

Library of Institute of Contemporary Development

THE ARCHITECTURE OF EURO-ATLANTIC SECURITY

Editors: Igor Yurgens, Alexander Dynkin and Vladimir Baranovsky

Moscow

2009

EDITORS

Prof. Igor Yu. Yurgens, Chairman of the Management Board, Institute of Contemporary Development (INSOR)

Prof. Alexander A. Dynkin, Academician, Director, Institute of World Economy and International Relations (IMEMO), Russian Academy of Sciences

Prof. Vladimir G. Baranovsky, Corresponding Member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Deputy Director, Institute of World Economy and International Relations (IMEMO), Russian Academy of Sciences

Project Director

Sergei A. Kulik

AUTHORS

Alexei G. Arbatov

Nadezhda K. Arbatova

Vladimir G. Baranovsky

Sergei K. Zavriev

Andrei V. Zagorsky

Sergei A. Kulik

Alexander I. Nikitin

Yelena N. Nikitina

Alexander A. Pikayev

Eduard G. Solovyov

Yekaterina A. Stepanova

Sergei V. Utkin

Igor I. Khokhlov

This document was prepared on the basis of a series of studies conducted under the auspices of the Institute of Contemporary Development and published in Russian in April 2009. It addresses the paramount and urgent challenge of upgrading the architecture of European security. Its emphasis is placed on an “audit” of the problems related to the issue of security in the Euro-Atlantic area, and corresponding recommendations.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD	5
I. MULTILATERAL SECURITY ORGANIZATIONS IN EUROPE	9
1. General overview	9
2. The United Nations	12
3. The OSCE	13
4. NATO	16
5. The European Union	17
6. The Council of Europe	19
7. The CIS	21
8. The CSTO	22
9. Sub-regional structures	24
II. THE INTERNATIONAL POLITICAL PRINCIPLES OF ENSURING EUROPEAN SECURITY	26
1. The Helsinki “declogue”	26
2. Human rights, pluralistic democracy and the rule of law	29
3. Equal security, indivisible security and unacceptability of ensuring security to the detriment of other states	31
4. Peaceful dispute resolution and conflict settlement	32
5. From inviolability of borders and their peaceful change to limiting the use of armed force	34
6. Territorial integrity and the right to self determination	35
7. Grounds for intervention	36
III. ARMS CONTROL IN EUROPE	39
1. The European dimension of the strategic arms reductions	39
2. Missile defense	40
3. The CFE	41
4. Tactical nuclear weapons	43
5. Confidence- and security-building measures, military restraint	44
6. Non-proliferation	46

IV. INTERNATIONAL PEACE OPERATIONS: EUROPEAN PARAMETERS	48
1. Intervention involving armed force	49
2. A Russia-West battlefield or mutual cooperation?	50
3. Reforming the mechanism of peacemaking: possible models	51
V. COUNTERING UNCONVENTIONAL THREATS	56
1. Counter-narcotics	58
2. Anti-terrorism	59
3. Ensuring bio-security	61
4. Prevention of and response to emergencies and humanitarian crises	63
5. Pan-European environmental cooperation versus ecological challenges	65
6. Possible coordinated responses to global climate change	66
VI. EUROPEAN SECURITY AND THE POST-SOVIET SPACE	68
CONCLUSION	73

FOREWORD

Speaking after a day of talks in Berlin in early June 2008, the President of the Russian Federation Dmitry Medvedev proposed holding a summit to sign a European Security Treaty. The proposal became part of the Foreign Policy Concept of the Russian Federation, which was approved in mid-July 2008. Mr. Medvedev further elaborated the key points of the idea at the World Policy Conference in Evian (France) in October 2008, and a month later at the Russia-EU summit in Nice.

Raising the problem and outlining a possible solution was actually most timely. Even before the August crisis in the Caucasus it became acutely apparent that a set of universal and binding “rules of the game” had to be forged out to help resolve such issues as, for instance, the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE) and Kosovo. The events of August 2008 in the Caucasus especially highlighted the obsolete nature of the existing European security architecture, the ineffectiveness of the present mechanisms of preserving international political stability, and the need for a truly open system of collective security in the Euro-Atlantic area.

The treaty, as seen by Russia, must serve to ensure equal security of all countries, and establish legally binding basic rules of interaction among its signatories – states and international organizations alike – for the sake of upholding peace, promoting stability and ensuring European and global security. The Russian position singles out three key aspects of the new treaty. The first relates to the indivisible nature of security, the second to arms control, and the third to the settlement of regional conflicts in the Euro-Atlantic area.

Work on the document would start at a pan-European summit (or a high-level conference) attended by the heads of state of all the countries in the Euro-Atlantic area, including the United States and Canada, as well as the most prominent organizations, including NATO, CSTO (Collective Security Treaty Organization), the EU, OSCE and CIS.

As time goes by, and the Russian position takes a more defined shape, a shift in the approaches by many European countries becomes apparent. During the first several months after Dmitry Medvedev’s June 2008 initiative, it was often perceived as a rather abstract wish list, detached from the most pressing issues on the global agenda. It was even likened to Soviet peace initiatives of the Gromyko era, Mikhail Gorbachev’s idea of a “common European home”, and the “strategic democratic initiative” of Andrei Kozyrev. Some analysts interpreted the proposal as an attempt to split the United States and Europe, and to strike a blow against the NATO alliance.

At the same time, many observers saw the Russian initiative as first and foremost a display of constructive pomp aimed at tying up the loose ends of an unfinished agenda from the post-Cold War era, a time of hope that confrontation between the two military alliances would give way to a common structure bringing together the former adversaries. Gradually, the Russian proposals were taken with more seriousness, while growing number of European states displayed willingness to respond to them constructively and in a positive tone.

The Helsinki meeting of the OSCE Ministerial Council in December 2008 became the first multilateral platform for an in-depth discussion of Dmitry Medvedev's initiative. It proved that the Russian proposal had a fair number of supporters. On the sidelines of the Helsinki meeting the idea was mooted that an expert "group of friends" of the treaty be set up to look for common understanding of the key aspects of strengthening pan-European security. The role that the international research community, high-profile non-governmental organizations and academics could play in the process was emphasized.

Though politicians and experts in the countries of the Euro-Atlantic area are just beginning to discuss the issue, it is possible to make some early observations.

Virtually all the countries whose participation is crucial for building a viable Euro-Atlantic security pattern rule out its being a substitute for the international structures operating in the area – such as the OSCE and NATO. Any prospective steps aimed at limiting the current scope of competence and authority of such organizations are also being rejected.

The debate over Moscow's proposals does not give rise to any apparent confrontation between the themes of European security and transatlantic solidarity. By inviting as many parties to the prospective discussion as possible Russia made irrelevant any argument on whether the new initiatives could harm transatlantic cooperation with the United States and Canada.

Generally, it is widely accepted that the OSCE could serve as the main platform for discussing the Russian initiative. Many countries also see it as the ideal framework for implementing the Russian proposals. That logic suggests that the main outcome of the reform could be a more powerful OSCE, with its role and functions reviewed and adapted to the new realities.

However, another view has also been expressed – that the OSCE should overcome its predominant focus upon the third "basket" (humanitarian issues) which has in fact modified the objective of the organization as it had been originally agreed upon by the member states. There are also ideas to "revive" the OSCE by giving it more authority in preventing and settling conflicts, including peacekeeping operations.

Moscow's aspiration for the treaty to be legally binding is a formal point of division between Russia and the majority of European countries. Even those countries that display an understanding of Russian concerns and tend to agree that the existing mode of operation of the European security mechanisms needs to be modified, are rather skeptical about this aspect of the proposals emanating from Moscow.

Hopes are expressed that the suggested reforms could contribute to the resolution of the "frozen" conflicts. Legitimization of the new global political realities taking shape as a result of the proclamation and recognition of independence of Kosovo, Abkhazia and South Ossetia is another serious problem arising in this context. One can expect the issue to be sharply divisive, and the search for acceptable solutions most likely to be long and complicated.

Among the immediate "candidates" for inclusion in the prospective treaty on European security are the problems of the existing and new arms control agreements. Along with them emerge new important issues – energy security, coordination of national activities in the Arctic region, and active promotion of joint efforts to respond to the new challenges of the modern age.

Both the supporters of the reform and the skeptics, when discussing the issues of international security in Europe, tend to voice specific concerns linked to the individual characteristics of their particular countries, i.e., arising from their geographical situation, history, domestic political developments, etc. But despite all the differences in political and expert approaches (between countries and inside them), there seems to be one prevailing view: Europe as a whole undoubtedly needs a common positive and constructive agenda.

To work it out one needs to examine the effectiveness of the existing structures and mechanisms, assess the viability of the earlier agreed principles, and think over the imperatives and the options for constructing a new Euro-Atlantic architecture in line with the realities and challenges of the modern age. Working out a common philosophy in the sphere of security is also on the agenda.

Experts on the history of international relations and international security could make a tangible contribution to taking stock of the existing problems that arise in the context of Euro-Atlantic security as well as of the tentative strategies to solve them, which are being put forward now or have been put forward before on the political and expert levels. This would help highlight an intellectual groundwork already in place for the identification of systemic flaws in the current security architecture and of the ways to remedy them in the future.

This publication is aimed at politicians and experts specializing in European security and other related issues, as well as any reader interested in the subject. The high-priority task of the research this work is based upon was

to produce constructive and possibly specific ideas and recommendations. The latter are laid out here without the substantial “back-up material” that the authors, naturally, had at their disposal – including it would have swelled the publication to numerous volumes. The document is positioned as an invitation to discussion and a catalyst for work on constructive positions aimed at forming a truly reliable and stable architecture of Euro-Atlantic security.

The authors base their judgments on the assumption that Russia is fundamentally – that is historically, socially, culturally, economically and intellectually – an integral part of Europe and its security space. It is in our common interest to integrate Russia as much as possible into this space on the basis of shared principles and values.

I. MULTILATERAL SECURITY ORGANIZATIONS IN EUROPE

1. General overview

Europe boasts the highest density of institutions of multilateral cooperation in the world. The key regional structures are the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), the Council of Europe (CE), the European Union (EU) and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO).

Added to the number of European multilateral institutions should be the bodies that have sprung up on the territory of the former Soviet Union. We are talking first of all about the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) and the Collective Security Treaty Organization (CSTO). The strict focus of these structures first and foremost on the post-Soviet international political space determines their specific character and importance in the context of ensuring European security.

In the system of multilateral cooperation in Europe a certain role is played by the United Nations (UN) and numerous structures aimed at the development of sub-regional cooperation.

Name	Number of Participating States	Notes
OSCE	56	Including the United States and Canada, Caucasus states (3) and Central Asian states (5)
Council of Europe	47	Including Caucasus states (3)
European Union	27	
NATO	28	Including the United States and Canada
CIS	10	Including Caucasus states (2) and Central Asian states (4)
CSTO	7	Including one Caucasus state and Central Asian states (4)
United Nations	192 (including 45 from Europe)	Out of the five permanent Security Council members (P5) four are from the Euro-Atlantic area
Sub-regional structures (10+)	5+	Among the most significant are: the Council of the Baltic Sea States, the Barents Euro-Arctic Council, the Organization of the Black Sea Economic Cooperation

The following trends in the development of multilateral cooperation in Europe are worth mentioning.

First, the expansion of the Council of Europe, the EU and NATO. These structures are gradually taking on an almost pan-European dimension.

Second, the growing interaction between EU/NATO states and non-EU/NATO states, with CIS countries occupying the top of the list of the latter. The EU is the biggest trading partner for most of them. It offers East European and South Caucasian countries prospective association and closer cooperation, including establishing a free-trade area in exchange for the approximation of economic regulation, technical standards and the basic principles of the political system. The EU maintains direct political dialogue with Central Asian countries with the aim of expanding economic, energy, and financial cooperation, promoting the rule of law and respect of human rights, and meeting new security challenges and threats.

NATO develops differentiated partnerships with most CIS countries on the basis of the principle of keeping the door open for their eventual membership.

Third, the “division of labor” among European regional organizations. In the 1990s, the idea of transforming the OSCE into an umbrella organization and establishing an “executive committee” vested with powers identical to those of the UN Security Council was mooted. It was also suggested that the OSCE takes on conflict settlement functions or delegates them to other organizations (NATO, EU, CIS). But such an approach failed to garner the necessary support.

A new practice of interaction took shape during the settlement of conflicts in the former Yugoslavia (Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1995, Kosovo in 1999). Under UN political guidance, the NATO alliance performed the tasks of providing security, while the OSCE took charge of developing democratic institutions (including law enforcement agencies), holding elections, establishing the rule of law and promoting human rights. The European Union, along with other relevant international organizations, was responsible for economic reconstruction.

Fourth, a functional shift in the activities of Euro-Atlantic institutions. The OSCE holds a comprehensive (though not exclusive) mandate to discuss security issues, economic and humanitarian cooperation, crisis management and conflict settlement. NATO was originally devised as a collective defense organization, the EU as a body of economic integration, and the Council of Europe as a guardian of democracy and human rights standards. However, over recent years a certain shift in the functional areas of activity of the above-mentioned structures has been apparent.

As it scales down its military activity and potential in Europe, NATO is starting to become involved in the crises management outside Europe. The European Union is stepping up its security functions, taking part in the crises

management in Europe and beyond, helping respond to the new challenges and threats, etc. As the OSCE and NATO tone down their activity in South-East Europe, the EU is stepping in to take their place.

This results in higher potential interchangeability of the activities performed by the European multilateral organizations. The situation, accentuated by the high density of such structures in the region, gives rise to a certain competition between them. At the same time, when a crisis erupts it becomes possible to assign different roles to the OSCE, the EU, NATO and the UN in order to cater to the different stakeholders' interests.

In general, when considering prospects of upgrading the European security architecture, it appears appropriate to take account of the following:

- It is legitimate to raise the issue of how effective the existing multilateral organizations are in Europe, and of their broader interaction in the interests of strengthening European security.
- Russia is interested that the CSTO features on the list of the main protagonists of the “European concert” of multilateral structures. To achieve this, it is necessary to at least make efforts towards increasing the viability of this organization.
- The overwhelming majority of European countries do not see any need in performing a profound change or an extensive makeover of the existing mechanism of multilateral cooperation, considering it, if not utterly efficient, at least adequate. With further expansion of the EU and NATO and their closer cooperation with CIS countries on the cards, the potential number of supporters of the “coalition for change” may shrink.
- Promoting the idea of a brand-new organization that would take charge of guaranteeing European security from scratch appears equally problematic. The international political landscape of the continent is overloaded with various multilateral institutions. Without serious reform, adding a new – and important – one to their number could only increase the clutter. Especially as the newcomer would require its “own field” assigned to it and a delimitation of the competences with other bodies already in place on the European continent.
- The difficulties that the existing regional organizations experience in responding to crises in Europe stem not so much from an institutional deficit as from a lack of enthusiasm from the participating countries to seek compromise.
- Another problem lies with the key member-countries not being sufficiently prepared to expand the field of independent action by the regional organizations or to allow them more autonomy.

