Andris Spruds
Riga Stradina University
Riga, Latvia

NATO Individual Research Fellowship, Abstract of Final Report

MINORITY ISSUES IN THE BALTIC STATES IN THE CONTEXT OF THE NATO ENLARGEMENT

After the restoration of the Baltic independence in 1991, the Latvian and Estonian legislatures, contrary to Lithuania, introduced a restrictive citizenship legislation which deprived a considerable number of Russian-speaking population in both countries from participation in decision-making. The question of citizenship, which has become central in defining minority status, has caused certain tensions not only in domestic politics but also in interstate relations, as well as it has become an important issue in the context of NATO enlargement and Baltic integration into the western structures, in general.

Internal and external developments affect the citizenship and minority policies. The expansion of western organisations, membership of which has become priority of the Baltic countries, can play a considerable role in dealing with minorities, in general, and defining citizenship legislation, in particular. Therefore, this research paper tests the following hypothesis: NATO enlargement is a strong factor in promoting observance of minority rights and adoption of more inclusive citizenship legislation in the two Baltic states, Latvia and Estonia.

After analysing domestic factors, revealing the role of international and regional organisations, and particularly NATO, in protecting minorities and defining citizenship legislation in the Baltic countries and assessing Russian factor, the advanced hypothesis is considered to be confirmed. The prospective NATO membership and NATO requirements to solve inter-ethnic problems have considerably contributed to the adoption of more inclusive citizenship legislation in both Latvia and Estonia. However, additional conclusions are made, which means that the confirmed hypothesis is complemented by caveats.

First, modifications to the initial Latvian and Estonian citizenship legislation have been so far only modest. The problem of considerable number of Russian-speaking population being non-citizens in Latvia and Estonia remains. Second, NATO enlargement is a complex process paralleled with other processes and it is difficult to attribute all changes in citizenship to NATO expansion. Third, observance of minority rights is only one of the several requirements candidate countries should meet and arguably, some political factors, for instance Russian factor, is even more important in defining enlargement. Fourth, in Baltic case Russia's position should be taken into consideration. Russian-Baltic bilateral relations as well as Russian-NATO relations have an impact on and concomitantly are influenced by NATO-Baltic relations. The interaction of these bilateral relationships affects also status of Russian-speaking population in the Baltic states, especially in Latvia and Estonia.

Future developments in citizenship and minority policy largely depend on the will of political elite. External factors, especially NATO and EU expansion, will, however, influence these decisions enormously. Thus, prospective, and not delayed, NATO enlargement will have a favourable impact on minority issues not only in the Baltic, but in Europe, in general.

Andris Spruds
Riga Stradina University
Riga, Latvia

NATO Individual Research Fellowship, Final Report

MINORITY ISSUES IN THE BALTIC STATES IN THE CONTEXT OF THE NATO ENLARGEMENT

I. INTRODUCTION

Inter-ethnic relations and minority rights are among the most controversial, debated and problematic issues in the post-Soviet area. The citizenship legislation alongside education, cultural and official state language policy constitutes the legal framework for inter-ethnic relations and minority status. The way, in which these issues are tackled, will have a strong impact for the whole European security structure. A balanced and realistic approach to minority issues is even more significant and necessary in the context of changing security paradigms and establishing new principles of domestic and interstate co-existence and interaction. Together with other processes, NATO enlargement plays a substantial role in defining new approaches and policies in Europe on both domestic and interstate levels. Expansion of NATO shapes the new system of relations by concurrently adding to the complexity of prospective developments and strengthening mutual interaction of various state and non-state actors.

After the restoration of the Baltic independence in 1991, the Latvian and Estonian legislatures, contrary to Lithuania, introduced a restrictive citizenship legislation which deprived a considerable number of Russian-speaking population in both countries from participation in decision-making. Thus, the citizenship legislation has become one of the most important and central factors in determining Russian-speaking minority status in the Latvia and Estonia. The question of citizenship has caused certain tensions not only in domestic politics but also in interstate relations, as well as it has become an important issue in the context of NATO enlargement and Baltic integration into the western structures, in general. This strongly points to necessity to make a thorough analysis of the citizenship legislation and factors that have led to its current contours or might influence in these two Baltic countries in the following years.

The citizenship regulations and Russian-speaking population status in Latvia and Estonia are not solely an outcome of governmental policy. Various internal and

external developments affect the citizenship and other minority related aspects. The expansion of western organisations, membership of which has become priority of the Baltic countries, can play a considerable role in dealing with minorities, in general, and defining citizenship legislation, in particular. NATO membership, which was officially opened for the Central and East European countries in the middle of the 1990s, requires among other criteria observance of minority rights. This, in turn, may lead to certain changes in the domestic politics of the candidate countries. Therefore, this research paper is intended to test the following **hypothesis**: NATO enlargement is a strong factor in promoting observance of minority rights and adoption of more inclusive citizenship legislation in the two Baltic states, Latvia and Estonia.

In order to confirm of refute this hypothesis, several questions should be posed and answered. First, what are the domestic factors that have determined the shape of the original citizenship legislation and later amendments in Latvia and Estonia? Second, what are the role of international and regional organisations, and particularly NATO, in protecting minorities and defining citizenship legislation in the Baltic countries? Third, what has been the position of Russia towards NATO enlargement, the Baltic states, their security concerns and aspirations to become NATO members? How has Russia perceived Latvian and Estonian policies with respect to the Russian-speaking population in these countries? The following sections of this paper will address these questions consecutively. While this paper endeavours to grasp the whole Baltic milieu, minority policy and, particularly, citizenship policy in Latvia in the context of the NATO enlargement is the focal point of this research. As already revealed, analysis on the minority issues in Latvia and Estonia primarily will pertain to the status of the Russian-speaking population, the term that encompasses different nationalities, including Russians, Ukrainians and Belorussians, and communicate predominantly in Russian language. Before engaging in the process of thorough evidence assessment and analysis, a concise theoretical perspective of the research are to be outlined.

Theoretical perspective

Sovereign countries possess the formal right to decide upon and implement their domestic policies.[1] This is relevant also with respect to minority and citizenship policies. Although international institutions increasingly influence domestic discourses on these issues, policy implementation usually is still led by national elites,

which at the same time normally seek for domestic public approval. Thus, perceptions held by society and the interests of the Baltic political elites may be put forward as two major aspects that determine legislation and decision-making on the national level. As Max Weber has argued, "Not ideas, but material and ideal interests, directly govern men's conduct. Yet very frequently the 'world images' that have been created by ideas have, like switchmen, determined the tracks along which action has been pushed by the dynamic of interest."[2] Barry Buzan points out that amity and enmity patterns, which are mostly shaped by historical dynamics, can have a durable impact on relationship between the countries.[3] This also can be applied to relations between various groups within the country, especially taking into account that some of these groups are, to a certain extent, linked to other countries. In the case of the Baltic countries, one may speak about formation of perceptions within the Brubaker's triadic nexus between the nationalising states, national minorities and national kin states.[4]

The interests of the political elites of states are significant. The elites are in a strong position not only to channel perceptions into domestic and interstate relations, but also deliberately or unintentionally to shape, manipulate and even create them. In the context of post-communist transitions when decision-making institutions are underdeveloped, the elite is tempted to use foreign policy for domestic goals, such as to shape the nation's identity and mobilize for reforms and state-building tasks. As Rogers Brubaker has stated, "Soviet and post-Soviet "national struggles" were and are not the struggles of nations, but the struggles of institutionally constituted national elites- that is elites institutionally defined as national- and aspiring counter-elites." According to him, "dominant elites…[of] new states, ethnically heterogeneous yet conceived as nation states promote (to varying degrees and in varying manners) the language, culture, demographic position, economic flourishing, and political hegemony of the nominally state-bearing nation."[5] Furthermore, according to Ole Norgaard, small elites were able to take advantage of the structural vacuum when, "old communist elites were discredited but developed interest groups were few, fragmented and disorganised." He states, therefore, that, "Rather, it is the social forces which are structured by the state. The decisions of a few individuals at the apex of the formal power structure can reflect their personal prejudices and idiosyncrasies, but at the same time lead to the formation of institutions having a profound influence on the future power configurations and policies." According to him, the new institutions created by small elites under the conditions of the transitional period "will gradually

produce their own social and economic basis, as happened to the institutions of the communist systems when they were installed."[6] This has been underlined and complemented also by Douglas North. He has argued that when individuals as well as institutions settle in the new institutional and societal framework, "the network externalities, the learning process of organisations, and the historically derived subjective modelling of the issues reinforce the course."[7]

Having indicated importance of the domestic perceptions and interests in defining and implementing state's policies, however, it is necessary to point to increasing complexity of decision-making, intensive interaction of internal and external dimensions and growing importance of international institutions under conditions of rapid globalisation.[8] International bodies are willing and increasingly ready to intervene in domestic politics, especially on such issues as minority and citizenship policies. They influence policy definition as well as implementation. Such interventions can not alter dramatically and immediately state policies, but can tip the power balances of domestic political forces and direct the prospective decision-making. Robert Putnam has pointed to the "two-level game" that reveals close relationship between the domestic and international variables and processes. Governments have to modify their policies and priorities according to both external and internal needs and requirements. Moreover, international system is increasingly intervening into the domestic political environment.[9]

II. BALTIC CITIZENSHIP LEGISLATION

As stated above, among various aspects influencing minority status in the Baltic states, citizenship legislation arguably has been the most important. Lithuania chose the so-called zero option that granted citizenship to all permanent residents of Lithuania regardless nationality. Latvia and Estonia decided to introduce more restrictive citizenship legislation, based on the principle of legal continuity of the citizenship status from the inter-war independent republics. What have been the provisions of the citizenship in Latvia as well as in Estonia, what domestic factors have caused such policy and what are the rationale behind gradual liberalisation of citizenship legislation in the both Baltic republics? This section will analyse these questions, in order to establish the basis for the following analysis of external influences on domestic politics, minority issues and citizenship, in particular.

Legal dimension of citizenship

The Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Latvia passed a resolution "On the Restoration of the Rights of Citizens of the Republic of Latvia and the Basic Regulations for Naturalisation" on 15 October 1991. The resolution granted automatic citizenship to all citizens of pre-war Latvia and their direct descendants regardless of ethnicity. The Supreme Council neither enacted a Citizenship Law nor defined a naturalisation procedure. The legislature decided that it lacked the necessary authority to deal with such an important question.[10] This decision differed from the principles incorporated into the Treaty signed between Latvia and RSFSR on 13 January 1991. The Treaty, in which Russia recognised Latvia as a sovereign country, among other issues, also provided for the prospective granting citizenship to all permanent residents in Latvia. Although Latvia ratified the Treaty on 14 January 1991, Russia, however, never ratified it.

