 NATO *Study on Enlargement* maintained that the 'enlargement of NATO is a parallel process with and will complement that of the European Union'. It also stressed that an 'eventual broad congruence of European membership in NATO, EU and WEU would have positive effects on European security'. Yet it also recognised that EU and NATO enlargement 'will proceed autonomously according to their respective internal dynamics and processes' which means that 'they are unlikely to proceed at precisely the same pace'.

The 1995 enlargement of the EU to include Austria, Sweden and Finland brought into the Union three more non-NATO 'neutral' countries (in addition to Ireland). On the other hand, the first round of NATO enlargement to the East has given the Alliance three more non-EU European countries (in addition to Norway and Turkey). The problem of divergent memberships between the EU and NATO will be further exacerbated if the dual enlargement process remains de-coupled. This will complicate the development of a coherent CFSP. 'Policy-making in the EU', it has been pointed out, 'cannot proceed smoothly if there is a parallel process in NATO in which several EU members are not taking part…. It remains

---

[18] The prime example is the merger of Germany's Daimler-Chrysler Aerospace AG (DASA) and France's Aerospatiale Matra SA to create a new defence industrial giant 'European Aeronautic, Defense and Space Company' (EADS). See *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 15 October 1999, p.1. On the implications of procurement policy and the defence industries for EU policy-making see Ulrika Mörth (1998).

difficult to see how the European Union's Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) and that of NATO can be reconciled if their membership becomes increasingly different'. Thus, a 'growing gap in European membership of NATO and EU/WEU would have a corrosive effect on the effectiveness of all the institutions' (Rühle and Williams 1995: 85). This problem is particularly acute in the Baltic region, where the creation of an 'extended non-aligned zone' would curtail ambitions to create a common EU foreign, security and defence policy. Indeed,

> The latter would require reducing the gap between allied and non-allied EU member states instead of widening it. Even if the development of a full-fledged common defence policy is, anyway, one of the most difficult undertakings of integration, it is questionable whether a true CFSP can materialise with a growing number of member states with a security status different from the rest of the Union (Jopp and Lippert 1998: 16-17).

The issue of divergent membership touches upon another question which remains at the heart of debates on the future of European security, including that of the Baltic – the place of the USA in Europe. The Clinton Administration has been broadly supportive of European aspirations to develop a defence capability, but remains somewhat schizophrenic on the issue.[19] The US is concerned about an 'EU caucus' within NATO and about what is termed 'sequencing', i.e., the sequence in which NATO and the EU address security issues: does the EU have first say, or NATO? Beyond a shared desire to avoid a damaging transatlantic row, little is clear in the debate on the practical implications of an autonomous European defence and security identity for transatlantic relations. Discussions around the strengthening of the CFSP do, however, suggest a growing need to find a new balance between an enlarged EU with a single currency and an emerging defence capability, and the world's last remaining superpower. One crucial task facing NATO members is thus to define a transatlantic partnership appropriate to the changing realities of the twenty-first century.

---

[19] NATO's new Secretary-General Lord Robertson has commented that there 'has always been a bit of schizophrenia about America, on the one hand saying "You Europeans have got to carry more of the burden"" and then when the Europeans say "OK, we'll carry more of the burden", they say "Well wait a minute, are you trying to tell us to go home?"". *Financial Times*, 15 September 1999.

CONCLUSION

BUILDING A STABLE PEACE ORDER IN EUROPE

Cooperative Security, Russia and the Euro-Atlantic Community

Since the end of the cold war, a cooperative security system has emerged in pan-Europe. This involves an informal 'concert' of the great powers (Zelikow 1992), and has found its institutional expression in the OSCE and the Contact Group. Central to the success of this cooperative security system has been the inclusion of a democratising Russia. The dilemma facing the future of the European security system – which is acutely felt in the Baltic Sea region – is that there is a tension between consolidating the cooperative security relationship, and enlargement of the transatlantic security community. Both enlargements will create new divisions in Europe, between those included in the integration process and those excluded. However, NATO enlargement in particular has been perceived as a threat to Russia's interests, and threatens to undermine the post-cold war cooperative security system.