2. The United Nations

The United Nations, the cornerstone of the modern system of international relations, performs a systemic function in the organization of European security:

- ▣ by its role in the formation of contemporary international law and the standards of political conduct of states in the world arena;
- ▣ by the activities of the UN Security Council, vested with the authority to deal with any issue bearing upon the interests of international peace and security and to adopt binding decisions with regard to its participating states, including the enforcement of peace (by such means as sanctions, embargos and the use of force).

Despite universal acknowledgement of the central role of the UN Security Council in the adoption of decisions to enforce peace, a number of factors complicate this function being implemented in practice.

First, decisions to that effect must get the backing of (or draw no objections from) all five permanent Security Council members. Such consensus is not always easy to come by.

Second, the United Nations has no armed forces of its own. Military operations approved by the UN Security Council are conducted by individual countries or groups of countries; it is their representatives who take charge of respective operations.

Third, the inability of the Security Council to reach agreement on the use of force may prompt its use without a UN mandate. Meanwhile, the UN Charter allows such use of force only in self-defense. If this is not the case the situation goes beyond the legal framework and is fraught with complicated collisions. Such situations have taken place more than once, including within the boundaries of Europe.

In the context of the inclusion of UN-related issues in the process of overhauling the system of security provision in Europe, we deem it important:

- ▣ to clearly and unequivocally reaffirm the central role of the United Nations in efforts to uphold international peace, and its overall leadership in the organization of the system of European security;
- ▣ to reiterate the importance of strict adherence to the UN Charter;
- ▣ to emphasize exclusive competence of the UN Security Council in authorizing the use of force; any use of force undertaken in a different framework shall be considered admissible only in extraordinary circumstances and with obligatory retroactive legitimization of the Security Council;

- while deploying efforts to increase the role of multilateral institutions operating in the European area, to promote their cooperation with the UN.

3. The OSCE

The European Security Charter, adopted in 1999, stipulates that the OSCE is a “primary organization for the peaceful settlement of disputes within its region and as a key instrument for early warning, conflict prevention, crisis management and post-conflict rehabilitation”.

However, it is not a regional organization of collective security since it has no right to decide on enforcement measures. This prerogative remains exclusive to the UN Security Council. Neither has the OSCE the authority to issue a “peace enforcement” mandate to other regional organizations. Its capabilities are conditioned on the willingness of its member states to faithfully implement their commitments which they have voluntarily entered in the three “dimensions” of the OSCE (security, economy and environment, and democracy and human rights).

This naturally sets certain restrictions on its activities right from the start, limiting its role in providing European security. Still, the OSCE has been an important vehicle for the formation of the principles, approaches, institutions and mechanisms of supporting security in Europe through the multilateral cooperative efforts of its member states.

First, it is necessary to stress the efforts to curtail military activity and ensure its transparency. These include:

- confidence- and security-building measures (exchange of information on military forces, major weapon and equipment systems and plans for their deployment; prior notification and observation of certain military activities; exchange of annual calendars of military activity; verification measures, etc.);
- the Treaty on Open Skies;
- the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (which led to substantial reduction of armed forces and weapons systems to the levels far below the limits established by the original and adapted versions of the Treaty).

Second, the mechanisms of early warning, conflict prevention and threat reduction have been set up.

- They include instruments allowing to draw attention to situations with the potential to degenerate into crises, including armed conflicts. In particular, any member-state has a right to submit any issue for the consideration by the Permanent Council during its weekly sessions at ambassadorial level in Vienna.

- ▣ There are mechanisms in place to call emergency meetings, including at the level of foreign ministers, to deal with emergency situations.
- ▣ Decisions on preventive action to avert conflict escalation or to promote conflict settlement can be adopted (including dispatching special missions and deploying OSCE peacekeeping operations).

The OSCE has been mostly preoccupied with conflicts in the Balkans. By contrast, its role in the post-Soviet area (in Georgia, Moldova and Tajikistan before 2002) appears extremely mitigated. The organization does not contest Russia's supremacy there. The overall results of OSCE activity in conflict settlement are contradictory – comprising successes as well as failures.

Successful missions include assisting in the settlement of the political crisis following municipal elections in Yugoslavia (1996), and the mediator role in forging the agreement that allowed to overcome chaos in Albania (1997).

Among the failures are the unsuccessful attempts to settle the conflict in Macedonia (2001), and the issue of the modalities of Montenegro's exit from Yugoslavia (2002). In both cases it was the European Union that played the decisive role.

Still, overall the OSCE has certain advantages with regard to other European multilateral institutions, even though on the reverse side they quite often turn into weaknesses.

- ▣ First, it is the only European organization to boast comprehensive membership. But this same feature becomes an obstacle when a common policy needs to be worked out on some seriously divisive issue.
- ▣ Second, all politically important decisions of the OSCE are taken by consensus. The difficulty of reaching consensus on the most controversial issues often leaves it paralyzed.
- ▣ Third, the competitive advantage of the OSCE consists in its complex approach, which implies combining and maintaining a certain balance of activities in the three “dimensions”. But member states view the importance of these “dimensions” differently, giving rise to debate about the geographical and functional imbalances of its activities, reproaches regarding its focus on the areas “east of Vienna” and on the issues of the rule of law and human rights.

The OSCE has been criticized over the last years by Russia and a number of CIS countries as well as by some other member states. They question the traditional balance of agreements epitomized in the OSCE commitments (“inviolability of borders in exchange for human rights”). The critics of the OSCE are increasingly reluctant to put up with its “interference” in their internal

affairs, reckoning that they get nothing in return as far as their security or economic development is concerned. Despite a pronounced intensification of the political dialog within the OSCE over recent years the existing disagreements often stand in the way of practical steps that could be undertaken to promote resolution of conflict situations.

At the same time the EU is becoming increasingly involved in the areas that previously were considered to be exclusive to the OSCE – such as political crisis management, monitoring of and supporting the participating states in the settlement, implementation of agreements reached, development of democratic institutions and strengthening the rule of law. Interest in cooperation with the EU and NATO rather than the OSCE is being displayed by countries absent from the Euro-Atlantic institutions (the trend has been most visible in South-East Europe, and to a lesser – but steadily increasing – extent, on the territory of the CIS).

There is no “magical” recipe to solve the problems of the OSCE. Restoring consensus over the organization’s central mission being prevention and settlement of conflicts could give the OSCE the ability to respond more promptly to developments in Europe. That would require at the same time substantially extending the authority of the OSCE institutions and structures, granting them the right to act independently without waiting for decisions of the Permanent Council (which can be blocked by member states). However, the majority of the participating states are not prepared to do that today, hindering the organization’s viability.

Signing the OSCE Charter or a European Security Treaty or holding a pan-European summit is hardly going to be enough to remedy the problem. There does not seem to be any ground to believe that any decision is possible that would fundamentally or even substantially differ from those which are now feasible within the OSCE.

In this regard, and in the context of a general orientation towards upgrading the European security architecture, the minimum possible task regarding the OSCE could be formulated as follows:

- ▣ While aiming deserved criticism at this structure, we should not allow any organizational, intellectual or political experience it has gained in addressing the security problems to be wasted. A substantial majority of security-related issues being raised today has been in some form or another the subject of consideration and often agreement within the OSCE.
- ▣ Accordingly, it stands to reason to take stock of the work already performed by the OSCE in relation to the issues of European security. This could yield mutually acceptable approaches and interesting practical solutions even to some of the most contentious (and difficult) problems we face today.

- ▣ If we do not narrow the idea of Helsinki-2 to merely holding a summit, but address it in a broader context, it is worth considering looking for ways to increase the role of the OSCE in contemporary international political development.

4. NATO

NATO is the biggest player in Europe in the field of security-related multilateral cooperation. Addressing the task of overhauling the system of European security requires a profound “reload” of Russia’s relations with this organization.

NATO remains concerned with performing its main function – joint defense of the participating countries from a potential external military attack, while also putting emphasis on crisis management operations. The geopolitical transformation of the alliance manifests itself in a gradual inclusion in its ranks of an increasingly broad range of countries, in establishing interaction with non-member states (the Partnership for Peace program) and in going beyond its traditional zone of responsibility (the operation in Afghanistan).

Eastward expansion of the alliance leads to heightened tensions with Russia, which considers eventual NATO membership for Ukraine and Georgia completely unacceptable. Possible NATO evolution is thus an important challenge to European security. It is paradoxical that the latter’s strengthening is conceivable with NATO’s participation. This makes ever more urgent taking off the agenda the issue of the alliance’s further expansion into the post-Soviet territory.

Fundamentally, there are several avenues to explore when trying to secure an optimal combination of various approaches.

- ▣ To make absolutely clear for the candidate countries the attractiveness of alternative ways of ensuring their security. For instance, by issuing clear and unequivocal territorial integrity and sovereignty guarantees for CIS countries, Russia could neutralize a fair amount of arguments in favor of joining NATO voiced in these countries.
- ▣ To warn of possible counter-measures by Russia. Threats, however, should be issued with extreme caution, for they may turn out to be unconvincing or, worse still, counterproductive.
- ▣ To create a stimulus for the alliance to freeze expansion. We are talking first of all about stepping up cooperation on issues of high importance for NATO. We should strive for Russia becoming a “necessary partner” in the eyes of NATO, relations with which outweigh the imperative of expansion into Ukraine or Georgia.

This line could include several key components.

- With regard to NATO's ventures in Afghanistan, Russia should facilitate cargo transit over its territory (including military hardware). Russia could also start considering a possibility of expanding economic and humanitarian assistance to NATO operations in Afghanistan – eventually, towards military deliveries and participation of advisors.
- At the same time it is worth raising the issue of recognition by the alliance of the CSTO, including through its cooperation with NATO on Afghanistan.
- Work towards involving NATO in negotiations, consultations and informal discussions of the issues related to the prospective deployment of the elements of the US missile defense shield in Europe. This would help keep afloat the idea of creating a joint early warning and defense system against a missile attack for the whole of the European continent, which requires interaction particularly with NATO and not just the United States.
- Eventual joint participation with NATO in peacekeeping operations is also worth considering. Drawing on the experience of such action in the Balkans, certain corrections are bound to be made – regarding troops command, in particular. But fundamentally such participation adds to establishing better trust between military structures, and increases their mutual adaptability in military conflicts, paving the way for a more prompt response in the case of crisis. The possibility of joint operations in the post-Soviet area should be banned, however.
- One other field of possible cooperation between Russia and NATO is the fight against sea pirates. This could lay some far-reaching foundations for joint navy action in the interests of guaranteeing stability in various maritime regions.

5. The European Union

Turning the EU into an independent international player is largely in line with the logic of creating a multi-polar world favored by Russia. No less important is one other aspect: the EU is building up capacity for crisis management and is fine-tuning the mechanism of its multilateral support, which in itself may be useful for the task of strengthening European security and working out some more effective methods of its maintenance. On this basis it is worth paying serious attention to finding forms of cooperative interaction between Russia and the EU as part of the efforts to upgrade the European security system. In this context, the following suggestions appear pertinent.

Russia is already seen by the EU as an important partner in preventing and dealing with the consequences of emergencies, in space exploration and in strategic lift capabilities. An important precedent has already been created – Russia’s participation in the EU operations in Chad. That is why the outlook for cooperation – involving a broad range of issues – may be generally assessed as rather promising.

Still, cooperation proposals by Russia that make European foreign relations and defense bodies in some way dependent on Moscow will most likely be rejected. If Russia conditions its involvement in the EU-sponsored projects of the European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) on its equal-rights, full-scale participation in the process of decision-making (that would put it on an equal footing with EU members), it is unlikely to achieve any concrete results. Points of contact are more likely to emerge if Russia helps in some form or other to strengthen the EU’s independent foreign and defense policies without trying to become a part of them.

In the process of preparation of the European Security Treaty and upgrading of other mechanisms of multilateral cooperation, especially in the field of crisis management, it is worth considering involvement of various EU institutions responsible for the functioning of ESDP in permanent interaction with similar organizations formed by non-EU countries (including Russia).

Special attention paid by the EU to the rapid reaction forces should not be overseen. The process of setting ESDP targets is based on regularly updated catalogues containing information on the military capability available for operations. Russia could come up with a catalogue of its own capabilities that it would be ready to provide for the EU in case of eventual joint operations. This would allow to cut the response time by Russia, with the deployment schedule and the likely level of related expenditure being agreed in advance.

Increasing the level of interoperability with the EU is possible through the employment of the concept of “battle groups” adopted as part of ESDP. The Russian army, which already has experience of setting up peacekeeping forces, is quite capable of creating a similar structure for international operations that would be well-equipped, well-trained and possess the necessary language skills. Such a battle group could take part in training as well as real-life operations alongside the EU forces.

Observer missions and participation of even a small number of Russian personnel in multilateral international projects and field operations by the EU shall not be dismissed. Russia’s participation in all EU projects where it prompts no fundamental objections by either side increases the level of trust between the partners and favors experience exchange.

6. The Council of Europe

The particularities of the role played by the Council of Europe in ensuring European security stem from the specific nature of this organization, its functional orientation. The formally proclaimed aim of the Council of Europe is to achieve a greater unity between its members by promoting democracy and the respect for human rights as well as cooperation on issues of culture, education, healthcare, youth, sports, law, information and the environment. Insofar as these themes are important for security on the European continent the Council of Europe can be considered one of the key instruments for guaranteeing and promoting it.

The role of the Council of Europe is also a reflection of the universal respect enjoyed by the organization, whose mere membership is deemed to certify adherence to the high standards of pluralistic democracy by the participating countries. But it is also the ground for collisions in relations with the member states (and those aspiring for membership) that have some problems in this particular field. Judgement and recommendations expressed on behalf of the Council of Europe may trigger rejection, seen as interference in internal affairs.