It took almost three years to enact the law "On Citizenship", which provided a procedure for obtaining citizenship. Initially the legislature passed a law which envisaged a quota system which would allow only 0.1% of non-citizens to be naturalised each year. After the involvement of international organisations and the Latvian President, the quota system was abandoned and the so-called "window system" was introduced. The "window system" meant that persons from different age groups could start to apply in different years. The "window system" began to work in 1996 and was intended to end in 2003.[11] The law stipulated that citizenship can be obtained by persons "whose place of permanent residence, on the submission date of their application for naturalisation, has been in Latvia for no less than five-years term counting from May 4, 1990," and who pass a Latvian language test, and who demonstrate knowledge of Latvian history, the national anthem and basic principles of the Constitution and the Constitutional Law "Rights and Obligations of a Citizen and a Person."[12] Restrictions on naturalisation are applied to persons who acted against Latvian independence, propagated fascist, chauvinist, national-socialist, communist or other totalitarian ideas, former employees of the KGB and security services, retired officers of the USSR Armed Forces. Restrictions relate also to persons who have been convicted to imprisonment for a term exceeding one year for an intentional crime.[13]

As result of this legislation, the majority of Russian speaking population (more than 60% of Russian speaking-residents) was deprived of citizenship. In 1995 there were 740,231 non-citizens out of 2,516,517 total residents that constituted 29.4% of

population. About 97% of non-citizens were of non-titular nationality, mainly Russians, Belarussians and Ukrainians.[14]

On 22 June 1998 the Latvian Parliament passed amendments which granted citizenship to all children of stateless persons and non-citizens born in Latvia after 21 August 1991.[15] Thus, 18.400 children (2.7% of non-citizens) can be granted Latvian citizenship.[16] At the same time, the so-called "window system" was abandoned and the majority of non-citizens obtained the right to naturalisation. However, these amendments did not come into effect immediately because a certain number of the members of the Parliament objected to the amendments and voted for gathering the signatures of the voters in order to convene a referendum on this issue.[17] The necessary 10% of signatures of all citizens were gathered and a referendum was held alongside parliamentary elections on 3 October 1998. 53% of voters endorsed the amendments passed by the legislature on 22 June 1998 and they came into effect.[18]

Estonian citizenship legislation basically has been similar with some minor differences in naturalisation procedures, some law provisions and rights of non-citizens. The non-citizens have been eligible to participate in local elections, which is not the case in Latvia. Amendments to the Estonian citizenship legislation were taken at the end of 1998, which provided citizenship to children of non-citizens born after Estonia regained its independence.

Domestic factors of citizenship legislation

The citizenship regulations enacted by the Latvian parliament in October 1991, the Citizenship Law of June 1994, followed by the 1995 and 1997 amendments were all rather restrictive in nature. Furthermore, even the debate surrounding the issue of Latvian citizenship among different Latvian political groups was rather limited until 1997. Several domestic factors in terms of perceptions and elite interests determined this situation.

The demographic situation played an important role in adopting a restrictive citizenship legislation in Latvia and Estonia. In the USSR Latvians and Estonians were the smallest among fifteen nationalities that nominally had their own republics, by constituting 0.5% and 0.4% of the total population, respectively.[19] More importantly, the 1989 census revealed that the share of the titular population in Estonia and Latvia dropped from 88% and 75.5% in 1935 to 62% and 52% in 1989, respectively.[20] Given comparatively unfavourable demographic tendencies among

Latvians, the figures suggest that Latvians were about to become a minority in their own republic. This situation promoted rather unenthusiastic approach among a considerable number of the Balts towards co-existence with Russian-speaking population. This was reflected by Visvaldis Lacis of Latvian National Independence Movement, who stated that, "in my party, we want the Russians to leave because otherwise, how will we be able to live in an independent Latvia where only 50% of the population are Latvians? We would be subjected to permanent biological war, and if their birth rate is higher, then we would be threatened with extinction."[21]

The perceptions of demographic threat to the national survival were strengthened by historical experiences that largely contributed to the formation of feelings of victimisation and deeply entrenched national grievances within the Baltic societies. The country's occupation by the Red Army in 1940 was followed by the ruthless deportations that took place in 1940-41 and 1949. The central authorities in Moscow eliminated the national dissent and prohibited national symbols, such as the national flag and anthem. Traditional agricultural modes were substituted by forced collectivisation. Extensive migration from other republics, in turn, strengthened the gradual re-enforcement of the Russian language and created an unfavourable demographic situation in the country. These were the factors that formed deeply entrenched national grievances and feelings of victimisation. As Romualdas J. Misiunas has expressed it, "Their Soviet experience unmistakably colours the contemporary national identities of the three Baltic peoples and affects the formulation of their internal as well as external policies."[22] The then Latvian Foreign Minister, Georgs Andrejevs expressed it directly on 18 April 1993 in a letter to Max van der Stoel: "...the current situation in Latvia...is a consequence of the long years which Latvia suffered under Soviet occupation."[23] This was a historically conditioned Russo-centric assertion of identity. Latvians, and Estonians as well as arguably also Lithuanians, strongly believed that they had been victims of the Soviet rule and Russian-speaking population bore most of the responsibility for this. Soviet practices were inexorably linked to Russia and Russian-speaking population. The activities of non-Latvians in Latvia during the late Soviet era were also perceived in an unfavourable light. Russian-speaking people were considered as opponents rather than supporters of an independent Latvian state. Moreover, Russian-speaking minority was perceived as a potential instrument for Russia to exert its influence on the new state. Georgs Andrejevs expressed the deeply entrenched anxiety of a considerable part of

the Baltic people regarding Russians on both sides of the Baltic-Russian border. He stated that "Russia, by using [her diaspora] as a fifth column…is seeking to create a situation enabling forces which are not Latvian to come to power and to annex Latvia to Russia."[24]

Perceptions of nation and state largely derived from the above mentioned beliefs. An ethnically defined nation-state was considered the only possibility for the survival of Latvian and Estonian culture, language and nation itself. Thus, the adopted citizenship legislations meant to be a continuation of the pre-war legislation and a means to minimise the Soviet legacy and ensure the independence of the state.

Interests of political elite also have been important in defining the citizenship legislation and the prospective role of minorities. After the resumption of independence, the Latvian political elite set itself a twofold task: to ensure its dominant position in the country and to establish new forms of political and social life. A potential collusion of political interests was obvious from the outset of Latvian independence. Given the high proportion of Russian speaking people, granting citizenship rights to them would lead to a high proportion of representatives of this group in the Latvian legislature. This, in turn, would limit representation of the Latvian national elite in the parliament, and would therefore reduce their influence on decision making. The last elections, in which all permanent residents of the republic could vote, were held in 1990. Of the 200 members of the Supreme Soviet of the Latvian SSR, Latvians constituted 69%, Russians 22.4% and others (mostly Russian speakers) 8.6%.[25]

A foreboding of future political confrontations existed in the heated debate over the declaration of Latvian independence that included renaming the Latvia's SSR for Republic of Latvia, the restoration of the general provisions of the 1922 Constitution and the initiation of a transitional period towards complete independence. On May 4, 1990, supporters of independence gathered 138 votes which was slightly over the two-thirds (134) required to alter the Constitution of Latvia SSR.[26] It should be mentioned that a considerable part of the non-Latvian electorate voted for ethnically Latvian candidates and the vote in the legislature was not clearly divided alongside ethnical lines. Yet, the general pattern was that most Latvians voted for Latvian candidates whose majority eventually supported the declaration. In turn, opposition to the declaration came mostly from the part of Russian speaking deputies who were elected with votes of the non-Latvian electorate. A restrictive citizenship

policy allowed the Latvian national elite to unequivocally become dominant in the decision-making process.

Furthermore, introducing a restrictive citizenship policy was accompanied by proclaiming Latvia a nation-state and strengthening Latvian nationalism. It helped the Latvian, and similarly Estonian, political elite to mobilise the population and deal with difficult tasks, such as establishing new forms of political and social life, and defining external relations with other states. As Neil Melvin has argued with regard to the post-Soviet republics, "it is primarily elites that have sought to influence the evolution of the new states and that have therefore played the key role in the development of nationalist forms of politics. Nationalism has provided the post-Soviet elites with their political discourse, framework for action, and justification for developing the apparatus of the state."[27] In this respect, Latvian politicians actively promoted a concept of a mono-ethnic nation-state. Valdis Birkavs, the former Prime and Foreign minister, stressed in early 1993 that, "the creation of a two-community state rather than a nation-state will entail the introduction of a second state language, of equal political rights, and ....the possibility of dual citizenship in the future... This is no way acceptable to the Latvians."[28] As Pal Kolsto and Boris Tsilevich have indicated this statement reveals that the concept of a nation-state has been equated to that of a one-community state. According to these authors, this notion was clearly underpinned by Birkavs' position expressed to the daily newspaper *Diena* in July 1993: "We see Latvia as one community nation-state with the right of cultural autonomy for traditional minorities."[29] The idea of a nation-state propagated and eventually institutionalised by the Latvian political elite helped not only to create new forms of political and social life but also to mobilise a generally supportive Latvian population across socio-economic divides. Additionally, the protracted debate between Latvia and Russia over Russian troop withdrawals from Latvia also had a mobilising, further strengthening support a nation-state built on a restrictive citizenship.

Towards integration of society

At the beginning of 1997, the Latvian party For Fatherland and Freedom failed to gather enough signatures to hold a referendum in order to introduce further restrictions in the Citizenship Law. In April 1997, the Latvian President Guntis Ulmanis launched a discussion about the need to integrate society. At the end of the

same year the amendments to the citizenship law were proposed and debated. In October 1998, the Latvian population endorsed in a referendum the shortly before enacted amendments which eased the naturalisation procedure to obtain citizenship.

Several domestic factors played a certain role in altering perceptions among Latvians, as well as Estonians, in the middle of 1990's. The initial concerns of national and cultural extinction have waned. Several hundred thousand of Russian-speaking residents had left the Baltic countries that compounded with a more negative natural growth among the Russian-speaking population, has led to an increase of Latvian and Estonian shares in their countries. According to the 2000 census, in Latvia Latvians constituted 57.6% of the total population while Latvian language as native was indicated by 62% of all residents.[30] Moreover, economic rather than political or national issues gradually were becoming priorities of the native population in the Baltic states and the citizenship issue began to lose its previously appealing status. The initially rather reserved stance towards the Soviet time immigrants began to change. That part of the population who wanted Russians to leave came to terms with the reality that most Russians would not leave. These changing attitudes of the Latvian citizens were revealed by a survey within the programme for studies and activities "Towards a Civic Society" implemented at the end of 1997. The survey indicated that 79% of citizens-Latvians (94% of citizens-Russians) fully or rather agreed with the idea that citizenship should be granted to children of non-citizens and stateless persons born in independent Latvia. 42% of citizens-Latvians (70% citizens-Russians) supported the idea that all who wish, should be allowed to acquire citizenship through naturalisation, thereby supporting abandoning of the "window system".[31]

The Latvian political elite, in turn, had secured its dominant position in the 1993 and 1995 legislatures. In 1995 ethnic Latvians constituted almost 80% of Latvia's citizenry. Furthermore, their political activity was higher than that of non-Latvians. As a result, only 10% of the Saeima deputies, elected in 1995, were non-Latvians.[32] Thus, at this stage the political struggle between Latvian political groups became more conspicuous and actual. Moreover, this happened in the context of decreasing popular interest in politics and increasing concern over economic issues. The parties, which arguably may be defined as nationalist, were gradually loosing their popularity within society and their previously stated goal of building a nation-state was partly replaced by aspiration for welfare. In elections to the Saeima in 1995,

nine political groups overcame the threshold of 5%. Three of them, which were rather nationally oriented, collected 33% of vote.[33] In the 1998 pre-election campaign nine political groups among twenty-one referred directly or indirectly to "Latvian Latvia" as one of the most important priorities to fulfil.[34] Yet only one party of these (TB/LNNK) passed the 5% barrier obtaining 17 seats in the Parliament. Other national parties, even altogether taken, did not gathered 5%. Parties, which emphasised economic development as well as the integration of society, became increasingly popular.