What the dual enlargement process has exposed is one the most important and pressing issues facing the future of European security – the future place of Russia in Europe. Finding a mutually acceptable answer to this question is crucial to the successful creation of a stable peace order in Europe. Unfortunately, 'Russia's proper place is a critical issue that the governments of the West, led by Germany and the United States, but including Britain, have failed to address' (Haslam 1998: 129). A number of structures have been established to institutionalise dialogue with Russia, notably the Permanent Joint Council, but there is no clear consensus on the substance of Russia's relations with its European neighbours. How much effective influence should Russia have on decisions taken within the Euro-Atlantic community? What are Russia's legitimate national interests? These questions remain unanswered. Part of the problem lies in Moscow. Many in the Russian foreign policy community remain wedded to outmoded geopolitical and great power ways of thinking which are not appropriate for contemporary Europe. Nonetheless, the West still lacks a clear vision of how to include Russia in pan-European networks of cooperation and integration, as the antinomies of the dual enlargement process have highlighted.

The problem facing the West is even more acute following the Kosovo tragedy. NATO enlargement generated Russian suspicions about the West that the bombing of Kosovo seemed to confirm. As the Russian author Viktor Kriwulin has written, the 180 degree turn-around mid-way over the Atlantic of the plane carrying Russian Premier Primakov to the USA on March 24 1999 is 'as symbolic an act as the shot in July 1914', symbolising the start of a new 'cold war' (Kriwulin 1999: 43). Other commentators have suggested that the Kosovo bombing has provided the catalyst for the emergence of a new Russian 'national idea', for which the post-Soviet and post-communist Russia elite has been searching since the early

1990s. Russia's new identity is built around anti-Americanism and what is perceived to be a distinctive Russian-Slavic-orthodox set of values (Holm 1999: 12).

In the wake of Kosovo, re-building trust and cooperation with Russia will be even more difficult. However, it remains essential for the long-term security and stability of Europe. Russia is economically, diplomatically and militarily weak at the moment, but it still has the capability to disrupt Western attempts to achieve its foreign and security objectives. A new, post-Kosovo relationship with Russia will need to built around pragmatic economic relations, intensive political and diplomatic dialogue and – where possible – functional military cooperation. The agreement reached in Vienna in April 1999 concerning revisions to the Conventional Forces in Europe Treaty (CFE) indicates that security cooperation with Russia remains possible (Busse 1999:12). However, building a more cooperative relationship with Russia will necessitate a more concerted effort by Western powers to engage Russia in a comprehensive network of political, economic and security relations.

It is in this context that the EU's Northern Dimension assumes such central importance. The Baltic Sea region provides the best context for building cooperation and trust with Russia in the economic, political and societal spheres. There have been promising developments in Russian policy towards the region which offer grounds for cautious optimism. President Yeltsin's unilateral disarmament initiative launched in Stockholm in December 1997 was preceded by indications of a policy rethink in Moscow towards the region. In late October 1997, the Council on Foreign and Defence Policy in Moscow issued a report that advocated a more constructive approach towards the Baltic region. It claimed that Russia no longer viewed the Baltic three as 'post-Soviet' states, and sought a normalisation of economic, political and cultural relations. Similar indications emerged from seminars at the Carnegie Moscow Centre.

Evidence of this new approach was provided by Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin's visit to Lithuania in September 1997, and the signing of a border treaty the following month. Then in January 1998, Chernomyrdin attended the CBSS meeting in Riga, emphasising Russia's interest in developing regional cooperation. At the same time, Russian pressure on Estonia and Latvia has been quietly eased. This reflects an underlying shift in Russian foreign policy from geopolitics to geoeconomics (Allison 1998). Russia has strong economic interests in the Baltic States, and Russian transit trade through Baltic ports has been steadily growing (Fedorov 1998: 87). Russian banks are central players in Baltic financial markets, and have developed significant investment porfolios in the region. By creating a network of joint ventures in the region, it is hoped that they will later have direct access to EU markets. There is also a high degree of interdependency in the natural gas and electric power sectors, given the existence of a common power grid. Finally, cross-border trade (not all of it legal!) is assuming a growing economic importance.