Russian politicians have been rather vocal in voicing their dissatisfaction with the Council of Europe, on the following grounds:

- unacceptable interference in the internal affairs of the state and inadmissible attempts to dictate the rules of conduct and the standards of the organization of internal political life it is supposed to follow;
- the practice of double standards (for instance, complacency towards discrimination against Russian-speaking minorities in some Baltic states on the one hand, and stringent requirements regarding respect for civil rights and freedoms in Russia on the other);
- a prevailing “anti-Russian” drive in the European Court of Human Rights (ECHR), which is overloaded with a mountain of lawsuits against the Russian state, and which often grants them.

At the same time, the problems of ensuring military security, preventing and resolving conflicts, and promoting economic cooperation – that is, problems that appear to bear most weight from the point of view of Russian interests in Europe (first and foremost in securing a more tangible Russian presence in the international political system of the continent) – are outside the competence of this organization.

A sharply negative perception of the Council of Europe manifests itself in the view that Russia, if necessary, can painlessly draw a line under its relations with this structure. Appeals for this to be done are quite possible in the

case of adoption by the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe of decisions that may be regarded as irksome or unacceptable for Russia.

As Russia deploys efforts to upgrade the architecture of European security it is important not to allow such attitudes towards the Council of Europe to take hold. Russia officially rejects them with considerable vigor. It is necessary to strictly and consistently follow that line in the future, making sure it does not fall victim to short-term maneuvering and emotional outbursts.

The following should be kept in mind:

- ▣ The Council of Europe is the only structure of those in place in the western part of the continent in the Soviet times that after the end of the Cold War took on a really pan-European dimension and which accepted Russia as a truly equal member. The mere fact of being a member of this organization underlines the possibility of forming in the Euro-Atlantic area an architecture of security that would banish Russian discrimination.
- ▣ Certain aspects of the activities of the Council of Europe directly contribute to a more solid European security and must be thoroughly supported. A good example is the Council of Europe Convention on the Prevention of Terrorism, which entered into force in 2007.
- ▣ The Council of Europe can perform an important informational and support function in alleviating certain problems fraught with potential threats for European security – for instance, in the field of minority rights protection, contesting discriminating court verdicts, etc.

Generally, the Council of Europe's participation in the organizational pool of those international structures that bear the brunt of responsibility for maintaining European security would be rather positive.

In that regard one should emphasize the following.

- ▣ It is necessary to work towards preserving the role of the Council of Europe as an element of the security architecture and a generator of a legal space common for all its participants.
- ▣ The Council of Europe, along with the OSCE, must play a leading role in promoting such important elements of ensuring European security as democracy, political pluralism, observance of human rights and basic freedoms, and development of civil society. Such approach must be promoted.

7. The CIS

There are a number of reasons underpinning the continuing importance of the CIS for Russia. However, fully-fledged and effective participation of this organization in the resolution of problems related to ensuring European security as well as its involvement in the process of upgrading the pan-European architecture appears problematic. There are at least two main reasons for this.

- First, a limited viability of the CIS, which results in its vague positioning in the European international political space.
- Second, the unmistakably dominant role of Russia in the Commonwealth prompts some of its members to exercise caution in entrusting the organization with any meaningful authority and powers, and external counterparts to refuse to consider it as a “powerful” figure in the international arena because in their view it would be tantamount to agreeing to Russian domination in the post-Soviet space.

Still, in a number of aspects CIS-related activities correlate with the problems of European security. For instance, the Council of the Heads of State may focus its attention on it, and the issues of security and military cooperation can be tackled in a more detailed way by the Council of Defense Ministers, which to all appearances is so far concerning itself with relatively peripheral issues. In the field of “soft security” (cooperation on such issues as the fight against drug trafficking and trans-border crime) the CIS continues to play a role, even though it is facing competition from the CSTO and GUAM.

The biggest joint project by the CIS countries in the military field is cooperation in setting up the Unified Air Defense System. Still, Ukraine favors bilateral cooperation, while its prospective NATO membership adds to the uncertainty of its position in the project. Accordingly, the logic of moving the system under the auspices of the CSTO as a more compact and homogeneous body becomes more attractive.

Early expectations of a rather important role to be played by the CIS in the conflict resolution on the territory of its member states have proved futile. The only peacekeeping mission ever to take place under the auspices of the CIS (and also approved by the UN Security Council) has been dispatched to Abkhazia.

The role of the CIS in the process of upgrading the architecture of European security has to be defined with caution and realism.

- An artificial rehabilitation of this institution is problematic, which limits its capabilities in influencing the tasks of European security.

- ▣ It is worth outlining the presence of the CIS (even in the most general terms) in the documents, decisions and mechanisms aimed at strengthening security over the former Soviet space (excluding the Baltic States). In particular, it may turn out to be politically worthwhile to counterbalance the involvement in the region of other multilateral structures (most importantly, the EU and NATO).
- ▣ On some specific aspects (“soft security”, the Unified Air Defense System) the CIS may be considered as a reserve institution (in particular, due to Ukraine and Moldova being members).

8. The CSTO

The CSTO may be defined as a multipurpose security structure in the making. Throughout the current decade it has been fine-tuned to combine two major functions: countering traditional external military threats (creation of a military union, unification and merger of the military infrastructures of the participating states) on the one hand, and countering new threats and challenges on the other.

The specific character of the CSTO as far as its membership is concerned is in the existence of three de facto autonomous segments, united by Russia’s uncontested core role in the organization. Belarus, Armenia and the Central Asian countries face different external threats creating serious objective difficulties in fostering horizontal ties between them and limiting the possibility of developing military and political cooperation within the CSTO framework in general. Russia emerges as the main integrating force on the territory of the CSTO, being the only country that is capable to provide security guarantees to its partners in each of the three above-mentioned territorial azimuths.

For them, cooperation with Russia is an important but not the only foreign policy priority; they are also looking for ways to counter external and internal threats (as well as to strengthen their own positions in relation to Russia) in other fields. There are also other problems inside the CSTO – such as the disagreements among the Central Asian countries (struggle for influence, an increasing water deficit, etc.).

In 2009, the members agreed to set up Collective Forces for Operational Reaction (CFOR) – in contrast to earlier such attempts, not on a regional but on a common basis. All member states have agreed to contribute military contingents (Russia – a division and a brigade, Kazakhstan – a brigade, the rest – one battalion each). The total strength of the CFOR is planned at about 16,000. The CSTO is also planning to set up a joint air defense system and a joint threat identification system for chemical and biological warfare. Military

and technical cooperation has been actively promoted. A system of joint training of military personnel has taken shape.

As far as countering “new threats” is concerned the CSTO is conducting conceptual work on the issues of joint peacekeeping; significant efforts are being undertaken to promote counterterrorist activities (information exchange, joint exercises, etc.). One of the key elements of the CSTO’s work is the fight against drug trafficking.

The CSTO, in the context of Russian efforts to upgrade the European security architecture, may become one of its elements due to a number of current and prospective factors:

- it is the only multilateral structure in the post-Soviet area capable of conducting military operations;
- in this capacity it can be used independently or as a partner (counterpart) of the EU, NATO or the OSCE;
- its role may turn out to be outstanding in efforts to stop drug trafficking from Afghanistan to Europe;
- supporting US and NATO efforts in Afghanistan could become a step of paramount importance for increased international political exposure of the CSTO;
- more generally, a focus by the organization on certain “new threats” (drug trafficking, terrorism) could be interpreted as a move away from the traditionalistic approaches to providing security.

Russia is interested in promoting the CSTO as an element of the new system of European security. At the same time it is important to identify the circumstances that work against this approach, and make efforts to at least alleviate them. Among them are, for instance, the notions that are widespread in the West that the CSTO is first and foremost a “Russian tool” and that by strengthening security and fighting terrorism the organization understands a perpetuation of the existing “undemocratic regimes”. To that effect efforts should be made to achieve greater CSTO transparency, broader informational support, and interaction with non-governmental organizations.

Other measures to heighten the significance of the CSTO in the eyes of its participating countries and external counterparties could include: regularly briefing the leadership of the CSTO states on the development or the outcome of certain negotiations (on nuclear disarmament, for instance); conducting consultations on the issues of global politics; and advance notification of important diplomatic or military steps or initiatives.

It is imperative to think about strengthening the real character of military functions, which will promote interest in the CSTO as a partner from NATO and the EU. In that sense the success of the CFOR project and convincingly presented information to that effect could be very significant. Another line of efforts could be making this particular organization responsible for effective support of the logistics of NATO's air operations in Afghanistan or organizing military cargo transit through Central Asian states to Afghanistan by land.

9. Sub-regional structures

Since the early 1990s a large number of new sub-regional organizations have emerged in Europe involving both western European countries and those of the former Eastern bloc. The most active participants have been countries of Central and Eastern Europe (CEE), South-East Europe and to some extent European countries of the former Soviet Union. All in all, we are talking about such structures as: the Council of the Baltic Sea States (CBSS), the Barents Euro-Arctic Council (BEAC), the Organization of the Black Sea Economic Co-operation (BSEC), the Central European Initiative (CEI), the Vysegrad Group, the Regional Cooperation Council of the Countries of South-East Europe (RCC), the South East European Cooperation Process (SEECP), the South-east European Cooperative Initiative (SECI), the Adriatic-Ionian Initiative (AII), and the Danube Cooperation Process (DCP).

Contrary to expectations, most European structures of sub-regional cooperation have managed to elude crisis after many of their members joined the EU and NATO in 2004–2007. Today they occupy a certain niche in pan-European cooperation.

They are focused on specific issues of regional interaction. It could be transportation or other infrastructure development, telecommunications, inland water and maritime transportation and fishing, economic development and environmental protection, support for small and medium enterprise, municipal development, cultural and educational cooperation, cooperation between law-enforcement authorities in combating terrorism and organized crime, strengthening democratic institutions, the rule of law and respect of human rights, trans-border cooperation, and so on.

Some of these are directly linked to the issues of security even though in most cases the connection is oblique. The traditional military aspects of security are rarely a matter of concern for these structures (with the exception of the south-east European countries which are engaged in sub-regional arrangements on limiting and reducing heavy weapons and on confidence- and security-building measures).

Still, taking into account the tendency towards broad interpretation of security provision, one should not overlook the role of sub-regional structures in maintaining it. Their mere existence is an important factor for the European international political landscape. With regard to some sub-regional organizations (the Barents Euro-Arctic Council, for example) one can assume that their activities will almost undoubtedly directly involve tackling future emergencies (and are capable of starting work to alleviate the tensions around them as early as today).

In the process of upgrading the architecture of European security it is important to keep in mind the positive role of sub-regional structures in maintaining international stability and to think over the possibilities and options of involving them in consultative, expert, intermediary and other mechanisms of maintaining European security at all levels – local, regional and pan-European.

II. INTERNATIONAL POLITICAL PRINCIPLES OF ENSURING EUROPEAN SECURITY

1. The Helsinki “decatalogue”

The modern code of pan-European political norms has its roots in the ten principles that the participating states of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe undertook to respect and put into practice in their mutual relations by signing in 1975 the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference. The ten Helsinki principles can be summarized as follows:

Sovereign equality, respect for the rights inherent in sovereignty

These include the right of every state to juridical equality, to territorial integrity and to freedom and political independence, the right to freely choose and develop its political, social, economic and cultural systems, as well as its right to determine its laws and regulations. In the context of sovereign equality the right of states to be or not to be a party to bilateral or multilateral treaties (including treaties of alliance) as well as the right to neutrality have been confirmed on a number of occasions. The rights inherent in sovereignty also include the possibility for states to change their frontiers “in accordance with international law, by peaceful means and by agreement”.

Refraining from the threat or use of force

The participating states undertake to refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, as a means of settling disputes between states or in any other manner inconsistent with the purpose of the United Nations and with the principles of the CSCE–OSCE.

Inviolability of frontiers

This principle was perceived not as an acknowledgement of the unchangeability of the existing frontiers in Europe but as a renunciation of forceful assault on them. That exact interpretation of the principle of inviolability of frontiers was emphasized by the inclusion in the Final Act of a provision on the “peaceful change” of borders. The documents signed also carried a political pledge to “refrain from any demand for, or act of, seizure and usurpation of part or all of the territory of any participating state”.

Territorial integrity of states

The participating states will refrain from any action inconsistent with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, against the territorial integrity, political independence or unity of any participating state.

In particular, it is inadmissible to “make each other’s territory the object of military occupation or other direct or indirect measures of force in contravention of international law, or the object of acquisition by means of such measures or the threat of them. No such occupation or acquisition will be recognized as legal”.

Peaceful settlement of disputes

The participating states are to “settle disputes among themselves by peaceful means in such a manner as not to endanger international peace and security, and justice”. For this purpose they are to “use such means as negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement or other peaceful means of their own choice”. All the participating states that are parties to a dispute among them, will “refrain from any action that might aggravate the situation to such a degree as to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, and thereby make a peaceful settlement of a dispute more difficult”.

Non-interference in internal affairs

Any interference (direct or indirect, individual or collective) in internal or external affairs falling within the domestic jurisdiction of another participating state – regardless of mutual relations – is proclaimed inadmissible. This principle specifically demands to refrain from any form of armed intervention or threat of such intervention.

Non-intervention is interpreted broadly – as unconditional (“in all circumstances”) abstention from any act of “military, or of political, economic or other coercion designed to subordinate to one’s own interest the exercise by another participating state of the rights inherent in its sovereignty and thus to secure advantages of any kind”. Direct or indirect assistance to terrorist activities, or to subversive or other activities directed towards the violent overthrow of the regime of another participating state is inadmissible.

Respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the freedom of thought, conscience, religion and belief

Respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms is recognized as an “essential factor for peace” necessary to ensure the development of friendly relations and cooperation among all states.

Equal rights and self-determination of peoples¹

By virtue of this principle, all peoples always have the right, “in full freedom, to determine, when and as they wish, their internal and external political status, without external interference, and to pursue as they wish their political, economic, social and cultural development”. They must “act at all times in conformity with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and with the relevant norms of international law, including those relating to territorial integrity of states”.

Cooperation among states

A new aspect of the interpretation of this principle was the recognition that “institutions, organizations and persons” have a relevant and positive role to play in contributing towards the achievement of the aims of cooperation among states. That brings forth the imperative of favorable attitudes towards contacts, relations and cooperation on various levels – towards development of cooperation of non-governmental organizations across the national borders, for instance.