Moreover, Latvian political elites had also to make steps towards integration because the nation-building process and consolidation of the state structures was, to a certain extent, accomplished and now more inclusive policies were demanded by the need to face concerns over prospective reality of the two community state. The Russian-speaking population's majority was becoming gradually apathetic and sometimes negative towards the Latvian state. Their reluctance to naturalise arguably revealed their disappointment with citizenship regulations. Before the amendments to the Citizenship Law came into effect about 148,000 of Latvia's non-citizens could apply for naturalisation. Yet, between February 1995 and 31 August 1998 only 11.200 non-citizens applied and citizenship was granted to 10,262 persons (7% of those eligible).[35] The original idea behind the "window system" was supposedly to ensure a smooth pace of naturalisation and to avoid overloading state institutions with too many applications. In reality, the state institutions that was dealing with the administration of the naturalisation, such as Naturalisation Board, had to reduce the number of its personnel due to lack of applications. This situation revealed the necessity to deal with a mass of non-citizens who became more of a liability than an asset for the Latvian political elite.

The concept of a nation-state has gradually been superseded by official support for integration. At the end of 1998 the Latvian government approved and decided to submit for public discussion the Framework Document for a National Programme "The integration of Society in Latvia." The programme indicated that, "Latvia has never been an ethnically homogenous country. Society must take into account the current situation and future prospects....Latvia is a democratic, national state in which every resident, the Latvian nation, and each national minority has the right to preserve their own national identity."[36] In 1999, the Integration programme was elaborated and approved.

The later developments have, to a certain extent, attested to the notion that society in Latvia is moving in the direction of compromise and stability. The March 1998 events, when the predominantly Russian-speaking pensioners were dispersed by the police in Riga, caused public outrage in Russia and underlined the fragility of Latvian-Russian inter-state relations. However, the situation in Latvia remained generally stable. It is not paradoxical that "integration of society" has become a key word for both citizens and non-citizens alike. The number of applications for naturalisation has grown considerably after the entry into force of the amendments of the Citizenship Law on 10 November 1998.

In Estonia, similar processes have taken place and, in some instances, tendency towards more inclusive policy can be revealed earlier than in Latvia. Already at the end of 1993, Estonian President Lenart Meri established the Roundtable on Minorities in order to facilitate inter-ethnic understanding. Estonia also removed the language requirements for local election candidates and modified its controversial 1993 Aliens Law.

Discussions on the integration of society in the both Baltic countries remain significant in the mass media, within political elites, among experts and representatives of different nationalities. Although opinions diverge with respect to the ultimate goals of integration, its elements and, in particular, the means of integrating society, the overwhelming majority of those who have expressed their position have supported the need for finding consensus on the integration of society.

To sum up, the decision to construct a restrictive nation state, thereby alienating a considerable number of non-Latvians and non-Estonians, was not surprising given the desire of the national elites to ensure a dominant position and to establish new forms of political and social life. This approach had emotional resonance within Baltic society, and was strengthened by historical, socio-economic and political perceptions of this society and national elites. With changing domestic environment and political and economic needs, certain changes occurred also in the domain of minorities and citizenship. Outside influences also played a certain role in the citizenship debate among which western countries and organisations and Russia were important factors in shaping the citizenship issues and minority status in the Baltic states.

III. NATO MEMBERSHIP AND MINORITY ISSUES

In January 1994, the leaders of the NATO states made the decision to open the Trans-Atlantic organisation to membership of other European countries that would be in a position to fulfil the principles of the Washington Treaty and to strengthen security in Euro-Atlantic space. Shortly afterwards, the three Baltic countries, alongside with other Central and East European countries, began to pursue their quest for the membership in Alliance. In addition, the preparation of the Baltic states for the NATO membership is occurring simultaneously with integration into and co-operation with other regional and international institutions. Particularly, the prospective membership European Union is considered to be one of the most important goals of the Baltic countries. The major questions to answer here pertain to the driving rationale behind the Baltic quest for NATO membership, requirements to be met, particularly in the area of minority rights and their discernible influence on domestic politics.

Baltic NATO aspirations

In the middle of the 1990s, all three Baltic countries submitted their applications for membership of the NATO as well as European Union. Baltic NATO aspirations are closely linked to Baltic perceptions about their place in European structures as well as security providers and insecurity sources. On the one hand, Baltic nations have perceived themselves as integral part of the Western civilisation, from which they were pulled out forcefully by the Soviet occupation. Hence, NATO as well as NATO membership became logical continuation of Baltic perceptions about their traditional cultural, political and economic place in Europe. On the other hand, the historically revealed vulnerability, the Soviet legacy of threat perceptions and predicaments faced at the initial stage of statehood also promoted a thorough attentiveness to the security issues in the Baltic states. While Russian factor will be discussed thoroughly in the following section, it must be noted here that these insecurity feelings largely stemmed from the perception of Russian inclinations and experience of Russian-Baltic relations.[37]

The political elite has enthusiastically promoted the idea of the Baltic NATO membership since the middle of the 1990's. As the spokesman of the Latvian Ministry of Foreign Affairs stated in 1996: "Latvia does not see any alternative to full-fledged membership in NATO."[38] This view has been shared by all three Baltic nations.

Especially it has become conspicuous after the Washington NATO Summit in April 1999 when Latvia, Estonia and Lithuania were named as NATO candidate countries.

Although push for NATO membership has been largely promoted by political elites, according to public surveys, the support has been considerable and increasing to prospective NATO membership among ordinary residents. Before the Washington meeting, 46.8% of Latvian residents supported Latvia's membership in the Alliance, while immediately after the Summit in August 1999, public support reached 53.1%. Thus, aspirations for NATO membership, which are strongly driven by political elite, are also shared among titular population even more than EU membership. However, it must be noted that there were rather considerable differences between Latvian and Russian-speaking population. In August 1999, according to the survey 68.1% of Latvians supported the aspirations to become NATO members as soon as possible, while among non-Latvians this proportion was only 34.7% with 54.2% disagreeing with NATO drive.[39]

NATO membership requirements

Most of the international organisations have requirements to meet. This is particularly relevant with respect to the defence alliance, NATO. In order to join the Washington Treaty, the candidate countries are required to meet several conditions that range from rather technical to those necessitating the applicant states to implement political and economic adjustments. Army command and communication systems must be gradually adjusted to the NATO standards. The candidate countries must be ready to devote certain proportion of GDP to defence budget. The budget itself as well as planning systems should be transparent. In political terms, the candidate countries must have developed a strong basis for democracy before they become the NATO members.[40]

The prospective allies also must have solved all inter-ethnic disputes and disagreements with other countries over the territories. NATO expects that the applicant countries would solve such kind of problems in peaceful manner according to the principles of the Organisation for Security and Development in Europe. This points to co-operation of different European institutions and also reveals that NATO, in fact, is prepared to delegate monitoring and assessment of minority situation to other institutions, above all to the OSCE and Council of Europe. It is possible to discern, to some extent, "division of labour" between Trans-Atlantic organisations.

The NATO and EU provide sources of military training, assistance in planning, economic support whereas OSCE and Council of Europe have developed mechanisms for minority protection, promotion of international law and conflict prevention. Nevertheless these difference, there exists a certain European minority rights regime, which is shared by almost all West European states and increasingly is being introduced in the EU and NATO candidate countries.[41]

External integration and domestic adjustments

In order to "return to Europe" the Baltic governments perceived integration into European structures as one of its most important tasks after re-establishing the sovereignty. At the beginning of Baltic independence, however, the impact of Baltic relations with Europe was rather limited on minority issues, in particular citizenship legislation. The situation began to change in 1992 largely because of the objections made by Russia and by Latvia's Russian-speaking population to the implemented restrictive citizenship policy. European institutions, primarily CSCE and Council of Europe, played a certain role in the formation of the Citizenship Law. The CSCE long term mission, which was established in Riga on 19 November 1993, and the High Commissioner on National Minorities urged Latvian parliament to set up clear regulations for obtaining citizenship. Van der Stoel warned that, "...within the community of CSCE states, the solution of the citizenship issues is seen as being closely connected with democratic principles. If the overwhelming majority of non-Latvians in your country is denied the right to become citizens, and consequently the right to be involved in key decisions concerning their own interests, the character of the democratic system in Latvia might even be put into question."[42] A Citizenship Law, which was enacted by the Latvian legislature in July 1994, envisaged a quota system whereby only 0.1% of non-citizens could apply for citizenship every year. The CSCE and Council of Europe immediately objected to this system. The latter announced that in this context Latvia would have difficulty becoming a member. Moreover, international support was necessary to accomplish Russian troop withdrawal. The Latvian President returned the law to Parliament and urged the latter to abandon quota system. This took place in a fourth, extraordinary reading on 22 July 1994.[43] As former Prime Minister Birkavs stressed, "We shall not allow this law to bar our way to Europe, the only place Latvia can survive." This statement is revealing since it indicated a certain role which external factors could play as well as the elite's

"willingness" to adjust, if necessary. Yet, the Citizenship Law remained exclusive in nature, and this stemmed from a lack of obvious advantages that European institutions could offer to the newly-independent state.

The influence of European institutions can be linked above all to the Latvia's aspiration for a membership of the NATO and European Union. Latvia's Foreign Policy Concept adopted in 1995 underlines the importance of NATO membership. Latvia's Foreign Policy Concept also stated that "joining the European Union is essential to the likelihood of the survival of the Latvian people and the preservation of the Latvian state."[44] In October 1995 all political groups represented in Latvia's legislature signed a declaration in support of application for the EU membership which was eventually submitted on 27 October 1995.

Plans to expand the NATO and European Union provided a certain stimulus for the elite to readjust citizenship policy. However, integration into the NATO and European Union was rather uncertain by the mid 1990s. In the second half of the 1990's with commencement of the NATO enlargement and enhanced certainty in EU expansion plans, domestic politics had to be adjusted to the standards of these organisations. As NATO and EU delegate to monitor minority issues and citizenship legislation to the Council Europe and, particularly, OSCE, the role of the latter institutions grew. It should be noted, however, that EU authorities were more active in encouraging candidate countries to promote inclusive citizenship and solve all inter-ethnic disputes.

