

**The Role of Youth Atlantic Organizations in the Framework of the
Euro-Atlantic Cooperation and Providing with Required Dialogue by the
Example of Russian and Ukrainian Youth Atlantic Organizations**

Final Report

Plan of the work

1. General description of aims, perspectives and possibilities of youth movement in modern world.
2. Tasks, problems, and potentialities of Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Co-operation and Security between NATO and the Russian Federation implementation and possible role of Youth movement in this process.
3. Tasks, problems, and potentialities of NATO-Ukraine Charter implementation and possible role of Youth movement in this process.
4. Activity of Youth Atlantic Club (YAC) in Russia and Ukrainian Youth Forum of National Council of Ukraine (UYF of NCU) in Ukraine and their potential role in providing required dialogue for the sake of mutual understanding in Euro-Atlantic space.
5. General conclusion on the role of contacts of two selected Youth organization – Russian and Ukrainian – in maintenance of required dialogue in the Framework of Euro-Atlantic Cooperation

1. General Description of Aims, Perspectives and Possibilities of Youth Movement in Modern World

The significant changes which took place in the world during past decade: end of global confrontation of two political systems, disintegration of the Soviet Union and collapse of the former Communist bloc led to the establishment of new realities in Europe overall in the world and influenced significantly not only the whole architecture of security system, but even the whole philosophy of this field of human activity. New way of thinking, creation of new

geoeconomic and geopolitical dimension highlighted the role of young people, as most capable to adaptation part of modern society, in current and future state of peace-loving efforts.

Additionally, study on subject of above titled Project is promoted by series of premises including among others:

- 1) complexities of societies' transformation both in Russia, and in the Ukraine having economic, political, mental, psychological, etc. nature as well as general similarity in their trends;
- 2) divergence in views and approaches to some important issues existing in Russia-the Ukraine relations, some of which refers to and objective difficulties of modern realities and others ones are connected with the far-fetched factors and ideological stereotypes, but both of them are certainly aggravated and/or directly caused by above transformation-derived problems;
- 3) searches both of Russian and the Ukrainian civil societies of the ways of self-identification and self-realization in modern world according to such its characteristics as growing economic globalization and far-reaching geopolitical changes, including transformation of bipolar Security system to new multipolar model; and their willingness to take deserved place in creating security architecture. And based on this point – activization of their relations with the main Security organizations, and primarily with NATO as one being the most prominent, powerful and influencing overall situation in the vast Euro-Atlantic area;
- 4) separate official registrations by these two countries of the former USSR their contractual relations with NATO taking in mind to play specific role in its activity in Euro-Atlantic region;
- 5) the democratic potential of NATO structures which became more evident now during transformation process taking place inside the Alliance being connected with its adaptation to new kinds of activity,

such as humanitarian and peace-keeping functions, and strengthening of the European «pillar» of NATO through the development of relations with the WEU and other European structures serves as additional impulse to promote the distribution of real information and knowledge about main objectives, principle and overall philosophy of this organization which was capable to combine successfully all efforts of the democratic states in the framework of NATO for the sake of reliable security and stability.

- 6) policy is creating not only on the level of governments and other official economic, political and military elites, but it is strongly and sometimes even opposed by ordinary people. Grounding on this point it is targeted to study the role of young representatives of ordinary people in above processes of self-identification and self-realization of two societies under consideration. This stratum of society being the most labile in their views and the most susceptible and responded to changes in world's sounding may contribute significantly to creation of specific mental and political environment in order to permit this particular countries to build their interrelations and perform their contractual activities (including primarily NATO according to Charters NATO - Ukraine and Founding Act Russia - NATO) in such way that it will promote the atmosphere of good-neighbourliness, priority of law and democracy, and respect for human rights and protection of minority, accordingly to objectives enshrined in Article 2 of the North Atlantic Treaty. Additionally this kind of activity conforms the objectives outlined in «The Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security between NATO and Russian Federation» signed in Paris on 16 May 1997, where was stated the aim to promote social realizing of growing relations between NATO and Russia through distribution of adequate information. The analogous purpose is introduced into NATO –

Ukraine Charter on Distinctive Partnership signed in Madrid in July 1997.

Implementation of Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Co-operation and Security between NATO and the Russian Federation, from Russia side, and NATO-Ukraine Charter, from Ukraine side, respectively, both signed in 1997, which constitute in both cases the base for their relationship and cooperation with NATO, depends on prevailing viewpoints in each individual society, which in their turn, are determining by gratitude of the most active part – young people. It is known that the role of this factor becomes more prominent in the key stages of history. This moment together with the previous decade are just the same period. And therefore youth movement in each country and, moreover, their interaction may be the significant factors contributing to success of many political events as a whole and to realization of Euro-Atlantic dialogue, particularly. In case of present work it is relevant to indicate their possible role in the context of providing with the suitable environment in corresponding societies favouring the mutual understanding and cooperation in the framework of Euro-Atlantic Space.

2. Tasks, problems, and potentialities of Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Co-operation and Security between NATO and the Russian Federation implementation and possible role of Youth movement in this process

The Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Co-operation and Security between NATO and the Russian Federation was signed in Paris on 27 May 1997 and called for the creation of the NATO-Russia Permanent Joint Council. The PJC holds regular monthly meetings at NATO headquarters at the level of ambassadors and also meets twice a year at the level of foreign and defence ministers.

The JMG was created in 1997 to fulfil several goals: to give substance to the call in the NATO-Russia Founding Act (FA) for greater parliamentary co-operation; to bring Russian and Alliance parliamentarians together in a joint collaborative project - notably parliamentary scrutiny of the implementation of the FA; and to improve public awareness of the problems and prospects of NATO-Russia co-operation. The creation of the Group also represented a natural evolution in relations between the Assembly and the Russian parliament underway since 1992.

As concern the scope of special activity in cooperation according to Founding Act, it is worth to note the agreements in some areas, namely common threats, and continuing disagreements on others, notably the role of NATO for Euro-Atlantic security, were the results of an April 6 meeting of NATO and Russian parliamentarians. Members of the NATO PA Civilian Dimension of Security, Defence and Security, and Political Committees held a very useful and productive exchange on European security issues with members of the Russian Duma and Federation Council as well as senior government officials. This was the first Joint Committee meeting in Moscow since the Duma suspended its participation in NATO PA activities as a result of NATO's 1999 air campaign over Kosovo.