Fulfillment in good faith of obligations under international law

In exercising their sovereign rights, including the right to determine their laws and regulations, the participating states will conform with their legal obligations under international law and political commitments under the OSCE–CSCE documents. All the principles set forth in the Final Act are “of primary significance” and “will be equally and unreservedly applied, each of them being interpreted taking into account the others”. The participating states also declared their intention to conduct their relations in the spirit of the Helsinki principles, not only among themselves but also “with all other states”.

Amendments made to the document at later stages were not aimed so much at altering the compendium of Helsinki principles itself as at refining their agreed understanding and working out measures to render them more effective in relations between states as well as between state and society. The adjustments were made as part of the CSCE–OSCE process (in particular, in the 1990 Charter of Paris for a New Europe, in the 1992 Helsinki Document, in the 1999 Charter for European Security) but also in a series of documents passed within the Russia–NATO framework.

The 1997 Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security between NATO and the Russian Federation basically reaffirmed the commitment to the Helsinki principles. At the same time some of them were strengthened or refined.

¹ The Russian and the French texts of the Final Act speak of “the right of peoples to be the master of their fate”; the English, German, Spanish and Italian versions – of “self-determination of peoples”.

In particular, the following principles were proclaimed:

- development, on the basis of transparency, of a strong, stable, enduring and equal partnership and of cooperation to strengthen security and stability in the Euro-Atlantic area;
- acknowledgement of the vital role that democracy, political pluralism, the rule of law, and respect for human rights and civil liberties and the development of free market economies play in the development of common prosperity and comprehensive security;
- refraining from the threat or use of force against each other as well as against any other state, its sovereignty, territorial integrity or political independence in any manner inconsistent with the United Nations Charter and with the Declaration of Principles Guiding Relations Between Participating States contained in the Helsinki Final Act;
- respect for sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of all states and their inherent right to choose the means to ensure their own security, and the inviolability of borders and peoples' right of self-determination as enshrined in the Helsinki Final Act and other OSCE documents;
- mutual transparency in creating and implementing defense policy and military doctrines;
- prevention of conflicts and settlement of disputes by peaceful means in accordance with UN and OSCE principles;
- support, on a case-by-case basis, of peacekeeping operations carried out under the authority of the UN Security Council or with the responsibility of the OSCE.

Some principles of the Helsinki “decatalogue” have been developed and refined in further documents while others have spurred controversy as well as sometimes over-optimistic expectations regarding the possibility of their radical upgrade to give them instrumental value. We think that it is important to strike a reasonable balance here between the desired and the achievable – taking into account both the objective need for the modern international political space to be efficiently organized and the existing constraints to that effect. It is no less important to implant into the “upgrade-oriented” approaches the best practices of the last two or three decades.

2. Human rights, pluralistic democracy and the rule of law

Interpretation of these concepts was long the subject of debate. Common understanding regarding their meaning was formulated in the 1990 CSCE Copenhagen document and later in the Charter of Paris for a New Europe.

Another aspect of the debate bore upon the acceptable forms of cooperation among states on the issue. In simplified form, the argument centered on whether international discussion of the situation with human rights in individual countries constituted interference in their internal affairs. Gradually, the logic according to which human rights protection is of paramount importance for international order and cannot therefore be considered an exclusive internal matter of individual countries, garnered increasing support. Consequently, raising the issue vis-à-vis other countries is fully lawful and is not interfering with their internal affairs.

To add weight to this approach, the “human dimension mechanism”, which allowed some states to raise with others the issue of specific human rights abuses and seek solution to them, was adopted in Vienna in 1989 and later perfected. The mechanism provides for voluntary as well as obligatory procedures, which the participating states have no right to ignore. The conceptual debate was finally clinched by the 1991 Moscow meeting of the Conference on the Human Dimension, which categorically and irrevocably proclaimed rightful international monitoring of the OSCE’s human dimension commitments.

That same document, incidentally, expanded the list of subjects regarded as fundamental for international order. The additions included the issues of democracy and the rule of law. The 1992 Helsinki Document adopted at the level of heads of state and government also emphasized that the “protection and promotion of human rights and fundamental freedoms and the strengthening of democratic institutions continue to be a vital basis for our comprehensive security”. The list was further expanded to include national minority rights protection (the 1999 Charter for European Security).

In the context of upgrading the approaches to the provision of European security, it is relevant to use the following points of departure.

- ▣ Since the 1990s, the commitment to respect human rights, promote the rule of law, observe and strengthen pluralistic democracy is one of the cornerstones of the system of relations in Europe. Proposals to amend the interpretation of the above-mentioned principles with some relativistic conditions may fail to rally support.
- ▣ In this sphere, the established views of the standards of international political conduct provide no place for the notion of unlawful intervention in the internal affairs of other states. It is worth looking with the utmost care into all the pros and cons of trying to solidify any sort of constraining criteria, since such an approach is most likely to be seen as a relapse into “yesterday’s” thinking and behavior.

- On the contrary, Russia would gain in authority if it unequivocally and unconditionally threw its weight behind the thesis that “peace and security in our region is best guaranteed by the willingness and ability of each participating State to uphold democracy, the rule of law and respect for human rights” (the 1999 Charter for European Security).

3. Equal security, indivisibility of security, and the unacceptability of ensuring security to the detriment of other states

In light of recent events the issue of promoting these concepts as important principles of European security has come to the forefront.

The Helsinki Final Act interpreted the subject solely through the prism of confidence-building. The 1990 Charter of Paris for a New Europe limited itself to just a few declarative theses – traditional in nature and emphasizing the importance of strengthening confidence and promoting arms control and disarmament. The Code of Conduct on Politico-military Aspects of Security (subsections 9-14 of the 1994 Budapest Code of Conduct) elaborated the common understanding of equal and indivisible security more profoundly:

- the participating states reaffirmed the inherent right, as recognized in the Charter of the United Nations, of individual and collective self-defense;
- each participating state, bearing in mind the legitimate security concerns of other states, is free to determine its security interests itself on the basis of sovereign equality, and has the right to freely choose its own security arrangements;
- the participating states each have the sovereign right to belong or not to belong to international organizations, and to be or not to be a party to bilateral or multilateral treaties, including treaties of alliance; they also have the right to neutrality. Each has the right to change its status in this respect, subject to relevant agreements and procedures. Each will respect the rights of all others in this regard;
- each participating state is to maintain only such military capabilities as are commensurate with individual or collective legitimate security needs, taking into account its obligations under international law;
- each participating state is to determine its military capabilities on the basis of national democratic procedures, bearing in mind the legitimate security concerns of other states as well as the need to contribute to international security and stability. No participating state is to attempt to impose military domination over any other participating state;

- a participating state may station its armed forces on the territory of other participating states in accordance with their freely negotiated agreement as well as in accordance with international law.

The 1999 Istanbul Charter for European Security (subsection 8) adopts a similar approach to the principle of equal and indivisible security. It reaffirms the inherent right of each and every participating state to be free to choose or change its security arrangements, including treaties of alliance as well as the right to neutrality.

The principle stipulating that countries must not beef up their security to the detriment of other states appears as unassailable theoretically as it is difficult to realize in practice. In European security documents it does not take center-stage and does not have any broad interpretation. Nor is there enough clarity regarding the grounds that legitimize a country's objections to measures undertaken by others under the pretext of infringement on its security interests. Currently, it does not appear feasible to concretize the principle of "non-infliction of damage" and specify some commonly accepted parameters for it.

There are even less grounds for positioning it in a way to thwart NATO's expansion. The right of states to be or not to be part of alliances is so unequivocally inscribed in the basic documents on European security that Russia would be better off refraining from raising the subject on a conceptual level to avoid at least intellectual embarrassment.

Specific agreements and limitations are a more promising path to take in that direction. And those should not be subject to the "principles of European security" but part of the drive to constrain military potential build-up. On the conceptual level, we reckon that the thesis that each state must keep its military potential in line with its international commitments on arms control and disarmament may prove its utility.

4. Peaceful settlement of disputes and conflict resolution

On the backdrop of the lingering "frozen conflicts" and particularly in connection with the conflict in the Caucasus, the issue of mechanisms for peaceful settlement of disputes as well as conflict prevention and resolution is being raised.

Within the OSCE framework there are two main instruments of peaceful settlement of disputes.

In 1991, a special procedure was developed allowing states that were parties to a dispute to request a special OSCE mechanism to be put in place. The latter can recommend the parties to resume negotiations or accept another form of settlement – fact-finding, conciliation, mediation, good offices, arbitration, adjudication, etc. The parties may also ask for general or specific

comments or advice on the substance of the dispute to be provided to them in order to assisting them in finding a settlement in accordance with international law and their OSCE commitments.

In 1992, the Convention on Conciliation and Arbitration within the CSCE (OSCE) was adopted. It established in Geneva the Court of Conciliation and Arbitration. The states may use the services of a Conciliation Commission, whose recommendations are non-binding or address their grievances to an Arbitral Tribunal whose verdict is final and not subject to appeal.

It is important to stress the existence of some significant exemptions with regard to both instruments. In the first case, the mechanism of dispute settlement would not be established or would cease to exist if any of the parties consider that the dispute bears on the issues of territorial integrity, national defense, the right to sovereignty or claims regarding jurisdiction over a territory. In the second case, a state may make an exemption on the same grounds while recognizing the jurisdiction of an Arbitral Tribunal.

That leads to serious doubts as to the effectiveness of these mechanisms – for instance, in settling possible territorial disputes. This could also possibly shed some light on why – despite the Convention on Conciliation and Arbitration coming into force in 1994 – the procedures it established have remained idle ever since. The convention has been ratified by a mere 33 states (Russia has not yet ratified it). No state has ever addressed the OSCE Court.

In the event of armed conflict, all OSCE participating states have committed themselves to “seeking to facilitate the effective cessation of hostilities and seeking to create conditions favorable to the political solution of the conflict”. They are also bound to “cooperate in support of humanitarian assistance” (section 19 of the Code of Conduct on Politico-military Aspects of Security). But no European organization has the authority to adopt decisions on enforcement measures (provided for by Chapter VII of the UN Charter). This remains the exclusive prerogative of the UN Security Council.

Nevertheless, certain OSCE mechanisms may be employed for conflict prevention and settlement (in the event of consensus among the participating states). They could use, inter alia, the following procedures:

- ▣ risk reduction measures (consultation and cooperation regarding unusual military activities, cooperation regarding hazardous incidents of a military nature, stabilizing measures for localized crisis situations, and measures aimed at fostering the role of the OSCE as a forum for political dialog);
- ▣ early warning action and crisis management measures (dispatching fact-finding and rapporteur missions, deployment of other missions, assistance to negotiations on conflict resolution, support for post-conflict-

rehabilitation and reconstruction in various spheres of the life of society, deployment of peacekeeping operations, etc.).

5. From inviolability of frontiers and their peaceful change to limiting the use of armed force

The subject of inviolability of frontiers and their peaceful change took center stage on the European security agenda mostly in connection with political discussions on whether the breakup of the Soviet Union and former Yugoslavia (and the unification of Germany) had affected the foundation of the Final Act – the recognition of European borders as they were in 1975.

The principle of the inviolability of frontiers in itself does not imply the latter's immutability, but, on the contrary, allows for their peaceful change. It was exactly the prospect of German unification, which in 1975 appeared purely theoretical, that pushed the Federal Republic of Germany and the United States to insist that the formula of a peaceful change of borders be included in the Final Act. In 1990, while drafting the Charter of Paris for a New Europe, a number of EU countries raised the issue of promoting the formula to the rank of a separate principle.

The breakup of the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia as well as the splitting of Czechoslovakia into two states, do not represent any extraordinary occurrence from the point of view of international law and its specific provisions dealing with the change of borders. No existing borders had to be changed in any of these situations, each was rather a matter of the emergence of new international borders – something the Final Act had nothing to do with.

The use of force in Yugoslavia took place in connection with the formation of new international borders (or, to put it differently, in connection with the transformation of old internal borders of a crumbling state). It was exactly in the context of the gathering crisis of the Yugoslav state that EU countries in the early 1990s emphasized the inadmissibility of using force to redraw emerging borders. It was, however, an issue of a broader interpretation of the OSCE norm and its extension to internal borders in the event of the breakup of a state.

That broader interpretation of the norm of peaceful border change did not pass muster, partly because of serious concerns that it would encourage secession and the breakup of countries. But the direction of the discussion itself changed as a result: having started on the issue of borders it was refocused towards the issue of the use of force. Several years later, with the adoption of the Code of Conduct on Politico-military Aspects of Security the OSCE made a first step towards defining the limits of the use of force for domestic purposes.

The subject has an extremely painful resonance for Russia. Russia, drawing from its own dramatic experience, could raise the issue of the inadmissibility of disproportionate use of force in internal conflicts inside countries.

6. Territorial integrity and the right to self-determination

The principles of territorial integrity vs. the right of peoples to self-determination debate tends to be politicized and often ignores the customary view of the issue by international law. At the same time, the issue of peoples' right to self-determination is often narrowed to that of the right to cessation. Such interpretation is, however, alien to both international law in general and to OSCE documents in particular.

International law avoids encouraging cessation even though it does not rule it out (prohibit it). Instead, it gives unconditional preference to "internal" self-determination of peoples by way of various forms of autonomy within the borders of the state they live in. Cessation is viewed as an extreme form of self-determination, justified solely in the event when the state in question refuses to allow peoples living on its territory to exercise the right to internal self-determination in reasonable forms that would make it possible for them to preserve their cultural, linguistic or other identity. As for the rest, territorial integrity of states takes precedence over peoples' right to self-determination. That thesis is reflected, in particular, in the 1970 UN Declaration on Principles of International Law Concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

The OSCE holds a similar view. Any document of the organization beginning with the Final Act, which mentions the right of peoples to self-determination, unfailingly refers to the necessity of treating the principle of territorial integrity with due respect. The Report of the CSCE Meeting of Experts on National Minorities (Geneva, 1991) gives preference to "internal" self-determination of peoples, specifying various forms of such self-determination, based on various forms of autonomy.

The ability of the state to take into account the interests of national minorities inhabiting it is of paramount importance for the realization of "internal" self-determination, as clearly stated in the 1999 Charter for European Security (section 19).

In this sphere, the international law and the OSCE have gradually adopted a de facto customary and cautious approach. Attempts to "overcome" it and clinch the debate about the two principles – by either banning cessation altogether or throwing the door wide open for it – seem problematic and ineffective. Politically, there are even less logical or practical

grounds for universal generalizations. Whenever the issue of cessation is raised, the problem requires careful specific consideration.