In 1997 the European Commission published its reports on all pre-accession countries, including Latvia. In contrast to Estonia, Latvia was not invited for the first round of negotiations on accession to the EU and one of the most considerable problems mentioned was the unresolved status of the non-citizens. This meant that the Latvian government, that considered the accession to the EU as a political and economic priority, had to meet requirements of the organisation. These requirements reflected in discussions with Latvian government as well as in the Opinion of the European Commission on Latvia's application for EU membership have derived from recommendations made by the OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities.[45] Already in October 1996, Max van der Stoel recommended to abolish the "window system" because Latvia faced the risk of too slow naturalisation.[46] Van der Stoel wrote also extensively to the Latvian government in the course of 1997 on granting citizenship to stateless children born in Latvia. He presented both legal and political

arguments to the government.[47] Immediately after the Saeima adopted the recommended amendments on 22 June 1998, the European Commission on behalf of the European Union welcomed the decision stating that, "The new legislation meets recommendations made by the OSCE and addresses one of the priorities in Latvia's preparation for EU membership."[48] The recommendations were supported and welcomed personally by the leaders of different states and organisations.[49] Yet, on 3 October 1998 alongside the parliamentary elections the referendum was to be held to approve the amendments. In answering to the question about the most important task for the Latvian government to begin EU pre-accession negotiations the Foreign Minister Birkavs stated: "Neither we nor the EU need a divided Latvia. An endorsing result of the referendum will attest to our readiness to deal with the most complicated integration issues, for the EU is a multi-national union of the states...If in the referendum a majority will vote against the amendments, the beginning of the negotiations with the EU will be postponed for at least one or two years."[50] Congratulatory statements by the international organisations were also issued after the October 3 referendum endorsed the parliament's decision. Once more the European Union, which closely followed the events, praised Latvia for "farsighted" and "courageous" decisions and concluded that the results of the referendum were "consistent with the principles and aims of the European Union."[51] Moreover, the referendum took place in the context of shifting preoccupations in society from national to economic and changing perceptions about both Latvia's internal and external developments.

With respect to the West, perceptions held by the Latvian population, at the beginning, were, to a certain extent, ambiguous. On the one hand, Latvians considered themselves part of Western civilisation and aspired to achieve western living standards. A majority of Latvians appreciated the support given by the West in Latvia's efforts to regain independence in 1991. On the other hand, a considerable part of the Latvian population felt that immediately joining European structures and complying with the requirements of international organisations would limit the independence of the newly-independent state. This perception was particularly obvious regarding the European Union. Many people objected to joining this institution considering that Latvians had not left one union (Soviet Union) in order to give up their statehood to another (European Union). In the meantime, NATO had not announced about its intentions to expand to the Central and East European states.

In the middle of the 1990's, however, attitudes were changing. Russian troop withdrawal, problems encountered during this process and NATO enlargement announcement gave a strong inducement to Baltic nations to seek NATO membership. At the same time, preoccupation with economic problems led to look more in the direction of the European Union. The EU, whose living standards the majority of Latvian society would like to achieve, became more popular in the country. There was a certain disappointment about the exclusion of Latvia from and inclusion of Latvia's neighbour Estonia within the first round of negotiations on accession to the EU in 1998.

Therefore, more people began to support the solution of the problems required by NATO standards and, especially, indicated by the European Commission in order to proceed with accession to both organisations. The suggestions for minority issues and citizenship legislation by the other organisations, in particular OSCE, were perceived increasingly as necessary to implement. Such approach was certainly facilitated also by by recommendations, frequent visits of officials, organisation of conferences and roundtables, and financing publications. Several surveys have been promoted and financed.[52] As a result, in Autumn 1998, when the October 3 referendum was held, almost half of the population supported Latvia's integration into the European Union.[53] Support for the NATO among citizens was even higher.

Thus, one can discern various aspects which influenced changes in the position of political elite and popular perceptions already before 1997. In 1997 a "critical mass" had accumulated and amendments to the Citizenship Law were endorsed in 1998. New aspirations for enhanced security and economic preoccupations rather than aspirations for a nation-state became the external and domestic priorities. Outside factors, such as the possibility of joining the NATO and European Union, began to play a far more important role than before. The minority and citizenship policy is not only a domestic issue. The choices of elites can be affected by international pressure, especially from international organisations of which the given state is a member or, even more, aspires to join. Thus, the growing desire and clearer opportunities for joining the NATO and EU in the future increased the acceptance by the Latvian and Estonian government of recommendations advanced by the international organisations.

To sum up, since the middle of the 1990's, integration into the Trans-Atlantic and European structures has become priority for the Baltic governments. NATO and EU expansions take place simultaneously. This requires not only foreign policy and diplomatic efforts but also important changes domestically, including enhancing protection of the minority rights according to western standards. This requires also good relations with neighbors. In the Baltic case it is Russia. Taking into account Russian factor in European security system, Russian attitude towards NATO enlargement and Russian attitude towards Russian-speaking minority in the Baltic states, it seems to be complicated situation to make co-operative relations with Russia.

IV. RUSSIAN FACTOR

Several political factors may influence the decisions to proceed with enlargement process. Political factors correlate with NATO aspirations to strengthen security in Europe. As one of the most important and the most relevant to the Baltic quest for the NATO membership, Russian factor can be put forward. Russia's position on European security arrangements can not be altogether ignored. Thus, Russian factor must be taken into account and analysed in the context of NATO expansion.[54] NATO expansion process has impact on Russian-Baltic relations, whereas Russia's position with respect to Russian-speaking population in the Baltic states should be taken into account while discussing Baltic NATO quest as well as minority policies.

Russia and NATO enlargement

Although Russian leaders have several time expressed willingness to join the NATO, it has concomitantly objected to NATO expansion. In the 1995 Study on the NATO enlargement it was expressed that simultaneously with the expansion of Alliance special relations will be established with Russia. In May 1997, NATO and Russian leaders signed the Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Co-operation and Security between NATO and Russian Federation. As result of the Founding Act, NATO-Russia Permanent Joint Council was established. Thus, Russia has been given a "voice but not veto" through these and other arrangements. The new Strategic Concept of NATO, accepted in 1999, once more underlined, at least in official rhetoric, the special role of Russia in the Euro-Atlantic security and importance of strong, stable and enduring relations between Russia and NATO.[55] Russian factor arguably influences directly and indirectly debate on security arrangements in Europe,

consensus building among allied countries with respect to the NATO enlargement as well as NATO-Baltic relations and prospective Baltic membership. This Russian influence may differ from country to country and from the issue to issue.

Russian-Baltic relations: geopolitics and "conflict manifestation"

Although Russia's support was instrumental for the Baltic countries to obtain independence and international recognition in 1991, the tactical partnership came to an end immediately after the national leaders ensured dominant positions in their respective countries. Actually, after Russia assumed the status of the legal successor of the Soviet Union, Russia and the Baltic states, now as sovereign countries, had to resolve all those disagreements and problems that existed between the imperial center and its periphery. The major issues in the Russian-Baltic relations have been security issues, status of the Russian-speaking population and economic problematique. Although a strong interaction exists between all these issues, a periodical shift of priorities can take place resulting in certain changes in the whole Russian-Baltic relations.

From the outset, the security aspects became the major and most complicated issue in Russian-Baltic relations. Security concerns have traditionally played a significant role in Russian political discourse. The withdrawal of Russian armed forces from the Baltic states and, later, the process of NATO enlargement has dominated largely, though not exclusively, the Baltic and, to a lesser extent, Russian mutual security approaches. They were influenced by what can be described as a "two-level interplay between the actual armed offensive and defensive capabilities of states on the one hand and their perceptions of each other's capabilities and intentions on the other."[56]

The Russian troop withdrawal from the Baltic countries stood as an immediate security problem, solution of which was of an inordinate importance for the Baltic independence. While the Baltic armed forces were still in their infancy, the personnel number of Russian armed forces deployed in the Baltic states in 1992 amounted to 43,000 in Lithuania, 40,000 in Latvia and 23,000 in Estonia.[57] Although Russian and the Baltic governments in February 1992 agreed to address and settle the issue of Russian troop withdrawal, the process was soon intermingled with and complicated by other factors. The governments largely strove to establish a new identity, and to manifest and legitimise national aspirations and concerns internationally. Russia

required the Latvian and Estonian governments that citizenship was granted to all residents living in these Baltic countries. The Russian military sought to retain military basis on the territory of the Baltic countries and particularly the Skrunda early-warning radar site in Latvia. Concurrently, the Baltic countries repeatedly rejected to link the troop withdrawal to other issues and appealed to the international community for assistance to end the "protracted occupation." Eventually, after prolonged discussions and active involvement of international organisations and western countries, Russia withdrew its armed forces from Lithuania by 31 August 1993 and from Latvia and Estonia by 31 August 1994. According to the agreements, which Latvia signed with Russia on 30 April 1992 Russia was entitled to use the Skrunda radar installation until 31 August 1998 with subsequent dismantling completed by 29 February 2000.[58]

To Neil Melvin the withdrawal of the troops was a sign that the Russian government once more recognised the independence of the Baltic countries.[59] Yet, the period between 1991 and 1994 had not only revealed the disparity of power and problems left by the Soviet legacy, but it also had a substantial formative influence on the future relations between Russia and the Baltic states. Although Russia lost much of its military potential after the break-up of the Soviet Union, in terms of absolute capabilities it has remained a powerful global actor.[60] Russia has retained its military superiority in the Baltic region and the comparative military strength of Russia is immense compared to that of the Baltic countries. Although the withdrawal of the Russian troops alleviated the immediate security concerns of the Baltic states, the disparity in military strength remained conspicuous. At the present, the Russian armed forces based in the Leningrad Military District and Kaliningrad region are considerably stronger than the armies of the Baltic states. According to the Latvian Defence Ministry, there are 80,000 soldiers in Leningrad Military District, 25,000 soldiers in Kaliningrad. Estonian, Latvian and Lithuanian national defence forces accounts for 4800, 5700 and 12,100 soldiers, respectively. The superiority of Russian forces would be even more conspicuous in terms of the equipment size. Kaliningrad, which is headquarters of the Russian Baltic Fleet, by the mid-2000 alone accounted for about 100 various combat ships, the same number of aircrafts and 850 tanks. The Baltic countries have a limited number of combat ships and aircrafts and only Latvia possesses a few tanks. Although the statistical military superiority does not unequivocally imply the supremacy in warfare, let alone the fact that a country

starting a war would inevitably attract a international condemnation, the military disparity may influence political decisions and provide a strong impetus to either transcend military power into political assets or to seek for military counterbalances, including the membership of military alliances. Hence, despite the potential reduction of the Russian armed forces, growing importance of non-military factors and a favourable international environment, the considerable disparity between Russian and Baltic military capacities contributes, to a certain extent, to the Baltic quest for security guarantees provided by a NATO membership.

The problems encountered during the withdrawal of Russian troops contributed to the perception in the Baltics that Russia retained its imperialistic ambitions. Russia on various occasions strengthened these feelings in the Baltic countries, above all by its activities and official statements with respect to the so-called "near abroad."[61] The "near abroad" has been defined as a traditional sphere of Russian interests where presence of foreign actors would be detrimental to Russian interests. A substantial role in defining the Russian security priorities has been played by geography, history and politics. These factors have facilitated the dominance of the geopolitical approach and aspirations for the great power status in Russian security and foreign policy thinking.[62] Russia attaches a strong salience to the influence in the former inner empire, which has also included the Baltic republics. The Russian Foreign Policy Concept, published in January 1993, strongly stressed the importance of geopolitical dictates. The Concept clearly located the post-Soviet space within Russia's zone of interests by calling for more active promotion of integration and inadmissibility of foreign powers in the region.[63] Already in May 1992, during discussions on the Russian Military Doctrine, the director of the Russian Military Academy, General Igor Rodionov announced that the Baltic countries must remain neutral or friendly to Russia, or otherwise anticipate the use of military force by Russia.[64] In the similar vein, General Aleksei Gulko equated Russian interests in the Baltics to the American interests in the Persian Gulf.[65] The Military Doctrine, adopted in November 1993, indicated that Russia would reserve the right to use military force if the rights of Russian citizens in other countries were violated, military facilities located abroad attacked or military blocs harmful to Russian security interests expanded.[66]

During the initial period of relationship, the Baltic states and Russia also tended to avoid tackling the common problems in bilateral relations, instead appealing

to the international organisations and other states to achieve the respective foreign policy goals. Knudsen and Neumann have termed this policy as "conflict manifestation", the implicit strategic goal of which has been to attract attention of and obtain support from other states by expressing explicitly attitudes and concerns on the international level.[67] In this manner, Russia and the Baltic states considered that only dealing directly with other powers they could meet their security interests. This approach largely stemmed from and at the same time underlined and strengthened the Baltic aspirations to fully integrate with western institutions, which had become one of the major priorities of the Baltic's "return to Europe."