Not surprisingly, therefore, the Baltic States future accession to the EU is viewed positively in Moscow (Alexandrova 1998: 92). Russia hopes that the Baltic three will provide a gateway between Russia and the EU. The Russophone minority in Estonia and Latvia will also become the first 'Euro-Russians' in the EU, able to make their own contribution to Russian-EU relations (Jopp and Warjovaara 1998: 19). The Northern Dimension promises to deepen relations between Russia and the EU, thereby facilitating cooperation and security in the Baltic Sea region. If such cooperation is to develop, it is important that the EU Commission, the Nordic states and the US use their influence with the Baltic three to make them realise the need to reach mutually acceptable compromises with Russia. All too often, the Baltic States have sought to talk up the 'Russian threat' in order to reap political dividends (Baev 1998: 79). In this respect, it is depressing that the dominant reaction in the Baltic three to the Kosovo tragedy has been whether or not it harms the Baltic cooperation, and whether this will make their entry into NATO more or less possible.[20]

Concluding Observations – Building a Stable Peace in the Baltic Sea Region

While the enlargement of NATO has, and the European Union will, facilitate the emergence of new forms of cooperation and integration in the Baltic Sea region, it is important to note that building a stable regional peace order involves more than formal institutional enlargement. The key to building a durable peace order in the Baltic lies in a deeper process of societal convergence and integration, involving thickening networks of trans-national trust, cooperation and inter-action. In Karl Deutsch's terms, it involves the emergence of a 'sense of community' or 'we-feeling' based on trust, mutual consideration, communication and responsiveness. Deutsch argued that 'the way to integration, domestic or international, is through the achievement of a sense of community that undergirds institutions' (1957: 7-8). . The 'sense of community' relevant for integration, Deutsch and his colleagues argued, turned out to be

> ... a matter of mutual sympathy and loyalties; of "we-feeling", trust, and mutual consideration; of partial identification in terms of self-images and interests; of mutually successful predictions of behaviour, and of cooperative action in accordance with it - in short, a matter of a perpetual dynamic process of mutual attention, communication, perception of needs, and responsiveness in the process of decision-making. "Peaceful change" could not be assured without this kind of relationship (Deutsch 1957: 36).

---

[20] 'Balten drängen in die NATO – mehr denn je', *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 14 April 1999.

The key to regional security in the Baltic is not simply institutional enlargement per se, but a process of convergence and integration between culturally distinct societies, political communities and value systems across the former East-West divide[21]. NATO can contribute to this in the military and political sphere by strengthening its role in security governance in the region. This involves above all developing the full potential of the Partnership for Peace programme, re-coupling NATO enlargement to EU enlargement, and working for better dialogue with Russia on security issues. At the end of the day, however, the success or failure of NATO's endeavours to build security governance in the Baltic Sea region will depend on the wider pattern of political, economic, social and cultural interactions in the region.

In this respect, it is important to recognise the close relationship between integration and security. As Helen Wallace has pointed out, an unfortunate dysjuncture between military and economic conceptions of Europe has arisen since the 1950s, reflected both in the development of separate military and economic organisations (NATO and the EU), and in the conceptual and analytical separation between 'security studies' and 'integration studies'. This has led to a neglect of the complementarities and interdependence between integration and security, and to the effective de-coupling of the process of NATO and EU enlargement. It is also reflected in the failure to develop 'an overarching concept of European integration that went beyond rather loose assertions of connectedness between these two domains'. In turn, this has led to a tendency to focus on formal institutional integration, rather than on the deeper process of societal integration and convergence (Wallace 1997: 221, 224-25).

One additional factor that must not be overlooked is that the emerging sense of regional identity in the Baltic area – which provides such a conducive environment for NATO's efforts to build security governance in the region – is developing primarily through deepening economic and social interaction. As one analyst has written, 'The region is emerging as more and more groups in society make links and connections across the borders and the sea. The Baltic Sea region essentially consists of these networks and has the power and potential of the networks. The political institutions are only bolstering constructions. This kind of development implies that the state actors are often reduced to a position as one political actor among many' (Joenniemi 1993: 137).[22] Institutionalised forms of multilateral

---

[21] One problem which will make societal convergence between East and West a slow and difficult process is the different understandings of citizenship and national identity in the two parts of Europe. As George Schöpflin notes, '[t]he heart of the difference between the two halves of Europe has lain in their contrasting approaches to citizenship' (Schöpflin 1993: 151). See also Hans Kohn (Kohn 1967).