The use of force by NATO against the FRY had had a profound impact on Russian perceptions. NATO, it was said, had acted illegally and also against the principles of the Founding Act. For Russia, the NATO operation was a worrying precedent. The question was repeated several times: would NATO in the future whenever it saw the need arrogate to itself the right to use force without the authority of the UN. Despite the variety of arguments marshalled by Assembly members to justify the NATO action - including the paralysis of the Security Council, the lack of further options, the need to stop the gross violation of human rights - the Russian members were unmoved. In the words

of the US NATO Ambassador, a yawning chasm continues to exist between the perceptions of the two sides on this issue.

Despite still existing disagreements arriving in society viewpoint trends make to think and to act in accordance of mutual understanding. And evidently role of youth organization and the active position is extremely significant. Partially this changes is reflected in attitude of parliamentarians. Thus, welcoming the resumption of the dialogue between the Assembly and the Russian Federal Parliament in their opening remarks, the heads of the Duma and Russian Federation Council, Ms. Lubov Sliska and Mr. Victor Ozerov, stressed the important role of parliaments in formulating foreign and security policy. All participants felt that "the ice has been broken". The Russian hosts as well as chairmen Peter Viggers (UK) and Jan Hoekema (NL) expressed satisfaction about the "environment of confidence" that had been re-established. In their introduction, the chairmen mapped out the areas of agreement as well as disagreement: the role of NATO and its relations with the OSCE and the UN, further enlargement of the Alliance, US plans for the missile defences (NMD), Russian foreign and security policy, defence reform, and the situation in Chechnya. The discussions included both the parliamentarians of the Russian Federal Assembly and of the NATO PA but also senior Russian government officials. The meeting provided an excellent stage for a very frank, but also fair, exchange of views.

In the context of present work it is necessary to stress the role of youth movement in the creation of special atmosphere in society permitting to find suitable understanding. Among the corresponding activity of mentioned trend it is worth to indicate series of seminar and round tables organized in Moscow and some other cities of RF (Vladimir, Suzdal, St. Petersburg) with participation of young people from International Association of Euro-Atlantic Cooperation (IAEAC) devoted to issues of reduction of information shortcomings among youth concerning Euro-Atlantic interrelation, as well as

participation of young people in annual Winter Academy which held under sponsorship of NATO Information Center in Moscow.

As during the meeting of the NATO PA - Russian Federal Parliament Joint Monitoring Group a month before, Russian speakers were highly critical of NATO's 1999 Kosovo air campaign, to which they referred as NATO "aggression". Russian legislators and government representatives reiterated their points of criticism, notably that by using force against the FRY without prior authorisation of the UN Security Council, NATO had acted illegally and set a dangerous precedent. Moreover, with this action the Alliance had breached the principles of the Founding Act. Russian speakers viewed the recent attacks by radical Albanian extremists in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia as a confirmation of their earlier assessment that the 1999 air campaign would prove futile in ending conflict in the region. Several Russian speakers demanded to investigate possible NATO crimes against humanity. One participant wanted to make a deepening NATO-Russia cooperation depended on this question. More specifically, the use of depleted uranium (DU) ammunition by NATO forces was criticised.

Acknowledging that NATO, too, would have preferred to act on a UN mandate, Assembly speakers explained again that, given the gridlock at the Security Council during this period, NATO felt obliged to act to prevent the continuation of "ethnic cleansing" of Kosovo by the Milosevic regime. That the Balkan peninsula will remain for considerable time to come the most direct challenge to European security was unanimous. All participants agreed that the territorial integrity of Macedonia would be very important for the stability of the Balkans. Moreover, Russian speakers also stressed that Montenegro should remain part of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (FRY).

Members of the NATO PA Committees welcomed the offer of Russian President Vladimir Putin to work together to develop a European theatre

missile defence (TMD) against attacks with ballistic weapons armed with nuclear, biological, or chemical warheads. All those who spoke shared the conviction that arms control remained an indispensable tool for international peace and stability. Russian speakers iterated the need for keeping the ABM treaty, while parliamentarians from NATO countries expressed the hope that Russia and the US can reach an agreement. The discussion revealed agreement about the important impact of the development and deployment of ballistic missile defences on China.

According to changes which are slowly taking place in Russian society and consequently in elites due at least partially to active role of younger in generation of needs to reach understanding it is became real to concentrate concern on common problems. Thus participants of above meeting were deeply concerned about the dangers generated by the use and trafficking of illicit drugs. A Russian member proposed that illicit drugs should be defined as "biological weapons" and argued that countries producing or trading should be targeted as "aggressor states". Ms. Sliska and other Russian speakers stressed the need to work together on ways to combat illicit drugs and drug-related crime. Russian parliamentarians repeatedly depicted Russia standing at the forefront of a "battle". The drugs problem was an issue close to the domestic concerns of several Alliance members. Recognising that NATO itself is not the most relevant organisation for co-ordinating the fight against drugs trafficking members considered that the Assembly could be a useful forum for the exchange of information and co-operation among parliamentarians.

That many Russians continue to regard NATO as a military bloc and much less as a primarily political alliance was reflected in the exchanges. There were several negative references to NATO military activities close to Russia's borders; with no acknowledgement that these were frequently exercises involving PfP nations in which Russia could be involved. Military activity was still seen through the prism of the Cold War. That a "military block"

approaches Russia's border would be "unacceptable", NATO PA members were told. In the absence of an outside threat NATO should transform into an "instrument of trans-European security" and the role of the OSCE as well as the UN strengthened.

As for the situation concerning the real fact that many Russians continue to regard NATO as a military bloc and much less as a primarily political alliance, there is also the direction of activity of Youth organization of Euro-Atlantic direction in order to aid to diminish that information gap existing in Russian society especially in Russian regions.

Accordingly there are major areas and possibilities for-operation. Among they it may be noted:

From the various presentations and discussions it appeared that there are several areas of co-operation that would be of mutual benefit:

- a continuation of the current co-operation in Bosnia and Kosovo was the most obvious, particularly in view of the rapidly deteriorating situation in southern Serbia.
- Defence against tactical and theatre missiles. The existence of a threat from WMD is accepted by all parties. There was general agreement that it would make sense to explore whether a common approach is possible - as the Russian leadership conveyed to Secretary General Robertson during his visit to Moscow in February. However it remains to be seen what relationship exists between Russian ideas on the one hand and US plans for missile defence and Alliance ideas for theatre missile defence on the other. Curiously, apart from a couple of critical references, there was little discussion of US plans for a NMD.
- Defence reform is evidently an area where experiences and practices could be usefully shared.