Baltic quest for NATO and Russia

The dynamic of NATO enlargement as a new aspect of security problematique, complemented by the disputed status of the Russian-speaking population, became a significant determinative factor in Russian-Baltic relations. Russia's assertive and vigorous objections to a potential NATO enlargement sharpened and contributed to the Baltic security and insecurity notions with Russia being posited as a source of the latter. Moreover, the Baltic countries could utilize the Russian rhetoric as a foreign policy instrument in order to attract international attention, promote the quest for security and justify domestic and external policies in general.

Russia has been interested is keeping the status quo in the Baltic region and NATO enlargement is considered to be taking place at Russia's expense, actually revealing the notion that stems from the cold war zero-sum game traditions in which one's actor's gains meant another's losses. The potential NATO membership of the Baltic states, which a prominent Russian historian, Andrei Sakharov, has described as "former conquests which had become pride of the nation" and their dispossession as "unbearable for the Russian population", only strengthens the opposition to NATO enlargement and concomitantly intensifies the negative perceptions of the Baltic states in Russia.[68] Already in summer 1993 in a survey done among Russian politicians and foreign policy experts the Baltic countries were ranked first in the list of Russia's enemies. The Baltic countries were identified as a top enemy by 6% of respondents as opposed to 5% respondents mentioning Ukraine and Turkey, 1% of United States.[69]

Certain security concerns might, actually rise in Russia as consequence of the possible NATO membership of the Baltic states. Russia would be potentially constrained in operational capacity of its naval forces in the Baltic Sea and further

limited in its ability to secure air defence over the Baltic Sea. The problem could be aggravated by a possibly increased exposure to NATO airborne reconnaissance and surveillance. Moreover, strategic and nuclear issues add to Russia's concerns since NATO expansion to Russia's borders, particularly in the absence of well-functioning early warning radar systems, could make it more vulnerable to tactical weapons. A notion exists that if the Baltic countries obtain NATO membership, Leningrad Military District, and especially Kaliningrad, could become militarily vulnerable in case of NATO attack. These concerns might be strengthened, especially within the ranks of military command's elder generation, by the memory of incursions through the Baltic territory.[70] Without denying the validity of the Russian concerns, however, great power ambitions compounded with apprehension to lose the influence in the world rather than genuine military concerns arguably determine Russian objections to NATO enlargement, and particularly to the Baltic countries. Russian concerns could be certainly alleviated by implementation of the 1999 Istanbul Agreement on the Adaptation of the CFE Treaty limiting the size of the forces placed by the NATO on the new members' territory.

Whereas the issue of the Baltic states for Russia, albeit important, is merely secondary in the quest for a great power status, Russia for the Baltic countries has historically and geopolitically meant a determinative factor on their security and insecurity balance list. The initially assertive Russian tone contributed to the amalgamation of insecurity and enmity feelings in the Baltic countries. A sociological survey among citizens of Latvia in the spring of 1994 pointed out various factors perceived by population as threatening to Latvian security and independence. The presence of Russian troops and implemented Russian foreign policy were respectively ranked second (19.9% of respondents) and third (18.5%) conceding only to the threat of a weak economy (21.2%).[71] Political elites based their actions on those perceptions, but they also shaped them through the "discourse of the danger," a term borrowed from David Campbell by Oeyvind Jaeger and applied to the Baltic context.[72] Threats allegedly emanating from Russia strengthened the notion of its "otherness" and provided the Baltic countries means to distance themselves from the former empire. Thus, the notions of insecurity and enmity contributed, to a certain degree, to a further development and strengthening of national identity, justifying certain institutionalised practices and striving for legitimacy in the world. The Baltic elites were disposed to utilizing the assertiveness of Russian policy to demonstrate the otherness and

imperialistic inclinations of Russia and, thereby underlining the necessity for the Baltic states to be incorporated in the western institutions. The Economist's incisive observation regarding Estonia's Russian policy that, "Estonian officials speak out in a way that sometimes does more credit to their courage than their diplomacy" reinforces the notion that in insecurity one can seek and find a security.[73] The feeling of insecurity and certain requirements for security means appears not only with respect to Russia, but also regarding the Russian-speaking minorities. Russia's position contributes further to the Baltic discourses on national security interests that have revealed an awareness of the important linkage between wider external security, internal order and societal strength.[74]

Russia and Russian-speaking population

After the break up of the Soviet Union, estimated 25 millions of ethnic Russians remained beyond the borders of the Russian Federation in the newly independent states. The status of these ethnic Russians and Russian-speaking population, in general, in the "near abroad" has a strong resonance within the Russian public. Russian public opinion polls reveal that protection of the Russian- speaking communities should be a top priority of Russian foreign policy. Already in the summer of 1993, results of one of these public polls indicated that between 2/3 and 3/4 of respondents were even in favour of re-uniting territories where ethnic Russians constituted majority.[75] A considerable number of various non-governmental organisations have been established, usually, under the auspices of various political parties, to deal with the issues concerning the Russian-speaking communities in the former Soviet republics. Thus, the question of the Russian and, in general, Russian-speaking diasporas, including those in the Baltic states, has permanently been on the political agenda of both government and opposition in Russia. Russian government has ostensibly followed the Brubaker's assertion, that a state has a "right- indeed obligation- to monitor the condition, promote the welfare, support the activities and institutions, assert the rights, and protect the interests of ethnonational kin in other states."[76] The answer to the question as to what means the Russian government was willing to use to protect their compatriots, however, can be found by applying the issue to the general domestic and foreign policy framework.

Domestically, the Russian government was initially facing the task to prevent an extensive influx of population from other republics, which might have had an

unfavourable impact on the already volatile economic and political situation in Russia. By 1995, approximately two million Russians had arrived to Russia from the former Soviet Union republics. In 1996 about 700,000 people arrived in Russia among whom 180,000 were regarded as refugees.[77] Several hundred thousands Russian-speaking people left the Baltic states. Notwithstanding the disapproval of the Estonian and Latvian citizenship policies, an overwhelming majority of the Russian-speaking population in these countries considered their economic situation better than that potentially provided in Russia. Moreover, the problem complex of the Russian diaspora has played an important role in domestic political struggles, especially due to its public resonance. The rise of Russian assertiveness in support of the Russian-speaking population and concomitant tensions in Russian-Baltic relations concurred with intensification of domestic struggles, especially in 1992-1993 and 1998. The opposition castigated the governmental approach to the alleged plight of Russian speakers in the near abroad as an administrative blunder and ignorance of Russian interests. Facing growing domestic economic and political tension, Yeltsin repeatedly resorted to the rhetoric of his opponents, primarily communists, to deprive them of a means to utilize this emotive issue in order to gather political support. During the presidential election campaign, on June 15, 1996, Yeltsin endorsed a new Russian National Policy Concept, in which support for "ethnic Russians" in the Baltic countries was expressed. After Yeltsin was re-elected, the political significance of this issue waned, only emerging noticeably again in 1998 during domestic political tensions and economic disagreements with Latvia.

Russian foreign policy also reveals a certain instrumentality of the Russian speaking-population issue. Until the end of 1992 Russian foreign ministry has the benevolent position. This was revealed by the statement of the Russian Deputy Foreign Minister Churkin that, "there can not be any linkage between withdrawing troops from the Baltics and safeguarding the rights of the Russian speaking communities."[78] In a similar vein, the Russian Foreign Minister Kozyrev declared that, "no alternative exists but to use the mechanisms of the United Nations or the CSCE for the settlement of national, ethnic and/or religious conflicts."[79] As domestic politics increasingly shaped the foreign policy patterns, the Russian diaspora became one of the priorities in Russia's Foreign Policy Concept and Military Doctrine. On 29 October 1992, Yeltsin officially announced a suspension of the army withdrawal from the Baltic states in order to ensure guarantees for the Russian-speaking community.

The protection of compatriots provided the Russian government with a solid pretext to exert pressure on Latvia and Estonia in order to promote its interests in this region. As a part of the "conflict manifestation" policy, Russia internationalised the issue in order to discredit the Baltic states internationally. As Russian UN representative Vorontsov wrote in the letter circulated to the UN General Assembly, "Latvia and Estonia have embarked, according to plan, on a gradual exclusion from the country of the Russian-speaking population…This amounts to ethnic cleansing."[80] Similarly, Russia recently condemned the Latvian court decisions to charge several former Russian partisans and security officers with crimes against humanity as a deliberate violation of the human rights of the Russian speaking-population.[81]

Towards changes

Already in the middle of the 1990's, in order to press forward with the prospective EU and NATO membership, however, the Baltic leadership also reduced, to a certain extent, the previously extensively invoked historical and moral symbolism and demonstrated willingness for a more co-operative approach with respect to Russia. Following Estonia, Latvia in 1997 ceased to insist on Russia to acknowledge the 1920 peace treaty and consequently withdrew its demands for return of the appropriated Eastern Latvian territories. By 1997 the Russian leadership also became increasingly aware of the importance of avoiding actions that might be interpreted as threats to the Baltic states. The "conflict manifestation" did not disappear completely but was gradually supplemented by what can be labelled as manifestation of dialogue.

In February 1997 the Russian President signed a document on the long-term strategy of Russia towards the Baltic countries, thereby, establishing an official "Baltic policy," which indicated a certain shift from a reactive to a more active policy. This document stated that, "Russia's strategic objective in the Baltic region is the full realisation of the potential friendliness between Russia and the Baltic states", and, "...the establishment of a constructive model of relations...".[82] The document, which clearly expressed Russia's objections to Baltic NATO membership, also revealed Russia's readiness to embark on a more subtle policy by combining economic levers and the issue of the Russian-speaking population to influence the relations with and situation within the Baltic states. As part of the "strategy of constructive dialogue", Russia signed a border demarcation treaty with Lithuania on 24 October 1997 and further proposed confidence building measures and unilateral security guarantees to

the Baltic states. Although the governments of the Baltic states flatly rejected the guarantees justifiably considered as a response to the prospective US-Baltic Charter and primarily aimed at the international audiences, Russia continued to follow the recently adopted subtler foreign policy towards the Baltic states. This policy also became gradually "economised" as was revealed by the tensions in Russian-Latvian relations in 1998.