[22] Similiarly, as one writer has written about the Second Conference of Baltic Sea Subregions, 'Das Treffen war typisch für die Ostsee-Region: Politik wird hier weniger "von oben" als von unten gemacht. Wichtiger als der Ostseerat der Aussenminister, der auf einer Initiative der Außenminister Genscher und Ellemann-Jensen zurückgeht, sind die zahlreichen Netzwerke, die entstehen, sind die zahllosen Kontakte, die zwischen all Regionen entstanden sind' (Steinfeld 1996: 27). ('The meeting was typical for the Baltic Sea region: politics was made here less "from above" as from below. More important than the Baltic Sea Council of Foreign Ministers which dates back to an initiative by Foreign Minsters Genscher and Ellemann-Jensen, are the plethora of networks which have been created and the countless contacts which have been established between the regions').

cooperation - notably the EU and the CBSS, have facilitated this process of deepening societal integration. Nonetheless, the primary dynamic underlying the development of the Baltic Sea as a distinct region within European international society is informal societal integration, rather than formal institutional integration.

Finally, in terms of the security architecture of the Baltic Sea region, NATO's role is pivotal. It lies at the heart of new forms of security and governance in the region. But it operates in a context of a dense institutional matrix, comprising a number of organisations: the EU, OSCE, the Council of Europe and the CBSS. Central to tackling the demands of security and cooperation in the Baltic is the development of an interlocking network of these different organisations, with a NATO-EU partnership at their core. Such an institutional network is also the best way to address the problem of ensuring cooperative relations between the 'ins', 'pre-ins' and 'outs' which EU and NATO enlargement has posed. Thus,

> …an interlocking pattern of relationships where a given state may belong to one or more neighbourhood groups, take part in association/partnership schemes led by the 'core European institutions', and be an active member of OSCE and the Council of Europe is emerging as perhaps the best paradigm for handling (if not resolving) the security concerns of non-integrated Central and East Europeans in an age of phased enlargement (Bremmer and Bailes 1998: 26).

References

Agrell, W. (1994) *Alliansfri - Tills Vidare*, Stockholm, Natur och Kultur

Alexandrova, O. (1998) 'Ambiguities and Normalisation in Russian-Baltic Relations', in Jopp and Warjovaara (1998), 89-96

Allison, R. (1998) 'Russia and the Baltic States: from Geopolitics to Geoeconomics', in Jopp and Warjovaara (1998), 97-106

Archer, C. (1996) 'The Nordic Zone as a "Zone of Peace"', *Journal of Peace Research*, 33: 4, 451-67

Archer, C., and Scrivener, D., eds. (1986) *Northern Waters*, Beckenham, Croon Helm for the RIIA

Arnswald , S. (1998) 'The Politics of Integrating the Baltic States into the EU – Phases and Instruments', in Jopp and Arnswald (1998), 19-100

Auffermann, B., and Visuri, P., eds. (1995) *Nordeuropa und die deutsche Herausforderung*, Baden-Baden, Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft

Axt, Heinz-Jürgen (1997) 'Strukturpolitik und Köhsion in der Europäischen Union: Reform in der Perspektiven der Osterweiterung', *Zeitschrift für Politikwissenschaften*, 7: 3, 885-927

Baev, P. (1998) 'Bear Hug for the Baltic', *The World Today*, March 1998, 78-79.