- The potential for co-operation in search and rescue operations was stressed; reference was made to the loss of the Kursk and its impact on raising awareness on the issue of co-operation.
- Terrorism, drugs. Russian participants stressed the need for a collective approach and even proposed the setting up of an International Strategic Centre for the co-ordination of Russia's and NATO's efforts to counter international terrorism - repeatedly alluding to their battle against the Islamic fundamentalists. While Alliance members agreed on the need to share information on terrorism as a threat that affects all nations, they emphasised, nevertheless, the limitation of NATO as a vehicle for this purpose.
- The establishment of a NATO Office of Information was seen by NATO officials as a constructive step that would allow the NATO voice to be heard in the Russian debate. Recent evidence following the Secretary General's visit to Moscow suggested that the situation with regard to Russian public opinion was far from hopeless.
- The briefings revealed the substantial co-operation between NATO and Russia in the field of science and the impressive assistance offered by NATO to Russian scientists; a considerable if little recognised dimension of NATO-Russia relations.

Not surprisingly, very different views existed on the Alliance' Open Door policy. On one side were speakers from NATO member countries as well as from associate countries to the NATO PA who argued that further NATO enlargement strengthened Euro-Atlantic security. Parliamentarians from the three new members pointed out that since the first round of enlargement round their bilateral relations with Russia had actually improved. But Russian speakers rejected this view, saying that enlargement would neither increase security for NATO nor for Europe as a whole. Deputy Foreign Minister Gusarov warned that further enlargement would negatively impact the military landscape of Europe as it would create different zones of security and could

"destroy" arms control. Duma and Federation Council representatives maintained that the Russian society viewed enlargement of the Alliance as a major threat to security. But members NATO applicant countries were unambiguous that they wanted to join the Alliance as soon as possible. A Baltic parliamentarian reminded of Russia's obligations to honour its international commitments and the right of each country to freely choose its security affiliation. However, parliamentarians from Russia's immediate neighbours also stressed the desire for improved, closer relations with their Eastern partner.

Others, though, were critical of the impact of some of Russia's policies on their countries. For example, a Georgian representative argued that Russian policy would lead to the destabilisation of the Caucasus. He cited the still unresolved issue of Russian troop withdrawal from Georgia territory and the recently introduced Russian visa regime for Georgians which would exempt people from Northern Ossetia, Abchasia and other areas in Georgia, which, he maintained, encouraged separatists in these regions.

Not surprisingly, the issue of Chechnya was another area where Russian and NATO views continue to differ. Russian speakers were adamant in pointing out that Chechnya is an internal Russian matter. Assembly members were told that Chechnya should not be a matter for NATO-Russia, except for the aspect of combating terrorism. More generally, some Russian speakers also stressed that Russia does not want to see NATO involved in the Caucasus. On the other side, though acknowledging the security risks, Assembly speakers clearly stated that they could not endorse the means applied by Russian authorities. They called upon Russia to initiate steps to try to solve the conflict by non-military means. In a similar vein, several members from neighbouring countries criticised Russian measures towards Chechnya as "contradictory", "inhumane" or "inefficient".

The exchange also reflected, at least in part, different views of Russia's foreign policy towards its neighbours. Russian speakers expressed frustration over being unfairly accused of an "imperialist attitude" in relations with neighbouring countries. On the contrary, Deputy Foreign Minister Gusarov described the strengthening of relations with its partners in the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) as the "centrepiece of Russian foreign policy". Assembly members were informed that Russia's foreign policy and security concepts were, in the words of Deputy Minister Gusarov, based on "realism about its international situation" and a "realistic assessment of its own capabilities". In essence, Russian policy will be less guided by "internationalism" but increasingly driven by its national interests, namely providing for external and internal security and creating economic growth. This will mean a stronger focus on domestic issues, such as increasing the living standard and the protection of the rights of Russians, including those living abroad. But this new approach would not mean isolation or confrontation, the members of the Committee were assured. On the contrary, Russia's aims at building partnerships and increasing the number of allies, thus striving to build a "new world order" which will be characterised by a multi-polar world. Though Russia is a huge country covering two continents, the focus of its foreign policy will remain Europe.

Referring to the downsizing of Russian armed forces after the end of the Cold War, several Russian contributions expressed considerable dissatisfaction about what they considered unilateral Russian concessions that were not matched by NATO states. In this context, Russian speakers raised questions about the continuing US military presence in Europe. Plans for necessary adjustments in the Russia's military doctrine to a new security environment were in principle supported by the Parliament. Relating Russia's armed forces to the broader picture of current and future security challenges, Colonel General Leonid Ivashov, Chief of the Main Directorate for International Military Cooperation of the Ministry of Defence referred to the risks emanating from the

proliferation of WMD and missiles as well as missile technology. He specifically stressed Russia's compliance with non-proliferation. The different emphasis of Russia's nuclear and conventional forces was also raised. Russia will try to reduce its nuclear arsenal while at the same time try to modernise conventional forces, putting increasing emphasis on mobility. The continuing economic crisis made it imperative, in the words of General Ivashov, to make the most efficient use of available resources.

As Ms. Sliska said, NATO and Russia should think together how to strengthen security. Europe and Russia face the same threats, namely through the proliferation of WMD weapons, and drugs. And in view of this situation Ms. Sliska called for joint activities. It is evidently that the last one may be just the same direction of activities where youth movement may greatly and positively contribute at least through the creation of special atmosphere in society. Other speakers added the fight against international organised crime where, in the words of Alexander Gurov, Chairman of the Duma's Committee on Security, "Russia failed to reduce organised crime". There also may be certain space for activity of youth organisation of Euro-Atlantic orientation.

The positive atmosphere and the unanimous perception of a very productive meeting was reflected, among others, in Russian proposals to initiate joint activities in two areas: first the Russian delegation suggested establishing a joint working group of Russian Federal Assembly and NATO PA members to evaluate the dangers arising from drug trafficking originating from Afghanistan; second, they put forward the proposal to create a NATO-Russia centre for the evaluation and coordination of international terrorism.