7. Grounds for intervention

The issue of the limits to sovereignty and legitimate intervention in internal affairs of states was the subject of heated debate in Europe in 1999 on the backdrop of the NATO military operation against Yugoslavia, which did not have UN backing. It was reignited by the conflict in the Caucasus in 2008.

However, the particular issue of the limits to sovereignty and the possibility of intervention in internal affairs of states has been discussed over the last ten years in a much broader context. The discussion has been impacted no less by the Kosovo intervention than by the impotence of the international community when confronted with the 1994 Rwanda genocide, which killed over a million people. The debate focused essentially on whether states enjoy absolute sovereignty over their internal affairs and whether the international community can intervene militarily for humanitarian reasons. And if so, who and on what grounds has the right to issue a legitimate mandate for such intervention.

The debate is still on. Today it centers not on the notions of “humanitarian intervention” or the “right to intervene” but within the framework of the concept of the “responsibility to protect”, laid out by the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty in 2001. Interim results of the discussion include several conclusions, which are today widely recognized and form the basis of a number of resolutions by the United Nations.

The contemporary concept of sovereignty goes beyond simple recognition of the right of states to control their internal affairs without any external interference; it makes them responsible for protecting the people living within their boundaries. Should national authorities be unwilling or unable to protect their populations, the task reverts to the international community. The document of the 2005 World Summit specifies that in such cases it is a shared responsibility of all countries to take collective action to help protect populations. Should diplomatic, humanitarian and other peaceful means be inadequate and national authorities manifestly fail to protect their populations, the UN Security Council should take the necessary collective action to impose its will under Chapter VII of the UN Charter.

The High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change, set up by the UN Secretary-General in 2004, came up with a list of criteria for adopting decisions that authorize intervention and the use of force. They include genocide and other cases of mass murder, ethnic cleansing and grave violations of international humanitarian law, which sovereign governments are unable or unwilling to prevent.

The UN Security Council outlined the legal basis for such intervention in Resolution 1674, adopted in April 2006. It noted that the “deliberate targeting of civilians and other protected persons, and the commission of systematic, flagrant and widespread violations of international humanitarian and human rights law in situations of armed conflict, may constitute a threat to international peace and security”. The Security Council reaffirmed in this regard “its readiness to consider such situations and, where necessary, to adopt appropriate steps”. Today, nobody challenges its authority to adopt decisions on such intervention under Article 24 of the UN Charter. For that reason the discussion on the international responsibility to protect populations has focused mostly on two issues.

- Would it be lawful and/or legitimate for states to intervene independently if the Security Council is unable, because of disagreement among its members (first of all permanent ones), to pass a corresponding resolution (as it was the case, in particular, with Rwanda in 1994 and with Kosovo in 1999)? The traditionalist approach rejects such a possibility. But there is a rather clear understanding that the inability of the Security Council to take responsibility would inevitably prompt states to take appropriate measures without its mandate, stressing the moral legitimacy of such legally dubious decisions.
- What measures are expedient for the UN Security Council to live up to its responsibility for adopting decisions in situations that require international intervention? The International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty has suggested the following measures:
 - a) Security Council authorization should in all cases be sought prior to any military intervention action being carried out;
 - b) the Security Council should deal promptly with any request for authority to intervene where there are allegations of large-scale loss of human life or ethnic cleansing. It should in this context seek adequate verification of facts or conditions on the ground;
 - c) the permanent five members of the Security Council should agree not to apply their veto power in matters where their vital state interests are not involved to obstruct the passage of resolutions authorizing military intervention for humanitarian purposes for which there is otherwise majority support;
 - d) If the Security Council rejects a proposal or fails to deal with it in a reasonable time, the matter may be considered by the General Assembly (in an Emergency Special Session under the “Uniting for Peace” procedure) or by regional or sub-regional organizations under Chapter VIII of the Charter, subject to their seeking subsequent authorization from the Security Council.

With respect to European Security it should be noted that there are no regional or sub-regional organizations in the area that could authorize military intervention to protect civilians. At the same time the OSCE is essentially a regional organization by virtue of Chapter VIII of the UN Charter, and has the right to address the UN Security Council.

Bearing in mind the above-mentioned trends, within the framework of the “reloading” of the system of European security one should not rule out the possibility of expanding the authority of the OSCE machinery to allow it to get actively and quickly involved in crisis situations that may erupt in the event of deliberate targeting of civilians and other protected persons, and the commission of systematic, flagrant and widespread violations of international humanitarian and human rights law in situations of armed conflict. In this context, it is also probable that the issue of granting the OSCE the right to adopt in such circumstances the decision to organize or authorize a collective intervention by European states (as an exemption to the rule and with a subsequent authorization request to the UN Security Council) may be raised in the process.

However, it is important to remember that putting such a decision into practice would be difficult. In the 1990s, the foreign ministers of Germany and the Netherlands, Messrs. Kinkel and Kooijmans, initiated discussion within the OSCE aimed at promoting the “OSCE first” principle providing for a more prominent and more enveloping role for the OSCE in national and cross-border conflicts. However, even then the proposal failed to harness broad support.

It should also be kept in mind that four out of five permanent Security Council members are also participants of the OSCE. If there is no consensus among them at the Security Council, it would be very hard to come by at the OSCE. In other words, the outcome of any particular discussion at the OSCE will not be substantially different from the result achieved at the Security Council. That is why no procedural novelties at the OSCE will be able to stand by for the imperative of better policy and position coordination among the leading European powers.

III. ARMS CONTROL IN EUROPE

The issue of arms control in Europe has been stagnating for a whole decade. Moreover, the sphere, which was once the most important source of stimulus for strengthening stability on the continent, is currently in a state of disrepair. Upgrading the European security architecture is unthinkable without serious steps to changing the current state of affairs. They, we reckon, could be taken along the following lines.

1. The European dimension of the strategic arms reductions

Control and reduction of strategic nuclear weapons is traditionally the realm of bilateral Russian-US relations. European countries have never been fully-fledged parties to the process. At the same time, their position was of importance and both Moscow and Washington traditionally sought their support.

There are objective reasons why direct involvement of leading European nations or the EU as a whole in the process of Russian-US negotiations is problematic. British and French nuclear arsenals are incomparably small alongside those of the United States and Russia². Other European nations are nuclear-free and the EU has no nuclear arms under its control.

An overwhelming majority of European countries are basically interested in Russia and the United States maintaining and strengthening their interaction in the field of strategic arms control. Still, one should not overestimate either their readiness or their possibilities to actively lobby this subject. The necessity to seek internal consensus within the EU and NATO between countries explicitly loyal to Washington and those advocating a more independent line further complicates the issue.

At the same time, “quiet diplomacy” plays an important role in transatlantic relations, which gives the European nations some leverage over US policies.

We deem it expedient to examine the issue of organizing bilateral consultations with the leading European countries (Germany, France, Italy, Great Britain) on the issue. In practice the leadership of these countries is either poorly informed about the state of affairs or receives the bulk of information from the United States within NATO mechanisms. Consultations with Russia would provide them with more complete and balanced data. On top of that, discussing the issue with them would serve to increase the level of mutual political trust.

² One argument that has been put forward affirms that once Russia and the United States substantially reduce their nuclear arsenals (to 1,000 warheads or less, for instance) it would become necessary for third nuclear countries to be involved in the talks. To use this argument would undermine prospective Russian-US strategic arms agreements. The issue of third nuclear countries could be raised later, and, naturally, with respect to non-European nuclear powers as well.

The issue of such discussions could also be raised within the framework of the developing Russia-EU partnership – during summits as well as at other levels of Russian contacts with the CFSP (the EU's Common Foreign and Security Policy). Consultations and briefings held along those lines would serve to beef up the two sides' common political agenda. It is probable that they would be most welcomed by smaller EU countries suffering from a lack of information over strategic matters.

2. Missile defense

The eventual deployment of the third area of the US global missile defense system has an obvious European dimension. The apprehensions of Europeans that they may fall victim of a military standoff ignited by the deployment are a serious but rather controversial factor. It may spur protest feelings against the US plans (including at the official political level in some European countries) as well as a negative reaction to retaliation threats voiced by Russia, especially if Europe becomes a clear target of such retaliation (as was the case when Russia announced prospective plans to deploy Iskander short-range missiles for targeting missile defense sites in Poland and, probably, Czech Republic).

In any case, Russia should tread very carefully on any issue involving an escalation of mutual military threats. For instance, Moscow's withdrawal on those grounds from the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty (INF) would hurt Russia's own interests (as far as both its reputation is concerned and its military capability – the latter in the event of a retaliatory deployment by the West).

In the search for clues to the missile defense puzzle Russia would be better off displaying sensitivity to the European political and psychological complexes. Washington may be the main party to deal with for any meaningful deal to be reached, but Russia should also encourage efforts to invite US European allies on board rather than ignore or, worse still, spurn such moves. These could include, for instance, agreements on deployment of Russian observers at missile defense facilities, on non-deployment of missile interceptors in their silos (for an agreed period of time or until Iran carries out any tests), and on the composition of the expert commission on missile threat assessment, etc.

The set of Russian proposals should be constructive rather than prohibitive in its approach (that is, aimed at joint efforts to take the sting out of a possible missile threat) and should specifically stress the importance of European participation. This concerns, for instance, joint use of the radar stations, the Data Exchange Centre, etc.

In the maximalist version of this approach – urging the development of a joint ballistic missile system that would provide protection for the whole of Europe – the partnership should be tripartite (US + Russia +NATO and/or the EU).

3. The CFE

As required by the 1990 Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE), significant cuts in military hardware and troops have been made. The Agreement on Adaptation of the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe, signed in 1999, eliminated the obligation of maintaining a block-based balance and set national limits. The adapted CFE treaty has not been ratified by the majority of participating states because of the conflicting interpretation of the so-called Istanbul Agreements regarding the withdrawal of Russian troops and bases from Georgian and Moldovan soil. Russia rejected claims made to that effect at the same time as voicing its concern about the situation surrounding the treaty. Its main grievances included the Western refusal to ratify the document, the absence of quotas for the Baltic States, NATO's broad military supremacy resulting from the alliance's expansion, and the preservation of the so-called flank ceilings for Russia. On the backdrop of an overall worsening of relations with the West, Russia in December 2007 unilaterally suspended its commitments under the treaty while never officially withdrawing from it or breaking its quotas (including the flank limits). In fact, Russia's "moratorium" on the treaty implementation translated only into the suspension of its transparency and verification mechanisms.

The move created a legal vacuum in Europe manifested by the absence of a key element in the system of measures designed to prevent military and political confrontation. If the goal was to put pressure on NATO and nudge it towards ratifying the CFE, it was never achieved. The West merely expressed concern, especially regarding the transparency situation, but refused to make any concessions. The Western nations simply shelved the CFE issue as an unpromising one. The 2008 war in the Caucasus, Russia's recognition of South Ossetia and Abkhazia, and deployment of new military bases there have driven the situation into a stalemate.

There are a number of additional considerations that should push towards breaking the deadlock.

- ▣ The increased attention that Obama's administration is likely to pay to harmonizing ally relations within NATO, including in the military field, will raise the issue of lifting uncertainty over the ceilings for conventional armed forces and military equipment in Europe as an important factor of long-term strategic planning.

- ▣ The issue is important in the context of the further development of the “Ukraine and NATO” theme.
- ▣ With the anticipated “new start” of arms control, it is important to keep in mind the possibility of the problem of tactical nuclear weapons returning to the fore. As they are mostly deployed in Europe, this problem cannot be alienated from the issue of the balance of conventional forces and the measures aimed at limiting and controlling them.

Some of the ways of tackling the problem that have been mooted within the expert community appear unpromising or even counterproductive.

- ▣ It is doubtful that raising the issue of CFE ratification today could bear any fruit. That would require at least restoring status quo ante (the state of things as before) regarding South Ossetia and Abkhazia.
- ▣ It would be equally problematic to insist on the additional claims (in excess of the provisions of the basic and adapted versions of the CFE) on which Russia conditioned the possibility of its return to the treaty when it announced its suspension.
- ▣ The idea of starting negotiations on a new treaty on the basis of overcoming the misbalance in the number of conventional forces and military equipment between Russia (in its European part) and NATO (or, as an alternative, between the CSTO and NATO) also appears a “non-starter”. In practical terms, none of our counterparties would even want to discuss this approach, while politically it would be regarded as a dramatic roll-back to the notions and division lines of the Cold War. In addition to that, Russia has no leverage to force NATO to proceed with many times more far-reaching arms cuts to bring them down to the levels of Russia or the CSTO.

To move the process out of the deadlock the following steps appear feasible.

- ▣ To return to the regime of transparency and verification of the CFE, putting aside the subject of its ratification and further adaptation until more distant future. This initiative is: (a) easy to realize (as it does not require any negotiations and could just be announced unilaterally); (b) legally sound (as Russia has never officially withdrawn from the treaty); (c) politically reversible (any crisis will allow Russia to easily review its decision); (d) would be highly appreciated in Europe, also as a politically significant gesture towards it; and (e) would be useful for Russia itself (as a way of receiving more information about military activity of the expanded NATO alliance).
- ▣ Additionally, on the same grounds, Russia could raise the issue of extending the regime (even without setting formal quotas on heavy military equipment) to countries outside the CFE area (including the Baltic countries). It is very hard to repudiate the essential logic of such a proposal;

it could be implemented without a tie-up with the ratification of the treaty and the formal voluntary accession of new countries to it. At the same time, should our counterparties fail to accept the proposal it would not turn the situation dramatically for the worse for us.

- ▣ Bearing in mind the existing state of affairs in the Caucasus, to exclude this area temporarily from the ceilings regime of the CFE with a view to returning to the issue at later date for additional consideration and negotiation in the context of political settlement. An additional argument in favor of introducing a “special regime” regarding the treaty limits could be the experience of two other regions: (a) the Baltic States – a region free of any limits; and (b) Southeast Europe – a region where special arms reduction measures have been introduced.
- ▣ To suggest launching in the foreseeable future negotiations aimed at signing a CFE-2 – this would include a larger number of participants and provide for deeper armed forces and military equipment cuts, with higher transparency.