Baranovsky, V., ed. (1997) *Russia and Europe. The Emerging Security Agenda*, Oxford, OUP for SIPRI

Baring, A., ed. (1994) *Germany's New Position in Europe. Problems and Perspectives*, Oxford, Berg

Bideleux, R., and Taylor, R., eds. (1996) *European Integration and Disintegration: East and West*, London, Routledge

Bildt. C. (1994) 'The Baltic Litmus Test', *Foreign Affairs,* 73:5 (September/October), 72-85

Birnbaum, K. (1995) 'Ausblick: Deutschland und Nordeuropa', in Auffermann and Visuri (1995), 187-192

Bjøl, E. (1983) *Nordic Security*, Adelphi Paper no.181, London, Brassey's for the IISS

Bremmer, I., and Bailes, A. (1998) 'Sub-Regionalism in the Newly Independent States', *International Affairs*, 74: 1, 131-48

Bungs, D. (1994) 'Seeking Solutions to Baltic-Russian Border Issues', *RFE/RL Research Report*, 3: 13 (1 April 1994), 25-32

Busse, N. (1999) 'Eine Neue Sicherheitsordnung', *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 9 April 1999, p.12.

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

Carlsen, P. (1997) 'Confidence and Security Building Measures', in CSRC (1997)

CBSS (1997) *Sixth Ministerial Session, Communique*, Riga, 2-3 July 1997

CBSS (1996) *Presidency Declaration of the Baltic Sea States Summit*, Visby, 3-4 May 1996

CSRC (1997) *Baltic Security: The Long View from the Region*, Conflict Studies Research Centre, RMA Sandhurst, conference papers G58

Deutsch, K., ed. (1957) *Political Community in the North Atlantic Area*, Princeton, Princeton University Press

Ehrhart, H-G. (1996) 'EU, OSZE und der Stabilitätspakt für Europa – Präventive Diplomatie als gemeinsame Aufgabe', *Integration*,1, 37-48

Federov, A. (1998) 'Russia and the Baltics', in Jopp and Warjovaara (1998), 83-88

Fest, J. (1994) 'Europe in a Cul-de-Sac', in Baring, 51-64

Fitzmaurice, J. (1992) *The Baltic: A Regional Future*, London, Macmillan

Garton Ash, T. (1998) 'Europe's Endangered Liberal Order', *Foreign Affairs*, 77: 2 (March-April), 51-64

Garton Ash, T. (1994) 'Germany's Choice', *Foreign Affairs*, 73:4 (July-August), 65-81

Haslam, J. (1998) 'Russia's Seat at the Table: A Place Denied or a Place Delayed', *International Affairs*, 74: 1 (1998), 119-130

Havel, V. (1994) *Towards a Civil Society: Selected Speeches and Writings, 1990-1994*, Prague, Lidove Noviny

Hellmann, G. (1997) 'The Sirens of Power and German Foreign Policy', *German Politics*, 6: 2 (August), 29-57

Henningsen, B., and Stråth, eds. (1996) *Deutschland, Schweden und die Ostsee-Region*, Baden-Baden, Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft

Hjertonsson, U. (1997) 'Sweden and Security in the Baltic Sea Region', in Huldt and Johannessen (1997), 59-62

Holm, K. (1999) 'Wieder Nicht Gefragt. Abstrakter Expressionismus: Russland im Jugoslawien-Fieber', *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 7 April 1999.

Howorth, J., and Menon, A., eds. (1997) *The European Union and National Defence Policy*, London, Routledge,

Hubel, H. (1994) 'Nordic and Baltic Security After the East-West Conflict: A German View', in Snider and Brundtland, 81-98

Huldt, B. (1997) 'The Baltic Sea Region and the New European Security Structure', in Huldt and Johannessen (1997), 3-8

Huldt, B., and Johannessen, U., eds. (1997) *1st Annual Stockholm Conference on Baltic Sea Security and Cooperation*, Stockholm, Utrikespolitiska Institutet

Hunter, R. (1997) 'US Views on European Security Challenges: NATO Enlargement, Russia and the Baltics', in Huldt and Johannessen (1997), 53-58

Hyde-Price, A. (1996) *The International Politics of East Central Europe*, Manchester, Manchester University Press

Hyde-Price, A. (1997) 'The New Pattern of International Relations in Europe', in Alice Landau and Richard Whitman, eds., *Rethinking the European Union: Institutions, Interests, Identities*, London, Macmillan

Jeffery, C., ed. (1997) *The Regional Dimension of the European Union. Towards a Third Level in Europe?*, Cass Series in Regional and Federal Studies, vol.2, London, Frank Cass