The 1998 default of Russian economy further underlined and contributed to the importance of the economic factors. The new Russian Foreign Policy Concept and Security Concept endorsed during the leadership of Vladimir Putin in 2000 have revealed an "economisation" of Russian foreign policy, thereby reflecting a shift from an explicit geopolitical thinking towards a more geo-economic approach.[83] Russia is increasingly interested in the European Union enlargement issues, especially on such aspects as transit, the status of the Kaliningrad region, investments and access to the markets. As far as the Baltic states are concerned, Russia seeks to ensure favourable conditions for Russian business, support Russian companies' positions in strategically important branches, such as the energy and transit sectors, and promote the fulfilment of specific Russian economic interests. The recognition of the Baltic independence and shifting emphasis in foreign policy priorities has contributed to the policy of a subtler application of various political and economic tools to achieve these goals with respect to Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania.

A certain accomplishment of identity building, consensus on foreign policy issues, support from the West and recognition of the Baltic independence by Russia have engendered certain changes in the Baltic and Russian positions with respect to the security issues and NATO expansion. Politicians increasingly recognize that dialogue rather than the "conflict manifestation" is what the West expects from Russia and the Baltic states. The initial rationale for the Baltic NATO quest to mitigate the military disparity and counterbalance perceived Russian threats has been modified, at least officially, to emphasise the stabilising character of the membership, which would have positive implications for external and domestic stability within a wide range of security aspects. Similarly, Russian objections to the NATO enlargement also have lost some of their initial sharpness and hostility. The Russian officials reacted moderately to the NATO Washington Summit's decision in April 1999 to name Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania as official candidates for the NATO membership. This might have reflected the officially expressed confidence that no further

expansion would take place after the first round of NATO enlargement.[84] Russia's willingness to avoid the exorbitant attention and rhetoric can also be interpreted as an attempt to decrease the relevance of these decisions as well as to underline Russia's pragmatic and potentially co-operative rather than confrontational stance. However, some analyses, including those of the influential Foreign and Defence Policy Council, arrive at conclusions that Baltic NATO membership is "highly possible", thereby pointing to a growing awareness of potential Baltic NATO membership in Russia.[85] In this respect, Russia's rather reserved reaction to the Washington summit may attest to the fact that Russian elites silently prepare domestic audiences for the enlargement. As Russian expert Sergei Medvedev has argued, Russia is "preparing herself for worse scenarios, i.e. for NATO enlargement to one or more Baltic states, although she seldom admits this publicly."[86]

Notwithstanding a gradually restrained rhetoric towards NATO expansion and mutual disagreements, NATO enlargement remains a complicated and complicating issue in Russian-Baltic relations. Apart from implicit perceptions and inclinations, officially stated positions are irreconcilable and reveal opposite framework of references. While the Baltic states point to the NATO expansion as a factor of stability for strengthening democracy in the East European region and European security, Russia underlines its destabilising character with negative repercussions for Russian domestic developments and European co-operation. Russia and the Baltic countries are reluctant to enter dialogue with each other on this problem and instead prefer direct relations with the Trans-Atlantic Alliance, thus actually underlining the irreconcilability of their positions. Moreover, the issue of NATO expansion has become not only one of the most important foreign policy priorities, but also an emotive factor in domestic politics, and any concessions could possibly undermine the political positions of the respective elites. The both quest for and objection to the Baltic NATO membership have become a value-laden issue with strong domestic appeal and perceived implications for Russia's international standing. The ostensible linkage between NATO expansion and such issues as the status of Kaliningrad, economic security and the rights of the Russian-speaking population adds to the complexity of the problem.

Without downplaying the validity of Russian motivation to support the Russian speaking-population in the Baltic states, however, given the lack of practical assistance, the assertive rhetoric seems to be more underlining the instrumentality of

the issue rather than genuine concerns and a willingness to improve the situation of allegedly discriminated Russian-speaking population. Arguably, the contrary might be closer to the reality, actually indicating that Russia is not particularly interested in improving conditions for the Russian-speaking population in the Baltic states, since this issue can be occasionally utilized to distract public attention from domestic problems as well as pressure for economic concessions from the Baltics, which becomes progressively more congruent with priorities of "economised" Russian foreign policy. The Russian foreign ministry official, Valerii Loshchinin stated that, "our trade and economic links should be straightened out. Russia can not turn a blind eye to the position of its brothers and sister."[87] Increasingly, Russian government is also prepared to resort to the issue not only to "straighten" the economic links but also to obtain economic concessions, as actually was exemplified by Russian pressure on Latvia in 1998. Both a certain ambiguity and economic rationale of Russian position may be effectively exemplified by the Russian Foreign and Defence Council report, which analysed potentially unfavourable consequences of Russian transit volume reduction through the Baltic states for the local Russian-speaking population. It pointed out that, "from both economic and political points of view, any country is obliged to show a prime consideration to own interests and to own citizens-taxpayers as contrasted to residents of other states."[88]

To sum up, there has been a certain shift from geopolitics to geo-economics. Economics began to play increasingly more considerable role in Russian-Baltic relations and also with respect to minority issues. However, political factors still play a significant role. Hence, the military and political situation, activities of elites, perceptions and interests, and their domestic institutionalisation still directly or circuitously influence Russian-Baltic relations, also with respect to NATO enlargement and minority issues, including citizenship legislation.

V. CONCLUSIONS

Minority issues and citizenship legislation, which largely defines the status of minorities, are complex, debatable as well as consequential problematique in the Baltic states, first of all in Latvia and Estonia. Changing domestic and external factors have altered the citizenship policy and subsequently the status of Russian-speaking

minorities in Latvia and Estonia. Among external factors, the prospective NATO membership and NATO requirements to solve inter-ethnic problems have considerably contributed to the adoption of more inclusive citizenship legislation in both Latvia and Estonia. Thus, hypothesis put forward in the introduction can be considered as confirmed. However, additional comments, made on the basis of the analysed evidence, are necessary. Thus, the confirmation of the hypothesis is complemented by substantial caveats that should be taken into consideration.

Firstly, modifications to the initial Latvian and Estonian citizenship legislation have been so far only modest. The problem of considerable number of Russian-speaking population being non-citizens in Latvia and Estonia remains. It is also clear that one should not expect that the citizenship legislation will change radically in the following years. The possibility for further changes seems to be rather limited.

Secondly, NATO enlargement is a complex process. It takes place simultaneously with expansion of the European Union. In this context, it would be difficult to draw unequivocal conclusions precisely which institutions has had a more substantial impact on modifications of citizenship policy and promoting minority rights.

Thirdly, observance of minority rights is only one of the several requirements candidate countries should meet. Moreover, as Stephen Larrabee has put: "A candidate's performance alone, however, does not automatically ensure membership. It is necessary but not sufficient condition for membership. Membership also needs to be in NATO's strategic interest."[89]

Thus, fourthly, in Baltic case Russia's position also should be taken into consideration. Russian-Baltic bilateral relations as well as Russian-NATO relations have an impact on and concomitantly are influenced by NATO-Baltic relations. The interaction of these bilateral relationships affects also status of Russian-speaking population in the Baltic states, especially in Latvia and Estonia.

What could be the future developments? Domestic and increasingly external factors will play a role. An important factor certainly will be the political will of the Latvian and Estonian national elite to proceed with other amendments to the citizenship legislation and to promote integration in general. Paradoxically however, one can even argue that the latitude enjoyed by the elite to make such decisions is more constrained now than it was immediately after restoration of the independence.

Therefore, outside influences will play a crucial role in the prospective developments of minority and citizenship policies in the Baltic states. Western involvement is of a paramount importance and only active engagement and co-operation will promote established Western values, among them minority protection, in the transition countries. With respect to the integration of society one can agree with Mark A. Jubulis, who stated already in 1996 that, "the incentive to maintain European standards of democracy will continue to exist only as long as [European] integration remains a realistic goal. Therefore, a prolonged delay in the expansion of either NATO or the European Union may create disillusion with the entire project of "joining Europe" and lead to backtracking in the protection of minority rights."[90] To paraphrase, the real perspective of NATO as well as EU membership will be a strong impetus for Baltic national elites to deepen the integration processes, thereby contributing to stability in Baltics, in particular, and in Europe, in general.

---

[1] This approach has been supported by traditional schools of International Relations, particularly realists and neo-realists. Certain revision of the state and its functions are proposed by marxists and recently by the constructivist theory. For more detailed review, see Hobson, John M., *The State and International Relations* (Cambridge: CUP, 2000)

[2] Quoted in Goldstein, Judith and Robert O.Keohane (eds.), *Ideas and Foreign Policy. Beliefs, Institutions and Political Change* (Ithaca, London: Cornell University Press, 1993), 11-12.

[3] Buzan, Barry, *People, States and Fear. An Agenda for International Security Studies in the Post-Cold War Era* (Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1991), 190.

[4] Brubaker, Rogers, *Nationalism Reframed: Nationhood and National Question in the New Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996)

[5] Brubaker, Rogers, "Nationhood and the national question in the Soviet Union and post-Soviet Eurasia: An institutionalist account" In: *Theory and Society*, No.23 (1994), 48.

[6] Noergaard, Ole, *The Baltic States after Independence* (Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing, 1996), 3

[7] North, Douglass, *Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Perfomance*, (Cambridge: CUP 1990), 99.

[8] This might particularly pertain to economic domain. See, Keohane, O. Robert and Helen V. Milner, *Internationalization and Domestic Politics* (Cambridge: CUP, 1996)

[9] Putnam, Robert, "Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-Level Games" in Evans, P.B., H.K.Jacobson and R.D.Putnam (eds.), *Double-Edged Diplomacy: International Bargaining and Domestic Politics* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1993).

[10] Muiznieks, Nils, "Latvia: restoring a state, rebuilding a nation" in Ian Bremmer and Ray Taras (eds.), *New States, New Politics: Building the Post-Soviet Nations*, (Cambridge: CUP, 1997), 392.

[11] Article 14 of the Citizenship Law indicates that starting from January 1, 1996 those persons could apply for naturalisation who were born in Latvia and were 16 to 20 years old; from 1997 this group was complemented by up to 25 years old persons born in Latvia; from 1998 by 30 years old persons born in Latvia; from 1999 by 40 years old persons born in Latvia; from 2000 by other persons born in Latvia; from 2001 by those persons who were born outside of Latvia and who entered Latvia as minors; from 2002 by persons born outside of Latvia and entering Latvia up to the age of 30; from 2003 all other persons

[12] *Law on Citizenship*, 1994, Article 12.

[13] *Law on Citizenship*, 1994, Article 11.

[14] Muiznieks, Nils (ed.), *Latvia Human Development Report 1997* (Riga: UNDP, 1997), 49.