At the same time, there was a distinct emphasis on the fundamental differences that existed on policy issues, notably those relating to the future shape of European security and NATO's role within it. Trust, it was said, had to be restored in the validity of international law and in the authority of the UN.

NATO should respect the principle of territorial integrity and Russian concerns over future enlargement. The OSCE should be accorded its proper role in European security. These concerns had a familiar ring from previous meetings, but evidently they have been exacerbated by NATO's use of force against the FRY. Failure to resolve these differences, it was suggested, could mean a return to the days of bloc to bloc relations. In this connection persistent reference was made to the fact that because of NATO's dominant role, the OSCE was not being used to its full potential.

The juxtaposition of these two perspectives may have implications for the future work of the JMG. First, it would appear that in Russian eyes, the resolution of these differences lies in NATO recognising the error of its ways, changing its policies accordingly and above all taking full account of Russian concerns rather than determined by different issues. The opening remarks of the Russian leaders contained two separate and potentially conflicting messages for the work of the Group. On the one hand, there was a demand for the JMG to achieve practical results and to find areas of co-operation where progress could be demonstrated to governments and electorates alike. "We must show our publics why we are here", they said. And undoubtedly in this context the role of youth organization of Euro-Atlantic vector of activity is extremely significant. AS it was decided, the Group should be more involved in the work of the PJC to the extent of formulating recommendations on each item and maybe the mentioned youth organization should coordinate its work in some areas with this Group in order to act more effectively. .

Three issues emerged during presentations and discussions as the source of fundamental disagreement concern following: the use of force by NATO without UN authorisation; a further round of NATO enlargement; and the role of Russia in European security. And in all them, especially in last one the role of Euro-Atlantic youth organization is evidently high.

There was similar deadlock over the question of future NATO enlargement. Why, the Russian members asked, did NATO insist on moving its boundaries eastwards; whose security did it improve? The response of Alliance members was equally firm: if NATO was no longer an adversary why did its enlargement cause concern? These are familiar arguments and again the two sides remain miles apart. The Czech Ambassador's argument that NATO membership had not harmed Czech-Russia relations but to the contrary had improved them, likewise, had no discernible impact.

Several Russian comments referred specifically to the potential inclusion of the Baltic States, again questioning the rationale; why if the security of the Baltic States was not threatened did they need to shelter in NATO? These concerns were accompanied by criticism of the Baltic States for exploiting their ties with Russia and for their treatment of their Russian-speaking population. Equally worrying were the references to the changes in the "balance of forces" as a result of enlargement and the suggestion that further enlargement would mean greater attention would have to be paid to the assessments and requirements of the Russian military. Countries, one Russian member noted, had a right to choose their Alliances but others had the right to react. These concerns were coupled with questions about NATO exercises and activities close to Russia's borders. Such remarks had a profoundly Cold War ring to them and were a sober reminder that despite the rhetoric of partnership the image of NATO as an adversary is never far from the surface. It was later pointed out that Russia is invited to observe NATO exercises but chooses not to do so.

Inevitably, discussion of enlargement led to the question of whether Russia could eventually join NATO; the reply from NATO officials and Assembly members alike was that eventual Russian membership should not be excluded. However, the Russian participants commented that they did not regard the "why not" response as reassuring but rather as a cynical Alliance ploy to make enlargement more palatable. The "successful" recent visit to Moscow by the

NATO Secretary General was assessed in a similar fashion, "we know the story". The reality, one member noted, was that the Alliance listened to Russian concerns, smiled reassuringly, but took no account of Russian views. This reminded him of Stalin's maxim when dealing with representatives of the people complaining of conditions in the Soviet Union: "feed them well first and then shoot them".

Russian policies in Chechnya were the subject of several exchanges with Assembly members and NATO diplomats expressing concern at the treatment of the civilian population. Assembly members recognised the problem of dealing with terrorists but criticised the means and the disregard for human rights. Russian members while emphasising that this threat was one that affected all nations insisted that information in the Western media was inaccurate.

Parallel with these deep-rooted differences, and in contrast to them both NATO and Russian briefers indicated that progress was being made in several areas.

The PJC is now functioning effectively. It has moved beyond the Russian imposed limitation of restricting discussion to co-operation in Bosnia and Kosovo and now covers a wide range of issues such as proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, strategy and doctrine, peacekeeping, defence against ballistic missiles and defence reform. Most recently General Manilov of the Russian General Staff had made a full presentation on the challenges facing the Russian armed forces in their efforts to reduce, restructure and reorganise. This had been matched by an Alliance presentation on the development of NATO's collective Ministerial Guidance. The PJC was clearly growing in effectiveness, helped it was said, by greater frankness and openness; it appeared that there was far greater freedom of discussion than previously concerning areas where mutual understanding is crucial.

However, the Russian side regretted that the PJC forum was still limited to the exchange of information rather than the development of joint decisions and actions as called for in the FA. However, NATO officials pointed out that the wording in the FA concerning joint decisions and joint actions is heavily qualified. The exact wording of the relevant section is as follows: "The PJC will provide a mechanism for consultation, co-ordination and, to the maximum extent possible, where appropriate, for joint decisions and joint action with respect to security issues of common concern. The consultations will not extend to internal matters of either NATO, NATO Members states or Russia". This leaves considerable latitude in deciding when it is "possible" and "appropriate" to act or decide jointly, what are "security issues of common concern" and what falls within the term "internal matters".

Military co-operation at operational levels of command and on the ground in Bosnia, Kosovo and at SHAPE was said to be good; according to General Zavarzin, the military had a better understanding of co-operation than their diplomat counterparts.

Various ideas for parliamentary work were also put forward, including meetings between NATO PA Committees and their Russian counterparts. These proposals offer the potential for more in-depth co-operation but will have to be assessed in terms of practical application.

The Russian delegation proposed a joint Communique that would summarise the views of the Group. However, producing such a document in a timely fashion would involve substantial political and practical difficulties. It was therefore agreed rather to develop a position paper reflecting areas of agreement and disagreement that could be reviewed at each meeting.

Clearly, there is considerable scope, and a real need, for dialogue and for joint efforts on areas of mutual interest and benefit if the political will exists.

However, overshadowing discussions of co-operation were the fundamental differences of policy and principle with little apparent room for movement on either side. And again the dialogue on non-formal level including level of youth organization, moreover of Euro-Atlantic direction of activity will be timely and effective tool capable to contribute positively the process of rapprochement.