Joenniemi, P., ed. (1993) *Cooperation in the Baltic Sea Region*, London, Taylor and Francis

Jonson, L. (1997) 'Russian Policy in Northern Europe', in Baranovsky (1997), 305-324

Jopp, M. and Arnswald, S., eds. (1998) *The European Union and the Baltic States. Visions, Interests and Strategies for the Baltic Sea Region*, Bonn and Helsinki: Ulkopoliittinen instituutti and Institut für Europäische Politik

Jopp, M., and Lippert, B. (1998) 'Towards a Solution of the Baltic Issue: the EU's Role', in Jopp and Arnswald (1998), 9-18

Jopp, M., and Warjovaara, R., eds. (1998) *Approaching the Northern Dimension of the CFSP: Challenges and Opportunities for the EU in the Emerging Security Order*, Bonn and Helsinki: Ulkopoliittinen instituutti and Institut für Europäische Politik

Judt, T. (1996) *An Essay on Europe*, London, Penguin

Kamp, Karl-Heinz (1995) 'The Folly of Rapid NATO Expansion', *Foreign Policy*, 98 (Spring), 116-31

Keohane, R., ed. (1993) *International Institutions and State Power: Essays in International Relations Theory*, Boulder, Westview

Kinkel, K. (1997) Welt am Sonntag, 8 June

Kinkel, K. (1996) 'Estonia, Lettland und Litauen - Partner Deutschlands auf dem Weg nach Europa. Beitrag aus Anlaß des 5. Jahrestags der Wiederaufnahme der Beziehungen', *Leipziger Volkszeitung*, 27 August 1996

Kirby, D. (1995) *The Baltic World 1772-1993. Europe's Northern Periphery in an Age of Change*, London, Longman

Kirby, D. (1990) *Northern Europe in the Early Modern Period. The Baltic World 1492-1772*, London, Longman

Kohn, H. (1967) *The Idea of Nationalism*, second edition, New York, Macmillan

Kriwulin, V. (1999) 'Der Neue Kalte Krieg', *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 27 March 1999, p.43

Krohn, A. (1996a) 'Germany' in Krohn (1996b), 96-115

Krohn, A., ed. (1996b) *The Baltic Sea Region*, Baden-Baden, Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft

Lange, P. (1995) 'Eine verkannte Herausforderung - Deutschland und die Neuordnung der Sicherheit im Ostseeraum', in Auffermann and Visuri (1995), 157-168

Lieven, A. (1996) 'Baltic Iceberg Ahead. NATO beware', *The World Today*, July 1996, 175-179

Lucas, Hans-Dieter (1995) 'Prospects for Cooperation in the Baltic Sea Region', *Aussenpolitik*, 46:1, 24-31

Lucas, Hans-Dieter (1997) 'The Baltic States in Europe. Problems and Prospects', *Aussenpolitik*, 48: 2, 127-136

Maeder-Metcalf, B. (1997) 'The Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe', in CSRC (1997)

Marody, M. (1998) 'Opportunities for and Barriers to Social Change', in *Accession or Integration? Poland's Road to the European Union*, edited by Tomasz Jezioranski, Warsaw, Erich Brost Foundation, 155-94

Maull, H. (1997) 'Quo Vadis, Germania? Außenpolitik in einer Welt des Wandels', *Blätter für Deutsche und Internationale Politik*, 10 (October 1997), 1244-1256

Mayhew, A. (1998) *Recreating Europe: The European Union's Policy Towards Central and Eastern Europe*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press

Medvedev, S. (1998) 'Geopolitics and Beyond: the New Russian Policy Towards the Baltic States', in Jopp and Arnswald (1998), 235-69.