[15] The amendments stipulate that citizenship can be granted to a child until reaching the age of 15 upon request of their parents. If parents have failed to submit an application for the recognition of the child's

citizenship, a juvenile has the right to obtain Latvian citizenship on reaching the age of 15 by submitting a document confirming the command of the Latvian language.
[16] *Diena*, 8 July 1998.
[17] *Diena*, 25 June 1998.
[18] *Diena*, 5 October 1998.
[19] Galeotti, Mark, *The Age of Anxiety. Security and Politics in Soviet and Post-Soviet Russia* (London: Longman, 1995), 9.
[20] Raid, Aare, "Security Policy of the Baltic States: The Case of Estonia" in Atis Lejins and Daina Bleiere (eds.), *The Baltic States: Search for Security* (Riga: Latvian Institute of International Affairs, 1996), 24.; Ozolina, Zaneta, "Latvian Security Policy" in Atis Lejins and Daina Bleiere (eds.), *The Baltic States: Search for Security* (Riga: Latvian Institute of International Affairs, 1996), 43.
[21] Quoted in Lieven, Anatol, *The Baltic Revolution: Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and the Path to Independence* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1993), 308.
[22] Misiunas, Romualdas J., "National Identity and Foreign Policy in the Baltic States." in S. Frederic Starr (ed.), *The Legacy of History in Russia and the New States of Eurasia* (New York: Sharpe, 1994), 93.
[23] Latvian Foreign Minister letter to Max van der Stoel on 18 April 1993. See, Zaagman, Rob, *Conflict Prevention in the Baltic States: The OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania* (Flensburg: European Centre for Minority Issues, 1999), 64.
[24] Andrejevs, Georgs, "Latvia Accuses Russia of International Sedition" in *The Baltic Independent*, 26 February- 4 March 1993, 4.
[25] Kolsto, Pal, and Boris Tsilevich, "Patterns of National Building and Political Integration in a Bifurcated Postcommunist State: Ethnic Aspects of Parliamentary Elections in Latvia" in *East European Politics and Societies*, No.2, 1997, 373.
[26] *Cina*, 5 May 1990
[27]Melvin, Neil, *Russians Beyond Russia: The Politics of National Identity* (London: Chatham House Papers, 1995), 2.
[28] Quoted in Kolsto and Tsilevich, 367.
[29] Kolsto and Tsilevich , 368.
[30] *Statistical Bureau News*, 7 November 2000.
[31]*Survey of Latvian Inhabitants November 1997-January 1998*, (Riga, 1998), 49.
[32] Muiznieks Nils (ed.), *Latvia Human Development Report 1997,* (Riga: UNDP, 1997), 54.
[33] These parties were the following: Tevzemei un Brivibai (For the Fatherland and Freedom), 11.9%; LNNK (Latvian National Independence Movement) and Zemnieku partija (Peasants Party), 6.3%; Tautas kustiba Latvijai (Popular movement for Latvia), 14.8%. It is also worthwhile mentioning that two leftist parties, which supported the zero-option on citizenship, were elected (Socialist Party and Harmony Party) each gathering 5.5% of vote.
[34] *Dienas Specializdevums: Velesanas' 98*, 23 September 1998.
[35] Interview with the Head of the Naturalization Board E.Aldermane, "The Roughest Period Has Passed" in *Latvia. Baltic State*, No.4, 1998, 8.; *The Integration of Society in Latvia. Framework Document for a National Programme*. See, ttp://www.mfa.gov.lv/ENG/POLICY/HRights/integration-plan.html.
[36] *The Integration of Society in Latvia: Framework Document for a National Programme*.
[37] Jaeger, Oeyvind, *Securitising Russia: Discursive Practices of the Baltic States* (Copenhagen: COPRI, Working Paper No.10, 1997), 18.
[38] *The Baltic Times,* 7-13 November 1996.
[39] Survey were carried out by the Market and public opinion research center SKDS.
[40] Materials at official NATO On-Line-Library: http://www.nato.int
[41] *OSCE Handbook* (Vienna: Secretariat of the OSCE, 1999)
[42] Zaagman, 39.
[43] Zaagman, 22.
[44] *Latvijas Vestnesis*, 10 February 1995.
[45] Zaagman, 11.
[46] Zaagman, 42.
[47] Zaagman 42-43.
[48] Letter by Martine Reicherts on 23 June 1998. See, http://www.mfa.gov.lv/eng/policy/EU/zinoj6.html
[49] The list included among others appeals by the British Prime Minister Tony Blair (*Diena,* 6 June 1998), the then President of the United States Bill Clinton (*Diena*, 5 September 1998) and the then NATO Secretary General Javier Solana (*Diena*, 19 June 1998).

[50] *Diena*, 11 September 1998.
[51] Quoted in Zaagman, 42.
[52] For example, survey "Towards a Civic Society" was sponsored among others by United Nations Development Programme, the Norwegian government, International Organisation for Migration, Foundation of Inter-Ethnic Relations. The working group included the following institutions: Naturalization Board, Latvian National Human Rights Office, Board for Citizenship and Migration Affairs, Ministry of Education and Science, National Youth Initiative Centre, Institute of Philosophy and Sociology, National Latvian Language Training Program, Soros Foundation and OSCE Mission in Latvia.
[53] *Diena*, 17 March 1999.
[54] Kugler, Richard L., *Enlarging NATO. The Russian Factor* (RAND, 1996).
[55] Materials from NATO official On-Line-Library at: http://www.nato.int
[56] Buzan, Barry, Ole Wæver, Jaap de Wilde, *Security. A New Framework for Analysis* (Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1998), 51.
[57] Godzimirski, Jakub M., *Russian Security Policy Objectives in the Baltic Sea and the Barents Area* (Oslo: Den Norske Atlanterhavskomite, Security Policy Library No.12, 1998), 11. For instance, the total number of Latvian armed forces including defence forces, border guards, naval forces and air forces by August 1994 reached 7412; moreover, border guard units constituted majority of the Latvian armed forces consisting of 4130 persons. See, Ozolina, 1996, 51.
[58] Bungs, Dzintra, "Russia Agrees to Withdraw Troops from Latvia" in *RFE/RL Research Report,* No. 22, 3 June 1994.
[59] Melvin, 1995, 93.
[60] At the end of the year 2000, the Russian Security Council informed that Russia, which remains one of the two nuclear superpowers, had 2,001,360 military servicemen and 966,000 civilian employees affiliated with the Russian military. See, *Moscow Times*, 5 October 2000.
[61] The term "near abroad" was used for the first time by Russian foreign minister A. Kozyrev in his first official statement, which was published in *Izvestiia* on 2 January 1992. He referred to the neighbouring countries of Russia as, "something that could probably be called the 'near abroad'."
[62] Galeotti, 1995, 4; Godzimirski, 1998, 4.
[63] *FBIS Report: Central Eurasia. Foreign Policy Concept of the Russian Federation*, 25 March 1993, 4-6.
[64] Brusstar, James H., "A Challenge for American Policies. Russian Vital Interests" in *Strategic Forum*, No.6, 1994.
[65] Krasnaia Zvezda, 10 October 1992.
[66] *Rossiiskie Vesti*, 18 November 1993.
[67] Knudsen, Olav F., Iver Neuman, *Subregional Security Cooperation in the Baltic Sea Area* (Oslo: NUPI, Research Report No.189, 1995), 13.
[68] Sakharov, Andrei N, "The Main Phases and Distinctive Features of Russian Nationalism" in Robert Service, Geoffrey Hosking (eds.), *Russian Nationalism. Past and Present* (London: St. Martin's Press, 1998), 17-18.
[69] Versinins, Vladislavs, "Krievijas nacionalas intereses un Krievijas-Baltijas attiecibu dinamika" in Talavs Jundzis (ed.), *Baltijas valstis liktengriezos* (Riga: Latvijas Zinatnu akademija, 1998), 489.
[70] Perry, Charles M., Michael Sweeney, Andrew C.Winner, *Strategic Dynamics in the Nordic-Baltic Region: Implications for U.S. Policy* (Massachusetts: Brassey's, 2000), 63-68.
[71] Mouritzen, Hans (ed.), *Bordering Russia: Theory and Prospects for Europe's Baltic Rim* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998, 133.
[72] Jaeger, 11.
[73] *The Economist*, 4-10 May 1996.
[74] (Galeotti, 1995; Skak, Mete, *From Empire to Anarchy. Postcommunist Foreign Policy and International Relations* (London: Hurst and Company, 1996)
[75] Jurado, Elena, *Russian 'Homeland Nationalism' and the Baltic States: Explaining Russia's Policy towards the Diaspora 1991-1997*, Unpublished Master Thesis, University of Oxford, 1998.
[76] Brubaker, Rogers, *Nationalism Reframed: Nationhood and National Question in the New Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 5.
[77] Stranga, Aivars, "Baltic-Russian Relations: 1995-Beginning of 1997" in Atis Lejins, Zaneta Ozolina (eds.), *Small States in a Turbulent Environment: The Baltic Perspective*, (Riga: Latvian Institute of International Affairs, 1997), 202, 233.
[78] *Nezavisimaja Gazeta*, 3 November 1992.
[79] Kozyrev Andrei, "Russia and Human Rights" in *Slavic Review*, No.2, 1992, 287.

[80] Quoted in Jurado, 1998.
[81] *Diena*, 13 April 2000.
[82] *ITAR-TASS*, 11 February 1997.
[83] Edward N. Luttwak (1998: 126) in his article "From Geopolitics to Geo-economics: Logic of Conflict, Grammar of Commerce" in *The National Interest* (1990) described "geo-economics" as "the admixture of the logic of conflict with the methods of commerce." The term also finds increasingly frequent expression and interpretation in Russian political science discipline. As Lapkin and Pantin (1999: 48) has pointed out, geo-economics are about "economisation of politics" and "politisation of economics."
[84] *Diena*, 28 April 1999.
[85] Russian Foreign and Defence Council, *Rossija i Pribaltika*, published in 1999 at http://www.svop.ru/doklad8.htm
[86] Medvedev, Sergei, "Geopolitics and Beyond: The New Russian Policy Towards the Baltic States" in Mathias Jopp, Sven Arnswald (eds.), *The European Union and the Baltic States. Visions, Interests and Strategies for the Baltic Sea Region* (Helsinki: UPI, 1998), 260.
[87] Loschinin, Valerii, "The Baltic States: The Situation Is Often Discouraging" in *International Affairs*, No.1, 1996, 52.
[88] Russian Foreign and Defence Council, *Baltija- transeivropejskij koridor v XXI vek* (Moscow: Foreign and Defence Policy Council, 2000), 34.
[89] Larrabee, Stephen, "NATO Enlargement after the First Round" in *The International Spectator,* No.2, 1999, 76.
[90].Jubulis, Mark J., "The External Dimension of Democratization in Latvia: The Impact of European Institutions" in *International Relations*, No.4, 1996, 73.