The question for the future is whether continued disagreement over the big issues will limit the effectiveness of the various co-operative efforts; or whether the good will and mutual understanding generated by cooperation will permeate upwards and eventually produce the much needed convergence of thinking on the fundamentals of European security. Only time will tell.

3. Tasks, problems, and potentialities of NATO-Ukraine Charter implementation and possible role of Youth movement in this process

The essence of the Ukrainian model of post-totalitarian development is a determined aspiration of the authorities for maintaining equilibrium in society by minimization of social changes, preservation of old structures and mechanisms of management in order to prevent mass social non-engagement which is an inevitable aftermath of radical breaking of a social foundation. Realization of this model results, on the one hand, in absence of large-scale violent conflicts, and, on the other hand, in decay of the economy and social and political activity. A total fear of any conflicts is cultivated to gain mass support of such a strategy in the society, that also applies to the conflict between old totalitarian management structures and a civilian society, which is necessary for a democratic development. As a result the fear of the population in respect of constructive social conflicts becomes the mechanism that prevents constructive actions aimed at overcoming the socio-economic crisis. Under present conditions the future of economic transformations and democratic statehood depends on strategic consolidation of the democratic forces on the common platform — formation of stable and democratic socio-economic and

political orientations of the population. And the role of Ukrainian youth movement in this process of consolidation of democratic and creative forces. The main task of this strategy is ensuring the understanding by the majority of the population that the conservative scenario of development is hopeless for Ukraine. According to it, most citizens should play the role of extras without any hope for determining their fates in the paternalist state with the declining economy, outdated and ineffective system of social protection and destructive ideology. The latter is peculiar for chimerical combination of relic stereotypes, folklore anti-imperial motives, and spiritualistic appeals to spirits of the market economy and the rule-of-law state. The democratic public of Ukraine should clearly realize that the present-day elected representatives of the people, ensuring heredity of the existing system of power and regulation of the economy, are guided, along with personal and corporative interests, by a certain social order. It is stipulated by contradictory orientations of masses and public opinion fluctuating between the desire to cross “the market Rubicon” and fear of losing intercession of the state. Utilizing these “infant fears” of the people who for many years used to live under constant guardianship of the totalitarian state and got accustomed to its “caring for people” one may try to preserve the society “in the cradle” reaping ponderable material fruit of individual and corporative social-political activity on the field of political apathy of the masses. Psychological reticence of the Ukrainian population manifested in stereotypes of isolationism contributes to viability of this strategy as well. The most vivid stereotype of this kind is a mass suspicion that poor neighbours and even well-to-do good-natured persons are trying to export the most valuable goods from Ukraine and to import rubbish which they do not need for themselves. However, the “conservative-guardianship strategy” cannot give the society a guarantee against a social outburst resulting from development of the crisis beyond exhausted resources of survival of considerable strata of the population. And the democratic opposition should be the last to want this outburst. Spontaneous outburst of social passions is more dangerous for democrats than for conservatives. Whereas only one of the

possible outcomes of a social outburst is dangerous for the latter, i.e. collapse of the state and anarchy, another way out, i.e. state dictatorship and authoritative rule, will become a total defeat for democrats. After all, the option of traditional patronage by Russia suits the old administrative Guards all right. Their skills of provincial self-assertion are hardly likely to suffer from a feeble attempt to assert itself at a sovereign political assemblage. And statehood democrats will in this case have to choose between philosophical observation of the next failure of the idea of statehood and solidarity with those for whom even a civil war or bloody dictatorship is an acceptable price for assertion of this idea. Therefore, it is necessary already now when prospects, so much inadmissible, for democrats are taking shape to specify a clear-cut strategy of actions. To prevent conflict which is about to happen in Ukraine between the goals of development of an independent, democratic and prosperous state, declared by the political elite, and the realities of life of most of the population is possible only under altered strategy of solving socio-economic and political problems: from the “conservative-guardianship” strategy to the “constructive conflict” one, i.e. the strategy based on recognition of the conflict between the residual totalitarian mechanism of state administration and emerging civilian society as a source of contemporary development of the society. It envisages renouncing the illusions of solving all social problems by efforts of the state and requires removing the state system of administration from regulation of processes developing in modern democratic states on the basis of independent actions of citizens. The less the state interferes into competence of the civilian society institutions the higher is the probability that its major functions - ensuring law enforcement and public order - will be supported by citizens. Realization of the new strategy would allow to make a resolute step in Ukraine’s advancement toward an open society and overcoming the socio-economic crisis. Most of the population is ready to endure difficulties for the sake of the economic reforms for another year or two preserving reason and self-control. Due to these features of its people Ukraine lived through the recent very difficult years without mass social outburst. There

is a hope that advancement to a civilian society will not be terminated by global social shocks. The analysis of historical experience, orientations and interests of the majority of the population, the necessity to preserve the main achievement of Ukraine - absence of violent social and class as well as interethnic conflicts lead to the following conclusions:

- Ukraine critically requires immediate privatization of land, housing, small and medium-sized enterprises. On the one hand, this will undermine unconditional domination of the socialist-type bureaucracy over the society, and on the other hand - involve considerable part of the population into the process of radical reforms promoting increased political activity, competence and effectiveness of the latter.
- The way out of the political deadlock is connected with division of the political (the ruling as well as the one in opposition) and economic elites and emergence an intellectual elite independent from state subsidies. Processes of democratic development and settlement of a conflict between elites and masses are successful if the economic elite is independent from the political one with the latter being independent from the intellectual elite.
- The initial ideological principle of state building is recognition of political freedoms, market economy and equality of all citizens before the law as the only basis of Ukraine's development. It is impossible to create an independent state without democratic principles and then to expect that a neo-totalitarian state will ensure the same living standards as in developed democratic countries.
- Especially important is establishing of effective influential public organizations of democratic orientation in accordance with the principle "who will win?": the etatist post-totalitarian state or democratically oriented civilian society.
- The way out of the economic crisis can be ensured by the government of men obsessed with the same ideas, young professional reformers who reject the experience of administrative management of the economy and

are not afraid of losing power since the source of their certitude in the future is professionalism and not high posts.