NATO (1995) *Study on NATO Enlargement*, Brussels, Nato Press Office (September 1995)

Nowak, J. (1997) 'Regional Arms Control in Europe (Theory and Practice)', in *The Polish Quarterly of International Affairs*, 6:1 (winter 1997), 41-60

Ozolina, Z. (1998) 'Latvia, the EU and Co-operation in the Baltic Sea Region', in Jopp and Arnswald (1998), 113-44

Pedersen, T. (1998) *Germany, France and the Integration of Europe*, London, Pinter

Pinder, J. (1991) *The European Community and Eastern Europe*, London, Pinter

Pridham, G. Herring, E., and Sanford, G. eds. (1994) *Building Democracy? The International Dimensions of Democratization in Eastern Europe*, London, Leicester University Press

Ries, T. (1994) *NORTH HO! The New Nordic Security Environment and the EU's Northern Expansion*, St.Augustin, Konrad Adenauer Stiftung

Rose, R. and Haerpfer, C. (1995) 'Democracy and Enlarging the European Union Eastwards', *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 33: 3, 427-50

Ruggie, J. (1997) 'Consolidating the European Pillar: The Key to NATO's Future', *Washington Quarterly*, 20: 1 (Winter), 109-24

Rühle, M., and Williams, N. (1995) 'NATO Enlargement and the European Union', *The World Today*, 51: 5 (May), 84-88

Schariot, K. (1997) 'The PFP and the OSCE - Key Elements of European Security', in Huldt and Johannessen (1997), 33-36

Schlögel, K. (1995) *Go East oder Die Zweite Entdeckung des Ostens*, Berlin, Siedler

Schöpflin, G. (1993) *Politics in Eastern Europe*, Oxford, Blackwell

Seidelmann, R. (1997) 'NATO's Enlargement as a Policy of Lost Opportunities', *Journal of European Integration*, 20: 2-3

Senghaas, D. (1997) *Frieden Machen*, Frankfurt am Main, Suhrkamp

Sergounin, A. (1997) 'In Search of a New Strategy in the Baltic/Nordic Area', in Baranovsky (1997), 325-351

Siebert, T. (1997) 'The New Atlantic Community and the Baltic Sea Region', in Huldt and Johannessen (1997), 95-102

Singer, M., and Wildavsky, A. (1996) *The Real World Order. Zones of Peace, Zones of Turmoil*, revised edition, New Jersey, Chatham House Publishers

Snider, D., and Brundtland, A., eds. (1994) *Nordic-Baltic Security. An International Perspective*, Washington, CSIS and NUPI Report

Staden, Berndt von (1996) 'Zwischen Russland und dem Westen. Das Baltikum in gefuerchteter Zwischenlage', *Internationale Politik*, 7/1996, pp.47-51

Stålvant, CE. (1995) 'The New Germany and the Old Norden: Good Neighbours and a Creative Partnership?', in Auffermann and Visuri (1995), 169-186

Steinfeld, J. (1996) 'Schweden, Deutschland und die Ostsee-Region', in Henningsen and Stråh (1996), 23-34

Stråh, B. (1996) 'Neue Verhältnisse im Norden', in Henningsen and Stråh (1996), 16-22

Thatcher, M. (1993) *The Downing Street Years*, London, Harper Collins

Ulrich, C. (1994) 'The Growth of Crime in Russia and the Baltic Region', *RFE/RL Research Report*, 3: 23 (10 June 1994)

Van Ham, P. ed., (1995) *The Baltic States: Security and Defence After Independence*, Chaillot Papers 19, Paris, WEU Institute for Security Studies

Wallace, W. (1990) *The Transformation of Western Europe*, London, Pinter

Wallace, H. (1997) 'Pan-European Integration: A Real or Imagined Community?', *Government and Opposition*, 32: 2, 214-33

Weidenfeld, W., and Janning, J. (1997) 'Das Europa der differenzierten Integration', in Senghaas (1997), 77-101

Wendt, A. (1994) 'Collective Identity Formation and the International State', *American Political Science Review*, 88: 2, 384-96

Zaslavsky, V. (1992) 'Nationalism and Democratic Transition in Postcommunist Societies', *Daedalus*, 121: 2 (Spring), 97-121

Zelikow, P. (1992) 'The New Concert of Europe', *Survival*, 34: 2 (Summer 1992), 12-30.

Zimmer, M. (1997) 'Return of the *Mittellage*? The Discourse of the Centre in German Foreign Policy', *German Politics*, 6:1 (April 1997), 23-38