Bibliography (primary and secondary sources)

Andrejevs, Georgs, "Latvia Accuses Russia of International Sedition" in *The Baltic Independent*, 26 February- 4 March 1993

Asmus, Ronald D. and Robert C. Nurick, "NATO Enlargement and the Baltic States" in *Survival,* No.2, 1996

Baranovski, Vladimir (ed.), *Russia and Europe: The Emerging Security Agenda* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997)

Barrington, Lowell, "The Domestic and International Consequences of Citizenship in the Soviet Successor States" in *Europe-Asia Studies*, No.5, 1995

Benoit-Rohmer, F. *The Minority Question in Europe: Texts and Commentary* (Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing, 1996)

Binnendijk, Hans and Richard L. Kugler, "Open NATO's Door Carefully" in *The Washington Quartely,* No.2, 1999

Blank, Stephen, "The Baltic States and Russia: The Strategic and Ethnic Contexts" in *The Harriman Review*, No.4, 1998

Brubaker, Rogers, "Nationhood and the national question in the Soviet Union and post Soviet Eurasia: An institutionalist account" in *Theory and Society,* No.23, 1994

Brubaker, Rogers, *Nationalism Reframed: Nationhood and National Question in the New Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996)

Brusstar, James H., "A Challenge for American Policies. Russian Vital Interests" in *Strategic Forum*, No.6, 1994

Bungs, Dzintra, "Russia Agrees to Withdraw Troops from Latvia" in *RFE/RL Research Report,* No. 22, 3 June 1994

Busigina, Irina, "Krievija, Baltijas valstis un Eiropas Savieniba" in Talavs Jundzis (ed.), *Baltijas valstis liktengriezos* (Riga: Latvijas Zinatnu akademija, 1998)

Buzan, Barry, *People, States and Fear. An Agenda for International Security Studies in the Post-Cold War Era* (Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1991)

Buzan, Barry, Ole Wæver, Jaap de Wilde, *Security. A New Framework for Analysis* (Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1998)

Crisen, Sabine (ed.), *NATO in Europe in the 21st Century: New Roles for a Changing Partnership* (Washington: Woodrow Wilson Center, 2000)

David, Charles-Philippe and Jacques Levesque, *The Future of NATO. Enlargement, Russia and European Security* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1999)

Dawisha, Karen and Parrott, Bruce, *Russia and the New States of Eurasia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994)

Eisenhower, Susan, *NATO at Fifty: Perspectives on the Future of the Atlantic Alliance* (Washington: Center for Political and Strategic Studies, 1999)

Evans, P.B., H.K.Jacobson and R.D.Putnam, *Double-Edged Diplomacy: International Bargaining and Domestic Politics* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1993)

Eyal Jonathan, "NATO's enlargement: anatomy of a decision" in *International Affairs,* No.4, 1997

FBIS Report: Central Eurasia. Foreign Policy Concept of the Russian Federation, 25 March 1993

Galeotti, Mark, *The Age of Anxiety. Security and Politics in Soviet and Post-Soviet Russia* (London: Longman, 1995)

Godzimirski, Jakub M., "Soviet Legacy and Baltic Security: The Case of Kaliningrad" in Olav F. Knudsen (ed.), *Stability and Security in the Baltic Sea Region. Russian, Nordic and European Aspects* (London: Frank Cass, 1999)

Godzimirski, Jakub M., *Russian Security Policy Objectives in the Baltic Sea and the Barents Area* (Oslo: Den Norske Atlanterhavskomite, Security Policy Library No.12, 1998)

Godzimirski, Jakub M. (ed.), *New and Old Actors in Russian Foreign Policy* (Oslo: NUPI, 2000)

Goldstein, Judith and Keohane, Robert O., *Ideas and Foreign Policy: Beliefs, Institutions and Political Change* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1993)

Hansen, Birthe and Bertel Heurlin, *The Baltic States in World Politics* (Surrey: Curzon Press, 1998)

Herd, P. Graeme, "Russia's Baltic Policy After the Meltdown" in *Security Dialogue*, No.2, 1999

Hobson, John M., *The State and International Relations* (Cambridge: CUP, 2000)

Hyde-Price, Adrian, *Germany and European order. Enlarging NATO and EU* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2000)

Jaeger, Oeyvind, *Securitising Russia: Discursive Practices of the Baltic States* (Copenhagen: COPRI, Working Paper No.10, 1997)

Jervis, Robert, *Perception and Misperception in International Politics* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1976)

Joenniemi, Perti and Juris Prikulis (eds.), *The Foreign Policies of the Baltic Countries: Basic Issues* (Riga: Centre of Baltic-Nordic History and Political Sciences, 1993)

Jubulis, Mark J. "The External Dimension of Democratization in Latvia: The Impact of European Institutions" in *International Relations*, No.4, 1996

Jurado, Elena, *Russian 'Homeland Nationalism' and the Baltic States: Explaining Russia's Policy towards the Diaspora 1991-1997*, Unpublished Master Thesis, University of Oxford, 1998

Keohane, O. Robert and Helen V. Milner, *Internationalization and Domestic Politics* (Cambridge: CUP, 1996)

Knudsen, Olav F., *Baltic Security: Domestic Factors* (Oslo: NUPI, Working Paper, No.496, 1993)

Knudsen, Olav F., Iver Neuman, *Subregional Security Cooperation in the Baltic Sea Area* (Oslo: NUPI, Research Report No.189, 1995)

Kolsto, Pal, Boris Tsilevich, "Patterns of National Building and Political Integration in a Bifurcated Postcommunist State: Ethnic Aspects of Parliamentary Elections in Latvia" in *East European Politics and Societies*, No.2, 1997

Kolstoe, Pal, "The New Russian Diaspora: An Identity of its own?" in *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, No.3, 1996

Kolstoe, Pal, *Russians in the Former Soviet Republics* (London: Hurst and Company, 1995)

Kozyrev Andrei, “Russia and Human Rights” in *Slavic Review*, No.2, 1992

Kugler, Richard L., *Enlarging NATO. The Russian Factor* (RAND, 1996)

Lapkin, Vladimir, Vladimir Pantin, “Geoekonomicheskaya politika: predmet i ponatiya (K postanovke problemi)” in *Polis*, No.4, 1999

Larrabee, Stephen, “NATO Enlargement after the First Round” in *The International Spectator,* No.2, 1999

Legislative Acts of the CIS and the Baltic States on Citizenship, Migration, and Related Matters (Moscow and Helsinki: International Organisation for Migration, 1996)

Lieven, Anatol, *The Baltic Revolution* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1993)

Lieven, Anatol, “Baltic Iceberg Dead Ahead: NATO Beware” in *The World Today,* No.7, 1996

Lopez, Andrea M., “Russia and the Democratic Peace: The Decision to Use Military Force in Ethnic Disputes” in Ted Hopf (ed.), *Understandings of Russian Foreign Policy* (Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1999)

Loschinin, Valerii, “The Baltic States: The Situation Is Often Discouraging" in *International Affairs*, No.1, 1996

Luttwak, N. Edward, “From Geopolitics to Geo-Economics: Logic of Conflict, Grammar of Commerce” in Gearoid O Tuathail, Simon Dalby and Paul Routledge (eds.), *The Geopolitics Reader* (London: Routledge, 1998)

Malcolm, Neil, Alex Pravda, Roy Allison and Margot Light (1996): *Internal Factors in Russian Foreign Policy,* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mearsheimer, J.John, “The False Promise of International Institutions” in *International Security*, No.3, 1994/5

Medvedev, Sergei, “Geopolitics and Beyond: The New Russian Policy Towards the Baltic States” in Mathias Jopp, Sven Arnswald (eds.), *The European Union and the Baltic States. Visions, Interests and Strategies for the Baltic Sea Region* (Helsinki: UPI, 1998)

Medvedev, Sergei, *Russia's Futures. Implications for the EU, the North and the Baltic Region* (Helsinki: UPI, 1998)

Medvedev, Sergei, *Russia's Futures. Implications for the EU, the North and the Baltic Region* (Helsinki: Ulkopoliittinen instituutti, 2000)

Melvin, Neil, *Russians Beyond Russia: The Politics of National Identity* (London: Chatham House Papers, 1995)

Misiunas, Romualdas J., "National Identity and Foreign Policy in the Baltic States." in S. Frederic Starr (ed.), *The Legacy of History in Russia and the New States of Eurasia* (New York: Sharpe, 1994)

Moller, Frank, *The Security of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania and the "Strength of States"* (Kiel: The Schleswig-Holstein Institute for Peace Research, 1998)

Moshes, Arkady, *Overcoming Unfriendly Stability. Russian-Latvian Relations at the End of 1990s* (Helsinki: UPI, 1999)

Mouritzen, Hans (ed.), *Bordering Russia: Theory and Prospects for Europe's Baltic Rim* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998)

Muiznieks, Nils, "Latvia: Restoring a State, Rebuilding a Nation", in Bremmer, I. and R. Taras (eds.), *New States, New Poltics: Building the Post-Soviet Nations* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997)

Muiznieks, Nils (ed.), *Latvia Human Development Report 1997* (Riga: UNDP, 1997)

Noergaard, Ole, *The Baltic States after Independence* (Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing, 1996)

North, Douglass, *Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance* (Cambridge: CUP, 1990)

OSCE Handbook (Vienna: Secretariat of the OSCE, 1999)

Ozolina, Zaneta, "Latvian Security Policy" in Atis Lejins and Daina Bleiere (eds.), *The Baltic States: Search for Security* (Riga: Latvian Institute of International Affairs, 1996)

Perry, Charles M., Michael Sweeney, Andrew C.Winner, *Strategic Dynamics in the Nordic-Baltic Region: Implications for U.S. Policy* (Massachusetts: Brassey's, 2000)

Raid, Aare, "Security Policy of the Baltic States: The Case of Estonia" in Atis Lejins and Daina Bleiere (eds.), *The Baltic States: Search for Security* (Riga: Latvian Institute of International Affairs, 1996)

Russian Foreign and Defence Council, *Baltija- transeivropejskij koridor v XXI vek* (Moscow: Foreign and Defence Policy Council, 2000)

Sakharov, Andrei N, "The Main Phases and Distinctive Features of Russian Nationalism" in Robert Service, Geoffrey Hosking (eds.), *Russian Nationalism. Past and Present* (London: St. Martin's Press, 1998)

Schimmefenning, Frank, "NATO Enlargement: A Constructivist Explanation" in *Security Studies,* No.2/3, 1998/99

Smith, Graham, *The Baltic States* (London: Macmillan, 1994)

Smith, Graham (ed.), *The Nationalities Question in the Post-Soviet States* (New York and London: Longman, 1996)

Skak, Mete, *From Empire to Anarchy. Postcommunist Foreign Policy and International Relations* (London: Hurst and Company, 1996)

Stranga, Aivars, "Russia and the Security of the Baltic States: 1991-1996" in Atis Lejins and Daina Bleiere (eds.), *The Baltic States: Search for Security* (Riga: Latvian Institute of International Affairs, 1996)

Stranga, Aivars, "Baltic-Russian Relations: 1995-Beginning of 1997" in Atis Lejins, Zaneta Ozolina (eds.), *Small States in a Turbulent Environment: The Baltic Perspective*, (Riga: Latvian Institute of International Affairs, 1997)

The Foreign Affairs of Latvia. A Collection of Official Speeches, Statements and Documents (Riga: Rasa ABC, 2000)

The NATO Handbook. 50th Anniversary Edition (Brussels: NATO Office of Information and Press, 1999)

Tishkov, Valerii A., *Ethnicity, Nationalism and Conflict in and after the Soviet Union*: *The Mind Aflame* (London: Sage, 1997)

Tishkov, Valerii A., *Russkiie kak menshinstva* (Moscow: Russian Academy of Science Institute of Ethnology and Anthropology, 1993)

Trapans, Jan Arveds, "The Baltic States: Defence and Geopolitics" in *European Security*, No.3, 1998

Versinins, Vladislavs, "Krievijas nacionalas intereses un Krievijas-Baltijas attiecibu dinamika" in Talavs Jundzis (ed.), *Baltijas valstis liktengriezos* (Riga: Latvijas Zinatnu akademija, 1998)

Zaagman, Rob, *Conflict Prevention in the Baltic States: The OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania* (Flensburg: European Centre for Minority Issues, 1999)

Webber, Mark, *The International Politics of Russia and the Successor States*, (Manchester: St.Martin's Press, 1996)

The bibliography also includes materials (speeches, press statements, press releases, basic fact sheets) from official NATO On-line-library at website: http://www.nato.int