- It is impossible to protect people of scanty means in a society where people of scanty means are in majority. As a result of radical economic reforms people of scanty means will constitute the minority receiving support from the well-to-do majority. Until the society consists mainly of people of scanty means they will vote for demagogues promising to protect everyone, which is possible only at the expense of robbing everybody.
- The development of effective institute of multi-party system is critical for establishing an irreversible character of political reforms in Ukraine. Only it can turn negativist opposition attitude dominating in the present-day political consciousness into constructive opposition attitude on the basis of clear differentiation of programmes of political parties and orientations of various electorate groups.

In situation of such atmosphere in whole society and particularly on youth level, that is highly important for the future of any country, the pace and essence of the relation with NATO have a kind of prognostic factors for future direction of whole society development. And in this connection it is worth to describe this area of activity with accent on some more significant directions and details.

As it was decided on the basis of NATO-Ukraine Charter there was created NATO Parliamentary Assembly- Ukrainian Rada Joint Monitoring Group (JMG). The first meeting of JMG took place from 2 to 3 November 2000. The Monitoring Group's purpose is to provide a parliamentary dimension to the NATO-Ukraine Charter - as envisaged in the NATO-Ukraine Charter - and to heighten both parliamentary and public awareness of relationship between NATO and Ukraine. At this first meeting, military and civilian officials from NATO and Ukraine provided an overview of the key areas of co-operation between NATO and Ukraine. This document provides a short summary of the

main themes discussed. They include among other such items as general areas of NATO-Ukraine co-operation, including primarily defence co-operation in context of defence reform in Ukraine, civil emergency planning, and information issue.

As for NATO-Ukraine co-operation, it was drawn the conclusion by the participants on considerable willingness on both sides for co-operation. It was also postulated that in many areas, practical co-operation between NATO and Ukraine is well developed. The NATO-Ukraine Charter signed in 1997 marked a qualitative improvement in co-operation between NATO and Ukraine. One of the most important elements was the "19-plus-one" format for consultation which operates at all levels and facilitates discussion of all aspects of mutual interest. Meetings of that nature had become routine at NATO headquarters.

Co-operation takes place in the frameworks of Partnership for Peace, the NATO-Ukraine Charter, the EAPC, and in peacekeeping operations in the Balkans. Areas of co-operation and discussion include defence reform, doctrine, peace support, armaments, economic issues, civil emergency planning, science, and the environment.

It is significant achievement and prognostic factor that participation in PfP has increased tenfold since 1995 with expert participants in well over 100 activities per year. These included military exercises, training, and education, involving approximately 3000 Ukrainian participants.

A recent highlight in NATO-Ukraine co-operation was Transcarpathia 2000, a disaster relief exercise hosted by Ukraine and the first ever practical EAPC exercise of the Euroatlantic Disaster Response Coordination Centre (EADRCC) and Euroatlantic Disaster Response Unit (EADRU). This was rendered possible by Ukraine's ratification of the Status of Forces Agreement earlier in the year. Regular meetings with experts from other countries help to

produce familiarity with counterparts elsewhere and this aids interoperability. This was demonstrated in the Transcarpathia 2000 exercise that studied how to shorten the intervention time in the case of floods.

In the economic field, although NATO does not have the resources to provide major economic assistance, it can provide expertise, and since the signing of the NATO-Ukraine Charter, there has been extensive dialogue and exchange of experience. Areas covered include economic security, conversion, restructuring, militarily downsizing, retraining retired military personnel and base closures. NATO was also helping to develop economics teaching in the Ukrainian military academy in subjects such as defence planning, programming, and budgeting. Regarding the retraining of officers, scholarships are being awarded to highly motivated officers, and NATO is calling upon the experience of organisations such as the British Council, the Alliance Francaise, and the Goethe Institute to assist with language training. So far 93 officers had received certificates from these institutes and 50 percent of these had obtained jobs.

Concerning issue of defence co-operation and defence reform it should be noted that just these field may be appropriately combined with activity of Ukrainian youth organization of Euro-Atlantic direction. Defence reform emerged as a dominant theme. While there is recognition of the need for reform and acknowledgement of NATO's role in providing training, advice and expertise, the lack of resources severely limits the pace and scale of reform in Ukraine. Both Ukraine and NATO recognize defence reform as being a key area for co-operation. All nations involved in the Cold War have had to deal with defence reform - the abandonment of conscription, military downsizing, adaptation to new roles and missions etc. - and this process is still in progress. The Alliance itself is undergoing a dramatic overhaul, having introduced a new command structure and undergoing a force structure review.

It should be noted in this context that in great part the lack of reform in legacy Soviet-era forces is an obstacle to developing a defence relationship with the West, since doctrine, training, and equipment are all incompatible. For there to be a really close co-operative military relationship, there will have to be reform on both sides. NATO holds very successful meetings at senior level with Ukraine, which has a clear commitment to co-operate on defence reform.

The Partnership Armaments Review Process (PARP) is being used to support Ukrainian plans for defence reform. This review process helps to implement short and mid-term planning, and to set targets tailored to Ukrainian needs. Ukraine had been asked to provide all relevant information on planning targets and this survey is providing data that is useful to both NATO and Ukraine. The focus was put on developing the interoperability of Ukrainian forces that are available for PfP but the process could be expanded to other areas of the Armed Forces. Bearing in mind that about twenty percent of the forces in Kosovo are from partner nations, interoperability is clearly an issue. Ukraine's presence in peacekeeping forces in Kosovo is highly visible and makes a vital contribution to stability. Since 1992, 18,000 Ukrainian members of the armed forces have participated in Balkans peacekeeping missions.

It was emphasized that parliament should insist on being involved in the reform process: military matters should not be dealt with in secret but in the open. Parliament's involvement is needed in order to allocate the necessary resources and to build public support for defence reforms. Parliamentarians must also provide the legal framework for defence reform. And undoubtedly there may be enough room for activity of Ukrainian youth organization in order to cooperate with parliament in such issue and eventually to contribute to its solution.

Ukraine has achieved a great deal since independence. Ukrainian participants pointed out that the number of personnel in the armed forces has been cut from

about 800,000 to about 400,000 in a decade. But the defence establishment still exceeds needs and is too costly. However, additional deep cuts are unaffordable at present, perhaps to 375,000 by the year 2005.

Civilian controls are improving and progress is being made with the defence budget and training. Progress is also being made with English language training - a crucial element for co-operation - although financial resources remained an impediment. Ukrainian military personnel were receiving international training at the NATO Defence College, the Marshall Center, and the military academy in Kiev. Students at Ukraine's defence academy also pay regular visits to SHAPE.