4. Tactical nuclear weapons

Both Russia and the United States have been reluctant to include tactical nuclear weapons (TNW) in the arms control agenda. For Russia they are an instrument for neutralizing NATO supremacy in conventional forces, especially in the light of the likelihood of the alliance’s further eastward expansion. The United States has traditionally striven to preserve their forward-based nuclear forces in Europe (400–500 tactical nuclear bombs for fighter-bombers) as an additional element for military supremacy.

However, the emerging renaissance of nuclear disarmament and arms control is bound to raise the issue of TNW. It is important for Russia to avoid driving itself into a politically disadvantageous situation by sticking to a sharply negative stance on the issue. It is better to demonstrate readiness for constructive discussion.

It is impossible to integrate reductions and elimination of tactical nuclear weapons and strategic nuclear forces. Verification over strategic forces is exercised through monitoring delivery vehicles. It is not the case with tactical nuclear forces as they use dual-purpose vehicles. Consequently, it is not the delivery vehicles that have to be monitored but containers with bombs and warheads in storage, which is unlikely to be acceptable for either side.

To get started, the parties could agree to move all tactical nuclear warheads from their forward bases deep inside national territory for centralized storage (in fact, making them part of second-tier reserves). Withdrawing all tactical nuclear weapons rather than a part of them is suggested for better

verification: it is easier to exercise and will be more acceptable from the point of view of protecting the secrecy regime if inspectors only need to record their absence from storage facilities, whose location and features are well-known. Moving tactical nuclear weapons to centralized storage sites will remove them from forward basing and ensure better physical protection from seizure by terrorists, unauthorized displacement or even use.

To realize that, the United States would have to withdraw its 400–500 bombs from the territory of six European countries. Russia would be obliged to redeploy some 2,000–3,000 tactical nuclear arms weapons (bombs and warheads) from air and navy bases on its territory to centralized storage sites. It would still be possible to return them quickly to the frontline in the event of a security threat.

In Europe, Russia's move to support or initiate such a project would be met most positively and help develop a more favorable attitude towards its policies.

5. Confidence- and security-building measures, military restraint

The first confidence-building measures in the military sphere (mostly related to prior notification of major military maneuvers) go back to the 1975 Helsinki Final Act. Since the mid-1980s, a vastly more comprehensive set of confidence- and security-building measures was negotiated and expanded with the aim of making national military activity more transparent. Those include:

- ▣ annual exchange of military information, data relating to major weapon and equipment systems and information on plans for the deployment of major weapon and equipment plans;
- ▣ exchange of information on defense planning, clarification, review and dialogue;
- ▣ risk reduction measures (mechanism for consultation and cooperation as regards unusual military activities, hazardous incidents of a military nature, voluntary hosting of visits to dispel concerns about military activities);
- ▣ military contacts (visits to air bases, military cooperation, demonstration of new types of major weapon and equipment systems);
- ▣ prior notification and observation of certain military activities;
- ▣ exchanging annual plans;
- ▣ constraining provisions;
- ▣ compliance and verification.

The OSCE-sponsored confidence and security-building measures (last specified in the 1999 Vienna Document) are supplemented by other agreements, in particular, on global information exchange (extending beyond Europe), and monitoring from the air under the Open Skies policy. Especially important was the role played by the mechanism of information and inspections exchange on the basis of CFE provisions.

The main result of the implementation of transparency measures in the military sphere over the last 20 years has been newly-shared confidence among the participating states that other participating parties do not engage in secret military activities. Isolated cases of employment of the consultation mechanism regarding unusual military activity (by Austria, Italy and Hungary towards Serbia in the early 1990s) have helped prevent dangerous incidents. But there were also situations when deployment of confidence- and security-building measures failed to achieve results, as happened on the eve of the Caucasus conflict in the summer of 2008.

The end of the Cold War led to a significant reduction in military activity in Europe. Despite lower levels of prior notification of military activities and troop redeployment being introduced, they still fall short of encompassing all militarily significant types of activity on the sub-regional level today. Also, they do not comprise some new types of military activity in Europe.

For that reason the Vienna document calls on the participating states to “complement, on a voluntary basis, OSCE-wide confidence- and security-building measures through additional politically or legally binding measures, tailored to specific regional needs”. Such measures have been agreed and implemented in Southeast Europe. They are effective, on a voluntary basis, between some states, Hungary and Romania in particular.

Special military constraining provisions, included in the 1997 Founding Act, are also effective in relations between the Russian Federation and NATO.

By signing it, the member states of NATO reiterated that they had no intention, no plan for, and no reason to deploy nuclear weapons on the territory of new members, nor any need to change any aspect of NATO's nuclear posture or nuclear policy – and do not foresee any future need to do so. They also said that NATO had no intention, no plan for, and no reason to establish nuclear weapon storage sites on the territory of those members, whether through the construction of new nuclear storage facilities or the adaptation of old nuclear storage facilities.

NATO also reiterated that in the current and foreseeable security environment, the Alliance would carry out its collective defense and other missions by ensuring the necessary interoperability, integration, and capability

for reinforcement rather than by additional permanent stationing of substantial combat forces. Accordingly, it will have to rely on adequate infrastructure commensurate with the above tasks. In this context, reinforcement may take place, when necessary, in the event of defense against a threat of aggression, and missions in support of peace consistent with the United Nations Charter and the OSCE governing principles, as well as for exercises consistent with the adapted CFE Treaty, the provisions of the 1994 Vienna Document and mutually agreed transparency measures.

Russia in its turn committed itself to exercising restraint in deploying its conventional armed forces in Europe.

The NATO countries fulfill their obligations under the Founding Act. But US plans to establish forward-operating “light bases” in Romania and Bulgaria put the issue of clarifying the notion of “significant combat forces” on the agenda. Its resolution implies reciprocity, as Russia has also committed itself to refraining from deployment of “significant combat forces”, notably, in the Kaliningrad region.

Within the framework of upgrading the European security architecture Russia could propose to develop further the practice of confidence- and security-building measures, as well as military restraint.

- ▣ It would be logical to suggest updating the Vienna Document, agreed ten years ago.
- ▣ The announcement of even isolated unilateral steps by Russia to provide information and display military restraint (deployment of troops and hardware, etc.) would have a positive effect.
- ▣ The most effective step would be Russia’s announcement that it would abide by the transparency regime of the 1990 Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe.

6. Non-proliferation

Scrutiny of Russian, US, EU and NATO approaches to the issue of nuclear non-proliferation reveals certain nuances and differences. But the task of upgrading the architecture of European security turns the spotlight on the imperative for joint action in the field.

Such action could proceed along the following avenues.

- ▣ Russia could initiate the search for a common approach to the issue by various European nations. It could be, for instance, the development of a broad European non-proliferation platform, which would absorb the key ideas of the corresponding documents by NATO, the EU (which have the

subject elaborated in more detail), and other organizations and individual countries of the region.

- The subject of European assistance in spreading the zone free of nuclear weapons to adjacent territories could be raised in connection with North Africa, the Middle East, the Caucasus, and Central Asia (in the latter case, in the context of efforts aimed at making the CSTO part of the upgraded European security architecture).
- In a more focused form that line could be pursued through coordinated European efforts at various international forums to strengthen the international legal regimes of nuclear non-proliferation. Strengthening the regime of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) is of special importance not least in the context of the 2010 NPT Review Conference. The expert community has been discussing the idea of strengthening the non-proliferation regime to minimize the possibility of its loopholes being used for the purpose of obtaining nuclear weapons. A common European position on the issue could become a tangible contribution to the cause of non-proliferation.
- One other potential sphere of cooperation is the development of multilateral intergovernmental models of organization of the nuclear fuel cycle (in order to eliminate the possibility of the latter being used to create nuclear weapons). The ideas to that effect emanating from Russia, Germany, the US, other countries and the IAEA in many ways complement each other. It would be useful within the European framework to take stock of the corresponding initiatives and agree to support them.

A separate theme in the context of non-proliferation is the role of the factor of Europe in connection with Iran's nuclear program. The "European troika" (Great Britain, Germany and France) as well as the CFSP mechanism of the European Union are involved in the ongoing negotiations with Iran. But the weight and the effectiveness of their participation in the process at times look rather dubious. At the same time there appears to be enough reason for harmonizing the Russian course with European political horizons (to name just a few: geopolitical closeness, the importance of the energy factor, a negative attitude towards the use of force, preserving their place in this multilateral framework if need be and depending on the situation, etc.).

IV. INTERNATIONAL PEACE OPERATIONS: EUROPEAN PARAMETERS

International peace operations in the narrow sense of the word is a system of operations by the United Nations in conflict regions conducted on behalf of the international community on the basis of the principles of Chapter VI (mediation and safeguarding of already established peace) and Chapter VII (peace enforcement) of the Charter of the United Nations. The system of collective operations by states in conflict regions began to take shape in late 1940s soon after the establishment of the United Nations, has been developing for about 60 years, and encompasses over 60 operations of varying natures. In 2009, 20 UN operations employing 110,000 personnel were in progress on four continents. As the United Nations has no armed forces of its own, the operations have always been performed by military contingents temporarily dispatched for the purpose by the UN member-states (all-in-all by 118 countries).

Along with operations conducted by the United Nations proper, a practice of conflict intervention (including use of force) by regional organizations has emerged over time. Such operations have been conducted by the African Union, some African sub-regional organizations, the Organization of American States (OAS); in Eurasia, they were carried out by the European Union, NATO and the CIS. In the 1990s, one of the trends was the emergence of coalitions of countries, which on behalf of international organizations (or by their own collective decision) realized an international mandate to intervene (for example, the US-led coalitions in Iraq and Afghanistan, the Australia-led coalition in the UN operation in East Timor, etc.).

Some states, in particular the United States, have created their own general guidance documents on peacekeeping operations. The United States as well as a number of other countries have started to use the term “peacekeeping” to describe certain action in conflict regions conducted on a multilateral basis (and sometimes also unilaterally) even without backing from the United Nations or an international regional organization. Moreover, the term “peacekeeping operation” has by extension started to be used occasionally to describe de facto police operations to stabilize the situation inside a country’s borders.

As, in contrast to “classic” international wars and conflicts, an ever-growing number of modern conflicts are of a non-interstate nature and happen inside states or involve non-state actors, the issue of peacekeeping and peace enforcement operations gets ever more tightly entwined with the problem of intervention by the international community (or its members) in the internal

affairs of states. The issue of the legitimate/illegitimate nature of various types and forms of intervention has become very acute.

1. Intervention involving armed force

The principles and the practice of the use of armed force by international organizations in conflicts have seriously evolved over the last two decades. Substantial differences of approach have become apparent between Russia and other countries, first and foremost the United States, regarding the goals, the nature and the legitimacy of intervention in conflicts on foreign territory, including conflicts in new independent states.

Replacing the standard practice of UN-sponsored peace operations under a UN Security Council mandate and with equal and joint participation by the countries of the East and the West, two basic and ever-diverging models of international conflict intervention have established themselves.

The first is the continuation of “classic” UN peacemaking under the mandates (political resolutions) of the Security Council or the General Assembly. It has seen universally recognized failures (Rwanda, Somalia) as well as successes (East Timor, for example).

The second professes conflict intervention by regional organizations and coalitions of countries without UN authorization. The 2003 Iraq invasion by the international coalition is not the only and not the first instance of such intervention. The same has happened at least ten times throughout the decade. NATO, the United States, Russia and the CIS have all acted in certain cases in the absence of a UN mandate.

The grounds for the conflict intervention may be categorized as follows.

- ▣ During the Kosovo crisis the formula of “humanitarian intervention” prevailed (military intervention aimed at averting or stopping a humanitarian disaster, genocide), which was widely quoted by Western countries in their doctrinal and political messages and conceptually finalized in the “Responsibility to Protect” Report to the United Nations.
- ▣ After September 11, 2001 and during the military campaign in Afghanistan a new formula was born – conflict intervention on the grounds of conducting a “counter-terrorist operation”.
- ▣ During the preparation stage for the Iraq invasion and after North Korea’s withdrawal from the NPT, a new type of intervention legitimization appears – to prevent proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD). It was proclaimed that the latter goal could be achieved by means of a preventive strike against a country arousing suspicion.

- ▣ On the same grounds and with the additional motivation of the “export of democracy” has appeared the formula of “coercive regime change”. The specter of “regime change” in Iran, North Korea, Sudan and even Pakistan some time further down the line was raised.

2. A Russia-West battlefield or mutual cooperation?

Military intervention in a series of conflicts by the United States, NATO and Western countries on one side and Russian involvement in certain conflicts (sometimes with CIS mandate) on the other look like two divergent lines and are mutually rejected as having nothing to do with “true” peacekeeping.

The West refused to recognize as legitimate peacekeeping Russian efforts under a CIS mandate in Tajikistan and Abkhazia (up to 2008) as well as under bilateral agreements with Moldova (Trans-Dniester) and Georgia (South Ossetia up to 2008). After the events of August 2008 the issue of Russian peacekeeping with regard to South Ossetia and Abkhazia has become irrelevant.

Russia does not recognize the legitimacy of Western and especially NATO-led actions against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia in 1999 and the US-led invasion of Iraq in 2003 (in both cases up until the issue of a UN mandate).

Military intervention in conflicts, both legally sound and infringing on traditional international law, has become a tacit “norm” of international life. Many operations conducted over the last 15 years in conflict regions are questionable and controversial as far as international law is concerned – both for the West and for Russia.

Russia may have vehemently contested the formula of “humanitarian intervention”, which it still rejects, but it is exactly that formula that presents the most compelling argument for legitimization of Russian intervention in the 2008 South Ossetia crisis. Despite berating the “regime change” formula, Moscow made a tacit exception for the “removal by force of the Taliban regime” in Afghanistan, operation Russia backed both politically (in the United Nations) and practically (by providing aid to the Northern Alliance).

The instances of military intervention in conflicts multiply, providing new material for a thorough examination of the ensuing political results. The multilateral structures that aspire to a tangible international presence, including NATO, the EU, the CSTO, are testing the instruments of intervention at their disposal or are creating new instruments for the future. NATO has set up the NATO Response Force (NRF), the European Union its own Rapid Reaction Forces, in the CIS/CSTO the development of Collective Rapid Deployment Forces (CRDF) for Central Asia was announced, as well as a decision to

create Collective Forces for Operational Reaction (CFOR). Both Russia and NATO, the EU, the United States and the West as a whole are in search of new forms and acceptable norms for conflict intervention.

On this background it is important to make the interaction between Russia and the West on international peacemaking proceed along the road of cooperation rather than competition and, worse still, confrontation. Engaging on that path involves resolving one after the other a number of tasks.

- Russia and the West must take steps towards each other to get over their mutual refusal to recognize the other's peacemaking efforts. It is necessary to get to see the controversial situations through the eyes of the "other side", and look for joint or mutually acceptable formulae for forceful conflict settlement.
- Both Russia and the West could turn their attention to the same conflicts and world regions. In such cases cooperation could come in really handy – up to coordinating peace operations and parallel use of some of their elements.
- Eventual creation of a common peace operations mechanism as an instrument of ensuring European security (with potential for use outside Europe in the more distant future) could serve as a beacon.

That course of action appears possible. Despite a serious impasse in Russia–NATO relations, their peacekeeping interaction in conflict regions seems to be a likely perspective in the medium term. It is worth recalling that the crises in former Yugoslavia have allowed Russia and NATO to gain some joint experience of field peacekeeping.

The Russia–NATO Council (until its suspension in 2008) worked out a concept of joint Russian-NATO peacekeeping operations. It was the result of three years of consultations in a special working group set up for the purpose. Unfortunately, that document has never been presented to the public and remains secret. To all appearances, it may come in handy in the new environment as far as the tasks of upgrading the architecture of European security are concerned. It is important, however, to make sure that work on the conceptual development of the issue involves stakeholders outside the Russia–NATO linkup.

3. Reforming the mechanism of peacemaking: possible models

The goal of such reform should consist in the development of a mechanism of joint conflict settlement. In this sphere, virtually any new system (architecture) of international security will be faced with tackling not just one but a complex of tasks.

- ▣ Form a system of early conflict warning monitoring and preventive (aimed at averting armed conflict) action.
- ▣ Put in place a system of effective international mediation.
- ▣ Set in motion a mechanism of political decision-making on conflict intervention (necessary to legitimize the intervention).
- ▣ Make possible the selection of the right level and format of international intervention.
- ▣ Provide for the creation and maintenance of an arsenal of tools of intervention (from humanitarian aid to military force).
- ▣ Make advance provisions for the measures of post-conflict settlement, stabilization, humanitarian aid, and restoration of peaceful life in the conflict region.
- ▣ Make sure that the problem of eradicating the roots of the conflict (social, economic, political, etc.) is addressed so as to avoid any recurrence.

It is doubtful that all these tasks can be solved with the help and within the framework of a single organizational format. It seems more likely that the international crisis response and conflict settlement forces could be multi-component – comprising the existing international organizations and elements with tasks distributed and coordinated among them.

One other basic point concerns the operating field of the peacekeeping mechanism. Applicability for such a mechanism could be envisaged on different levels:

- ▣ to be applied first and foremost in Europe;
- ▣ to be available for deployment across the whole OSCE area;
- ▣ to be ready for use on a larger scale.

Obviously, in a situation when several regional structures each with a different list of participating countries and a history of competition against the others co-exist in the same geo-political space, it would be logical for the United Nations to play the role of key reference structure, to which any mechanism of peacemaking would be tied. It is also true that the OSCE in its current political and organizational state would have problems performing the important coordinating peacekeeping functions in the new security architecture. To do so, it must get its second wind by giving a new quality to the mechanisms of its first “basket” (politico-military and disarmament issues). To define it, the OSCE-2 or OSCE-Plus formula could be used.

Three models of possible reform of the mechanisms of conflict settlement and crisis response in the architecture of European security may be put forward.

(i) **The model of joint conflict monitoring** with independent follow-up action by various international structures.

As the security structures in the Euro-Atlantic space are rather heterogeneous, Russia could suggest within the framework of this model to create a mechanism of joint monitoring in the zones of regional conflicts on the basis of a common UN mandate.

In particular, observers dispatched by common agreement and on the basis of a common coordinated UN mandate could be present in regional conflict zones on behalf of the main Euro-Atlantic security-related organizations (the United Nations, the OSCE, the EU, NATO, the CSTO, possibly, the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) and the Council of Europe). It would help better organize and coordinate conflict settlement efforts. Further action with regard to the conflict in question would be undertaken by each international organization independently on the basis of its own special procedures, mandates and mechanisms.

That is a watered-down version of the joint approach to crisis response providing for better mutual communication and transparency but leaving it to individual parties to make their decisions and choose the course of action. The advantage of this approach is the possibility of setting it in motion relatively quickly and with no additional bureaucratic, political and financial efforts.

(ii) **The Russia–USA–EU model**

This model takes account of the existing objective limitations to the powers of international organizations and focuses on the traditional role of states as the main protagonists in the international political space.

We would suggest proposing to the United States and the EU a joint action program based on a clear understanding and delimitation (geographically and functionally) of each other's spheres of interest and areas of responsibility – individual as well as common. At the same time we are proposing joint rather than competitive action by Russia, the EU and the United States to settle conflict situations. That will require overcoming serious political and psychological barriers and stereotypes by both the West and Russia.

The chances of this option in the security architecture are seriously hindered by a lack of interest and possible passive resistance to it from other players on the territory of the former Soviet Union (including some participating states of the CIS and the CSTO). Some post-Soviet states benefit from certain tension between the three centers of power, which provides them with a wider playing field (multi-vector policy) and allows them to exploit the contradictions between Russia, the United States and the EU.

(iii) The OSCE-2 model

This model presumes overhauling the role and functions of the existing organizations and security mechanisms. Unlike the first of the above-mentioned models, which provides for joint monitoring but separate action, this model implies setting up a mechanism of deeper coordination in regional conflict situations that would go beyond mere observation and involve joint decision-making and practical steps by the powers of the region. We are talking about upgrading, increasing the role of the first OSCE “basket” or even using it as a foundation for an independent regional mechanism of crisis response and conflict settlement – with universal representation of all the countries of the region.

The OSCE-2 format could comprise a number of principles and “formulae”, such as:

- ▣ regular (possibly, even annual) OSCE-scale summits and emergency summits of the countries of the region in the event of a sharp deterioration of a conflict in the region;
- ▣ creation of a mechanism of pan-European political consultations on the issues of security;
- ▣ development of the monitoring role of the Conflict Prevention Centre;
- ▣ creation of an autonomous or integrated within the OSCE coordinating structure on the issues of conflict settlement and crisis response in the region;
- ▣ agreement on the selection of a tool from the existing set of instruments of emergency response (at the disposal of the EU, NATO and the CSTO) depending on the location, type of conflict, etc.

In the event of the formation of a new security and conflict settlement structure (organization) on the basis of the transformation of the first OSCE “basket”, it appears relevant to:

- ▣ ensure the continuity of the practices and the legal basis of the system of the United Nations and the OSCE;
- ▣ employ all the existing OSCE elements dealing with the issues of security (conflict prevention, counterterrorist and anti-drugs activities, etc.), having provided for their enlargement and a more tangible mandate, which could be formally issued by an OSCE summit;
- ▣ look into the possibility of creating additional mechanisms: the Centre for the Monitoring of the Politico-Military Situation (in conjunction with the consultations and conciliation mechanism involving stakeholders – as a mechanism for a new adaptation or radical upgrade of the CFE); the

Coordination Service for Regional Peacekeeping Operations, including those authorized by OSCE-2 (this service would seek agreement of the participating states on the joint or separate use of the instruments of crisis response by the regional organizations – first of all the EU, NATO and the CSTO); the International Regional Organizations Coordinating Committee (involving the EU, the Council of Europe, NATO, the CIS, the CSTO, the SCO, the Organization of Islamic Conference (OIC), etc.) – to exchange information and agree a common position on the issues of peacemaking and conflict settlement.

A new structure, based on the upgraded first “basket” of the Helsinki Final Act, would possess a number of advantages.

- ▣ Its functional objectives will directly tackle the most acute aspects of the issue of European security.
- ▣ It will not be designed to counterbalance NATO or the EU, but interact with them as actively as possible with the option of them taking center stage if that is necessary and acceptable.
- ▣ Its added value for the system of European security will consist in involving all the main multilateral structures operating the region.
- ▣ Its continuity and organizational link with the OSCE will lift some objections regarding the new institutional construction in Europe.

The scheme leaves no room to suspect Russia of self-seeking maneuvering (claims over its “sphere of influence”, demands that NATO expansion be halted, etc.) while paving the way for a fresh start in combining efforts to uphold European security, something that is quite in line with Russian interests.

V. COUNTERING UNCONVENTIONAL THREATS

One of the imperatives of forming a new system of pan-European security is the need for joint action to counter the so-called unconventional, or “new”, threats to security and their prevention. These threats are considered new in comparison to the traditional military threats to state security associated with the Cold War era.

There is no exhaustive or universally accepted list of new security threats. However, the need for the full mobilization of international cooperation resources to counter these threats is widely recognized. It may require employing the existing multilateral institutions, retuning some of their mechanisms and creating special institutions better tailored to the specific character of this set of security problems.

This chapter examines the issue of countering some key new threats: narcotics trafficking, terrorism, bio-terrorism, emergency situations and humanitarian crises, ecological challenges, the global climate change.

There are other promising areas of Russia’s interaction with its partners in countering unconventional security threats – such as cross-border crime, corruption, illegal migration, sea piracy etc.

Due to their inherent cross-border nature, all these threats usually require a broad, comprehensive or even pan-European response that not only goes beyond Russia’s bilateral cooperation with individual European countries but also extends beyond the current framework of Russia’s relations with existing European institutions and organizations. There are grounds to expect that the nature of unconventional threats will prevent cooperative efforts in countering them from falling hostage to the state of Russia’s political relations with its Western partner (states or international institutions). Certainly, disagreements on traditional political and military security issues such as local and regional conflicts in Europe (primarily with NATO) or economic and especially energy security problems (with the EU member-states) would have certain impact on the format of cooperation on the new threats. But there is still significant room for maneuver to step up this cooperation on grounds relating solely to the corresponding spheres of concern.

However, neither of the two key European institutions – the EU (due to the particularities of its institutional bureaucracy, the highly politicized decision-making process, etc.) or NATO (due to its excessive militarization and the lingering overwhelmingly militaristic character) – is well suited to establish

cooperation on the new security threats with third countries. When it comes to such an objectively key player in European security as Russia, this situation puts serious obstacles in the way of such cooperation.

Next, not only is there no unity on countering unconventional security threats among the traditional institutions (and within them), but also some fundamental disagreements are evident. At the same time, the existing institutional mechanisms, including those within the EU framework, often do not help overcome such disagreements and provide nothing more than a platform for multilateral dialogue. This pattern, on the one hand, ensures a certain level of pluralism in decision-making, but on the other hand, prevents the development of effective means of preventing and tackling the above-mentioned threats.

As Russia is not a member of the EU and NATO, it finds itself *de facto* alienated from these institutions' activities in the field of new security threats. Still, the need for operational response and broader action to counter and, even more so, to prevent transnational unconventional threats is so urgent that the actual formation of certain (so far, isolated) elements of the prospective pan-European system is *de facto* under way, even despite the stalled cooperation between Russia and the European countries at the institutional level (within the EU and the OSCE framework, not to mention NATO).

For instance, while the crucial issue of setting up a European Disaster Management Centre has long eluded solution, some elements of this mechanism are being created on an *ad hoc* basis – in conjunction with separate countries and groups of countries most interested in such cooperation. The forthcoming creation of a permanent European base for the Russian Ministry of Emergencies (EMERCOM) amphibious firefighting aircraft fleet to be used against recurrent wildfires in Europe could serve as a good example. It could be eventually used to promote emergency interaction with the European Commission in providing urgent humanitarian relief and form the base of the Euroquadron, a joint emergency response body long suggested by EMERCOM.

Establishing pan-European cooperation to deal with any of the new threats, including those listed below, would require:

- ▣ first, assessing the level and the areas of existing cooperation between Russia and its European partners in tackling the main unconventional threats;
- ▣ second, exploring why the existing institutional mechanisms are not up to the task of resolving these problems;
- ▣ third, outlining the prospects and specific proposals on interaction in this area at the pan-European level, which could become one of the pillars of the pan-European security.

Naturally, the specific nature of each of the areas of activity should be taken into account.

1. Counter-narcotics

Narcotics trafficking is a common threat for all European countries, Russia included. In contrast to the United States, which has its own regional sources of opiates, including heroin, European countries are among the main consumers of Afghan opiates, and Russia is a transit country turning into a large consumer of opiates from Afghanistan. Production, trade and consumption of synthetic drugs and illegal circulation of precursors – chemical substances necessary for the manufacture of illicit drugs – also pose a common problem for Russia and other European countries.

Most of Afghan opiates reach Europe through trafficking routes that bypass Russia. As the center of opium production in Afghanistan has shifted back to the southern regions and narcotics production in the north declines, the volume of traffic of Afghan opiates along the so-called northern route (“the Silk Route”) has been falling steadily. According to the UN data, in the mid-2000s, some 15 percent of all Afghan opiates found their way to Russia and Europe through Central Asia.

Still, while the northern route of Afghan narcotics traffic primarily supplies the Russian market and the markets of CIS countries (and, to a lesser extent, China), some of the opiates are dispatched further into Europe, mainly to the Baltic and the Scandinavian states. Also, while the Russian domestic market is dominated by the opiates originating from Afghanistan (even though the volume of heroin has been in decline over the last years), the countries of Western and Central Europe have recently become the fastest growing market in the world for cocaine shipped from South and Central America.

Wider cooperation between Russia and other European countries in this area is thwarted by the lack of a common approach to counternarcotics in Europe itself, and in the EU in particular, as well as the differences in counternarcotics policies between the EU (where illicit drugs are mostly treated as a health and law enforcement issue) and Russia (where narcotics are treated as a national security problem). It explains the following paradox: despite common interest, shared by of Russia and other European countries, in curbing the Afghan opiate trafficking and the trade in synthetic drugs, the level of anti-drug cooperation between Russia and Europe lags behind that between Russia and the United States.

Stepping up Russia–Europe counternarcotics cooperation on the pan-European level could proceed along the following lines.