The Charter envisaged setting up an office to coordinate all activities between NATO and Ukraine. This was only now beginning its work with three people in the Ministry of Defence coordinating military co-operation. Ukraine has overcapacity in its defence industrial sector and is keen to pursue armaments co-operation with NATO nations. Ukraine has been frustrated and disappointed at the progress made so far, despite its considerable expertise in some sectors.

Ukrainian participants expressed disappointment at the relative lack of success in arms sales and armaments co-operation, noting that Ukraine should be considered as a potential supplier for new NATO members seeking to up-grade their defence equipment.

As for civil emergency planning, it was concluded that NATO-Ukraine co-operation in civil emergency planning may be described as "exemplary". Co-operation in civil emergency planning has been an integral part of NATO since the very beginning, and at the end of the Cold War NATO decided to try to co-ordinate civil emergency planning for both members and partners. Since 1994 several partners have shown considerable commitment in this field. Accordingly, Ukraine's civil emergency planning staff have an excellent reputation, and the

memorandum of understanding with Ukraine on civil emergency planning is the most detailed that has been signed with any partner. Ukrainian civil emergency planners have absorbed a great deal from the experience of Chernobyl, and this experience is now being shared in fields such as water resources, agriculture, health, medical services, transport, and telecommunications.

In information field of co-operation it was revealed the major progress that has been made over the last year, and NATO has opened its first-ever Information and Documentation Centre. The NATO Information and Documentation Centre (NIDC) was established in Kyiv in 1997 to improve knowledge and understanding between NATO and Ukraine. The Center provides information, research assistance and project support to Ukrainian citizens and organisations on NATO-related topics as well as providing access to NATO documents and publications. A key goal is to ensure that information about NATO is disseminated throughout Ukraine, particularly to the provinces and regional centres. In this context it is worth to note that opinion polls in July 2000 revealed that 43 percent of people in Ukraine had a negative image of NATO, perceiving it as an aggressive Alliance. Fifty percent had no knowledge of its role. However, the evidence indicates that the more people find out about NATO, the more positive they feel towards it.

NATO Information and Documentation Centre is working on several directions to present itself properly in Ukraine. There was a programme to take Ukrainian journalists to Bosnia and Kosovo, and this was helping to change perceptions by demonstrating the practical utility of the Alliance. There was also a great effort to involve the press in the Transcarpathia 2000 exercise. A film about that exercise will be broadcast in on Ukrainian television and this will show an unfamiliar aspect of NATO: its role in civil emergency planning. One of the Ukrainian specialists found that opinion amongst the political elite differs sharply from public opinion. Among the political elite, fewer than 10 percent had negative views of NATO. Polls clearly indicated a public desire for more

information about NATO, and the Information and Documentation Centre in Kiev would certainly help. In this area the involvement of Ukrainian youth organization may be the most urgent and significant as for it contains in its aims the activity promoting the information exchange and shortening the informational gap concerning NATO as well other international organizations dealing with security issues.

The Information Centre has the active support of the Ukrainian government and parliament. It will work on producing publications and on disseminating information via the Internet. A particular focus would be universities and schools, and great efforts are being devoted to developing information that is at the right level for schools.

NATO was right to focus on the regions. Negative attitudes over NATO action against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia arose because a great deal of information in Ukraine comes from Russia. As said one of Ukrainian specialists, Russia dominates Ukrainian "information space". In this context the role of youth organizations in both countries is enormous and undoubtedly their continuous and substantial dialogue may and will greatly and positively contribute to dissemination of relevant information concerning the events in Euro-Atlantic space and their appropriate evaluation. In that respect will be relevant to note the point of one Ukrainian specialists which stressed that the battle for public opinion would be won more easily if pro-NATO groups could point to material benefits from the relationship with NATO.

Thus, the meetings and discussions should be more informative and not in last order due to dialogue on level of youth. While participants on official level agreed that they should meet in Ukraine for further discussions and briefings from Ukrainian military and civilian officials engaged in NATO-Ukraine co-operative activities. It was also agreed that the NATO Parliamentary Assembly

would examine ways of providing advice and expertise on the role of parliaments in defence. Consequently, the NATO Parliamentary Assembly is supporting a series of four Rada Defence and Security Seminars in co-operation with NATO, the Geneva Centre for Democratic Control of the Armed Forces, and the Marshall Centre.

4. Activity of Youth Atlantic Club (YAC) in Russia and Ukrainian Youth Forum of National Council of Ukraine (UYF - NCU) in Ukraine and their potential role in providing required dialogue for the name of mutual understanding in Euro-Atlantic space

In context of complexity and associated problems of realization of special programs on cooperation, mutual understanding and rapprochement the fact of existence of appropriate Youth Atlantic regional organizations in countries under consideration: Russia and the Ukraine (Youth Atlantic Club (YAC) in Russia and Ukrainian Youth Forum of NCU (National Council of Ukraine) in Ukraine, respectively), which pay specific attention to information direction in their work, becomes especially significant.

Youth Atlantic Club (YAC) is a public organizations uniting young specialists in fields of economics, politology, history, law and journalism. Members of YAC are studying in elite institutes and universities of Moscow and other Russian cities or working in important spheres of social life. The same is true for the the Ukrainian Youth Forum (UYF) of NCU. Both of these structures are substantially conformed in their objectives, priorities in work, methods and organizational grounds to the corresponding principles of Youth Atlantic Treaty Association (YATA). Primarily it is correct for that element of YATA activity which refers to its aim “to educate and inform the public concerning aims and goals of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; conduct research in the various purpose and activities related to that Organization; promote a spirit of solidarity among the people”.

YAC as well UYF of NCU were established as specific responses to challenge of situation in both Russia, and Ukraine connected with great transformations which took place in past decade in these countries in all fields of life. Additionally to economic difficulties there are also big problems in the mentality of people, who have rather strong stereotypes. In modern world these stereotypes are very absurd and do not help Russia and Ukraine as individual countries of the former USSR to enter the Democratic Community and to participate in the creation of Modern Architecture of Security. One of the big barriers preventing an understanding of international political and security processes on the level of ordinary people is, among others, considerable dearth of information concerning such issues. In this context it is worthy to mention that, unfortunately, transition from a planned economy to a market economy increases nationalism and xenophobia and it is true for both particular countries. Moreover, this increase is in inverse proportion to the effective control of the process on the part of political institutions. Consequently, information activity of Youth Atlantic Organization including Russian and Ukrainian ones may be very urgent and appropriate. That is one reason to consider the creation of Youth Atlantic Club in Russia and UYF of NCU in Ukraine as very timely and useful processes.

The main aims of YAC, as well as of corresponding Ukrainian youth counterpart, activity are:

1. To stimulate the progress of studies, connected with the developing of investigations, concerning the problems of organisation and functioning of collective security systems. They accent pimarily on the role of NATO and also other important in this field organizations (OSCE, Council of Europe, WEU, etc.), their principles and forms of activity.
2. To increase the level of knowledge of the modern principles of security's architecture, systems and structures of collective security and

to promote the broad distribution of objective information in both countries on various layers of people, including regional population.

3. To coordinate scientific efforts in such fields, including the exchange of results between analogical organizations and institutions.

4. To increase the level of knowledge of young specialists in the issues of collective security by organising of special courses, seminars, conferences, round tables, excursions and stages.

The main ways of YAC's and of corresponding Ukrainian youth counterpart's exercising activity are the following:

1. Organising and conducting of Russian and international conferences, symposiums, seminars and round tables devoted to various aspects of establishing and functioning of the collective security systems.

2. Establishing of contacts with the partner organisations of Youth Atlantic Treaty Association (YATA), conducting the joint projects concerning urgent problems.

3. Preparing of special materials for mass-media, connecting with different aspects of structures and systems of collective security, including NGOs and their places in the system of international organizations.

5. Publishing and spreading of special Information Bulletin, devoted to the documents and materials serving in the Documentation and Information Centre and urgent events in the security issues. Preparing of documental/informational films and other videomaterials, concerning NATO's activity and various aspects of European and international security.

5. General conclusion on the role of contacts between two selected Youth organizations – Russian and Ukrainian – in maintenance of required dialogue in the Framework of Euro-Atlantic Cooperation

Nowadays when the Cooperation and Dialogue became the main values in collaboration between different international NGOs (especially youth), everyone can be sure that cooperation between Youth Atlantic Organizations of Russia and Ukraine is establishing on the basis of respecting the ideals of Democracy in the name of Security and Stability in Eastern European region. The basis of such cooperation is sharing the same values which turns into practical realization like organizing and carrying out of seminars and conferences which could help youth of two countries to overcome stereotypes and information depth. Actually, earlier these activities concerned such themes like Problem of Black Sea Fleet, Problem of Russian-speaking people in Crimea, National conflicts in Ukraine and Russia. Nowadays we can assume that the problems of International terrorism, Environmental Security, Economic Security (money laundering, etc.), Drugs and xenophobia among European youth became much urgent among other security problems. It demonstrates that youth of our countries eager to overcome stereotypes in thinking between Ukraine and Russia and starts to think globally and try to solve same Security problems as their youth colleagues from European states try to dissolve. In the nearest future could be realized projects between youth of Russia, Ukraine and Poland. It will be devoted to the discussion of the modern security problems and place of international organizations as NATO, OSCE and UN in this field. There are some role games and seminars on Peacekeeping and natural disaster prevention operations in plans. These could be realized with the assistance of military experts from Russia, Ukraine and NATO in different towns of Ukraine and Russia. Still in great demand among youth of two countries discussions on the theme of Youth and Army and the experience of NATO countries. We are planning to organize some meetings on this subject in the nearest future.

Another project is the conference on security in the Black Sea and Caucasus Region together with the youth NGOs of Moldova, Georgia, Armenia and Azerbaijan. The participation of delegates from countries members would be desirable. There would be discussed a lot of regional and specific youth problems.

Our Youth Atlantic partner organization have a lot of plans and its realization would depend on desire of youth of our countries to live in stable, secure and peaceful United Europe, where dialogue and mutual understanding are the main imperatives of our modern life. Russian and Ukrainian official authorities, political and scientific elites and experts put their efforts to create appropriate architecture of European security and to promote collaboration with the main international and European organizations as NATO, OSCE and other IGOs and NGOs, to build the bridges of understanding with the countries of Europe. As for members of our Youth Atlantic organizations, they would like to do the same on their youth level.

In conclusion, I would like to express my gratitude to NATO-EAPS Fellowships Program as for this work was done exclusively due to its support.

LIST OF LITERATURE

1. "NATO Washington Summit (23-25 April 1999) Guidebook" (1999), pp. 19-20;
2. "NATO Handbook", 50th Anniversary Edition, (1998-1999, Brussels), pp. 97-103;
3. O. Kolobov "Russia-USA-NATO: Dynamics Of Modern Relations" (2000, Nizhni Novgorod), pp. 116-127;
4. D. Danilov, A. Moshes "Structurization Of The Security Space In The West And East Of Europe" (2000, Moscow), pp. 82-91;
5. D. Trenin "Russia-NATO Relations: Time To Pick Up The Pieces", *NATO Review (spring-summer 2000)*, p. 19;
6. I. Kharchenko "The New Ukraine-NATO Partnership", *NATO Review (September- October 1997)*, pp. 27-28;
7. E. Zadorozhniuk "Dynamics Of "Special Relations" NATO-Ukraine", *Documents Of The International Conference "The First Anniversary Of the NATO – Russia Founding Act: Appraisal And Outlook", (19-20 June 1999, Moscow)*, (1999, Moscow), pp. 242-247;
8. A. Moshes "Ukraine in the Black Sea Region", *Europe And Russia: Problems Of South*, (2000, Moscow), pp. 247-249;
9. V. Sekachev "Regional Factor In The Social Political Life Of Ukraine", *Europe And Russia: Problems Of South*, (2000, Moscow), pp. 264-268;
10. "Monitoring Ukraine's Foreign And Security Policy", *Report Of The Ukrainian Center For Peace, Conversion And Conflict Studies*, (1998, Kyiv), pp. 12-15;

11. B. Parakhonsky "Ukraine 2000 And Beyond: Geopolitical Priorities And Scenarios Of Development", (2001, Kyiv), pp. 98-101;
12. V. Baranovsky (ed.) "Russia And Europe: The Emerging Security Agenda" (Oxford University Press For SIPRI, 1998), pp. 530-531