- By forming a special pan-European coordinating body (Center) on countering narcotics trafficking (preferably in close cooperation or even on the basis of the UN Office on Drugs and Crime). It could comprise representatives of the law enforcement authorities, foreign ministries and special services of all European countries. It is advisable that a branch of the Center be established in Russia or one of the Scandinavian or Baltic countries (possibly, on the basis of the Northern Dimension) to coordinate and develop joint action to control the opiates traffic by the northern route and the trade in synthetic drugs in North-Eastern Europe. A similar regional branch could at the same time be set up, for instance, in Spain to coordinate efforts to curtail cocaine transit to Europe.
- By coordinating Russia's and European countries' approaches to and support for anti-narcotics efforts in Afghanistan itself and those of its neighbors, especially Iran, Turkmenistan, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan and Kyrgyzstan. This task cannot be effectively pursued within the framework of any of the existing European formats and could become one of the areas of activity of the pan-European Center for Countering Drug Trafficking.
- By more actively using the European experience in demand reduction in consumer countries (as long as it does not contradict Russian anti-drug policies). This includes both the treatment of addicts (for instance, preventive measures against HIV-infection) and the law enforcement aspects of the matter. Of particular interest is, for instance, Sweden's experience of complete criminalization of the consumption of illicit drugs and psychotropic substances.

2. Anti-terrorism

Prevention of, and the fight against, terrorism remain one of the most highly politicized areas of cooperation among European countries, including that between Russia and EU countries. In addition, specific requirements of anti-terrorist activities – related, first of all, to intelligence information and special services operations – impose objective limitations on the scale and character of any international cooperation in this area, including on the regional level.

As far as counter-terrorist activities in Europe are concerned, in individual countries, especially those that are more heavily affected by terrorist threats (Great Britain, Spain, France), related national policies take priority over any coordinating EU mechanisms, which are still quite weak despite some progress achieved over the recent years. It is bilateral ties on the inter-governmental level – between the EU countries as well as between individual European countries and Russia – that play the main role in practical cooperation on anti-terrorism, particularly on information exchange and joint operations.

There are also differences of approach – within Europe (despite the lowest common denominator established by the EU Counter-Terrorism Strategy, for instance, the common EU definition of terrorism) as well as between key European countries and the United States, and between the EU countries and Russia. An example of the latter case would be European criticism regarding human rights protection during anti-terrorist operations in Russia (similar criticism by the European countries is also directed towards the United States).

Despite these strict limitations, there are several promising areas in the field of practical cooperation and coordination of the approaches by Russia and other European countries to anti-terrorism, which so far have been relatively neglected (even though all these spheres have an anti-terrorist dimension, they go well beyond it).

- ▣ Providing security and uninterrupted functioning of the critical infrastructure facilities and systems, including, but not solely, against terrorist threats. In that sense, the “all-hazards approach” that prevails in Europe (and aims at protection from the wide range of threats, from terrorist attacks to man-made and natural catastrophes) deserves attention. Cooperation and coordination of approaches in this field could become one of the main areas of activity of the pan-European Coordination Center for Disaster Response (see below for more detail).
- ▣ Strengthening border security, including through coordination of the introduction of biometric passports, the systems of border and immigration controls, etc. Such cooperation is already ongoing with the EU where the system of integrated border management is in place, but so far its main goal for the EU has been to secure greater protection for itself, while Russia’s main goal has been the facilitation of the visa regime with the EU countries. At the same time, the shared goal of increasing the level of pan-European security, including in the face of terrorist threats, remains more of a declaration.
- ▣ The problems of balancing the special intelligence and counter-intelligence needs and legal aspects of anti-terrorist activity as well as human rights protection in prosecution of terrorist suspects (monitored, in particular, by the European Court of Human Rights in Strasbourg) acquire particular importance for all European countries, Russia included. In this context, the European experience (particularly that of France and Spain) deserves careful study and may be applied in Russia. An optimal way to ensure systematic information exchange on these matters would be a creation of a special pan-European Best Practices Centre – possibly, in cooperation with or on the basis of Europol – with Russia as a fully-fledged partner.

- The sharing of experience in countering social and political radicalization of certain segments of mass migration, especially in the second generation. In that sense Russia today, with its mass influx of first generation labour migrants, is in many ways similar to France or Germany of yesterday, while Russia tomorrow, i.e. in the medium and long term, when the second generation of migrants comes about and the consolidated, compact migrant communities emerge, is likely to confront integration and radicalization problems similar to those that Western Europe and, to some extent, Central Europe face today.
- Close views and approaches regularly displayed by the key European countries, including Russia, on conflicts such as those in the Middle East, Iraq, Afghanistan and a number of other non-CIS conflicts may provide a basis for a specific European approach to global conflict management. In this context, the creation of a permanent pan-European body (forum) for political dialogue and coordination of positions on local and regional conflicts outside Europe appears rather promising. The need for Russia's full-scale participation in such body is as much based on its position of a permanent UN Security Council member, as it is dictated by the close political views shared by the key European countries, first of all, by Germany, France and Russia, on conflict management strategies, including ways to counter terrorism as a tactic of armed confrontation, within the comprehensive conflict management and peace-building framework. The experience gained by the existing mechanisms, such as the OSCE Conflict Prevention Center or the corresponding working groups of the Russia–NATO Council, may come in handy. However, neither the level of these mechanisms, nor the sphere of their functional competence, allow them to position themselves as a pan-European political body (forum) for conflict resolution.

3. Ensuring bio-security

Among the key challenges faced by society and requiring broad international interaction are threats of biological origin endangering the lives of humans in their habitats. These threats may be naturally-occurring (pandemics, natural disasters) as much as man-made. The latter may be divided into two clusters: biological threats resulting from unintentional breach of security (violating instructions regarding storage and transportation of highly dangerous pathogens, nonchalance, etc.); threats resulting from deliberate action (use of biological warfare by a state, acts of sabotage at bio-hazardous sites, and bio-terrorism).

Humanity grew conscious of the inherent dangers of biological (bacteriological) warfare a long time ago, so much so the awareness paved the way for the adoption more than 30 years ago of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons. As for the threat of bio-terrorism, the events of September 11, 2001 gave a powerful boost to the awareness of the issue. One particularly worrying factor is the relatively easier accessibility of biological agents suitable for terrorist activity as compared to chemical and nuclear weapons.

The threat of bio-terrorism is perceived to be rather serious. It has to be said though that currently, for a lack of important financial resources, high-class scientists and special development and production facilities, terrorist organizations are hardly capable of manufacturing biological weapons that could be used in a large-scale attack with massive casualties. Still the political and psychological fallout from the use of biological weapons could be very important indeed even if the actual lethal impact of such an attack were relatively subdued. The real threat of bio-terrorism is, for instance, its ability to destroy sources of vegetative and animal-source nutrition, which could destabilize the systems of healthcare and food security of a whole country or region for a long period of time. Finally, the progress of biological sciences and biotechnologies and the existence of naturally-occurring pathogens pave the way for a significantly higher bio-terrorism threat in the future.

The fight against bio-terrorism goes hand in hand with the efforts at minimizing the risk factor of those biological threats that occur naturally or unintentionally. The range of such factors is growing along with the progress of society and its ever higher technical sophistication, especially on the backdrop of intensifying globalization processes. An important component of the fight against bio-terrorism is physical protection and prevention of unauthorized access to biological materials that can be used as biological weapons.

Currently, there is no global international network of cooperation that would regulate various aspects of bio-security (in particular, security at biotechnological sites). However, it would be extremely important for Russia to establish cooperation with its European partners that are engaged in joint action in the field - first of all within the European Union. The latter did, for example, adopt in October 2007 a new plan for fighting bio-terrorism – the “Green Paper on Bio-Preparedness and Food Safety”, which was followed by a string of consultations aimed at forging effective measures to counter the threat of bio-terrorism.

International cooperation is a key condition for the fight against bio-terrorism to be a success. Its main lines of development are:

- non-proliferation of technologies and materials for the manufacture of biological weapons;
- strict international control over deliveries of dual-purpose equipment and materials;
- national and international control over higher education and consequent employment of experts in microbiology and virology of highly hazardous infections as well as in the field of large-scale microorganism cultivation;
- development of effective vaccines and therapies against all highly hazardous infections;
- elimination of natural sources of endemic infections wherever possible;
- development of a system of monitoring and control over information on outbreaks of highly hazardous (especially viruses) so as to reduce the likelihood of ill-wishers getting their hands on pathogenic material;
- awareness campaigns among the population on the potential and limitations for terrorists to develop biological weapons as well as on bio-security-boosting methods and techniques;
- creation of national systems of monitoring and non-proliferation of the technologies and materials by the countries that enter the club of technologically advanced nations with access to technologies that can be employed for the development of biological weapons;
- development of an international legal framework regarding the responsibility for circulating/selling over the internet or by any other freely accessible means of hazardous microorganism or data enabling/contributing to the creation of any type of warfare, including biological, that can be used for the purpose of terrorism.

4. Prevention and response to emergencies and humanitarian crises

Prevention and emergency response to natural and man-made disasters and humanitarian relief operations remain the least politicized areas of security cooperation between Russia and European countries and institutions. Optimism about such cooperation is underpinned by the fact that Russia's Ministry of Emergencies (EMERCOM) is not only ranked among the ten most effective rescue services in the world but is also one of the most professional and well-equipped emergency agencies in Europe. It is

also the largest of its kind on the continent. The main areas and the most important tasks of practical cooperation with European countries in this field include:

- ▣ Russia's initiative to set up a European Disaster Management Center, a Russia-EU hotline for emergencies alerts and aid solicitation (regretfully, as far as the EU is concerned, the initiative hardly went beyond the signing of a 2004 memorandum on information exchange);
- ▣ formation of an air squadron (Eurosquadron) to more actively use EMERCOM's emergency aircraft that is in short supply in most European countries for rescue operations, firefighting, etc. (presently, such cooperation mainly takes place on the basis of bilateral agreements);
- ▣ cooperation in emergencies forecasting (developing methods for prospective assessment of the impact of earthquakes, setting up a mobile laboratory to calculate buildings shock resistance, etc.);
- ▣ cooperation and coordination of emergency aid provision to third countries.

The central initiative in this field should be the creation of the European Disaster Management Center that could become one of the key bodies (agencies) of a new pan-European security system and a body that so far has no institutional equivalent at the European level. While most European countries have an interest in setting up such a body, its creation within the framework of the existing bureaucratic institutions and mechanisms of the EU and NATO is problematic. The first operational component of the center could be the planned Eurosquadron (possibly on the basis of an EMERCOM's base in one of the South European countries). Eventually, the European Disaster Management Center could become a regional prototype and a basis for the UN-sponsored International Emergencies Agency promoted by the Russian EMERCOM.

Russia could also put forward an initiative to form a pan-European system of mutual assistance in crisis response as well as joint work to evaluate, prevent and reduce the risk of natural disasters. It could include:

- ▣ creation of joint systems of early warning, forecasting and monitoring, operational exchange of information containing anticipated natural disasters alerts;
- ▣ coordinated action by teams specially trained for crisis response operations;
- ▣ sharing of experience on risk management in the planning of land use, waterway construction, urban development, etc.

5. Pan-European environmental cooperation versus ecological challenges

Over recent decades new challenges have been added to the list of traditional pan-European environmental problems. Among the most important are the global climate change, diminishing bio-diversity, risks related to natural disasters and the problem of sustainable development and consumption patterns.

These problems top not only national but also the European agendas. The EU countries that are parties to the majority (about 230) of multilateral environmental agreements, actively promote application of international mechanisms to deal with the environmental issues. As far as the pan-European system of international environmental cooperation is concerned there is still a great scope for improvements.

In this context the issue of “pan-European environmental space” formation could be raised, including the pan-European institutional structures and a package of measures to assess, prevent, mitigate and adapt to new environmental threats. As most of the risks are of a cross-border nature it would be expedient to apply coordinated risk reduction measures across the entire European continent rather than limit actions solely within the framework of regional unions.

Moscow should be more active in using the environmental factor in international contacts and in promoting the Russian approaches to constructing a system of pan-European environmental security.

Relevant Russian initiatives could explore the following avenues.

- ▣ Joint action aimed at fashioning a common pan-European environmental space and a system of response measures to new challenges appear quite timely. To that effect, development of a pan-European strategy with clear tasks, timeframes and action plans is essential. It would promote coordinated governance of new environmental risks, including their evaluation, prevention and mitigation as well as adaptation to the new environmental threats.
- ▣ Formation of partnerships between public and private stakeholder groups to coordinate efforts aimed at achieving common pan-European environmental goals and counteracting common ecological threats. They could become an important supplement to ongoing cooperation on the European continent within already existing inter-governmental international and regional environmental regimes.
- ▣ Development of a scheme for the pan-European environmental cooperation as a special “roadmap”, or as a crosscutting element within other “roadmaps” of the new Russia–EU partnership cooperation agreement.

6. Possible coordinated responses to global climate change

European countries regard risks associated with the global warming as one of the main threats to their security. Thus, climate change mitigation is seen as a priority of the national and international environmental agendas for the EU. At the same time the European Union is aiming to play internationally the leading role in climate change problem-solving and in the ongoing process of the post-Kyoto negotiations.

The year 2009 is an important milestone in the further development of international climate change regime to regulate from 2013 the national actions for climate protection. Its new rules are due to take effect after termination, in 2012, of the Kyoto Protocol mandate. Negotiations on a new agreement – its format, contents, national commitments and technical procedures – were launched in December 2008 in Poznan. The new agreement is expected to be adopted at the end of 2009 at the UNFCCC conference in Copenhagen.

At the end of 2007, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) issued its Fourth assessment report on climate change. Its data indicate that the rate of global warming has increased over the last decades. Human and ecosystems' vulnerability to global warming is expected to be growing.

IPCC's assessment set in motion the process for development of response measures and institutional schemes with specific quantitative commitments by the states on climate protection. Solutions to the problem are being sought along two mutually complementing directions, including measures to reduce greenhouse gases emissions and measures to adapt to increased warming and its impacts.

Recently the EU has set quite ambitious goals for greenhouse gases emission reduction among its members for the year 2020. Three main targets include: a 20% cut in carbon dioxide emissions by 2020 from their 1990 level; a 20% share of renewables in the bloc's energy mix; and a 20% improvement in energy efficiency. To make good on these plans a system of measures has been developed containing legislative steps as well as a comprehensive set of technical regulations to achieve lower emissions. In December 2008, the European Parliament approved the EU climate change and energy "package"³. Russia's progress along this avenue is more modest⁴. As the current level

³ The legislative package includes: 1) revision of the EU Emission Trading Schemes (ETS); 2) equipping power plants with carbon dioxide capture and underground storage technology; 3) national targets for increasing the share of renewables in the EU's energy mix; 4) targets for carbon dioxide emission reduction from cars; and 5) reduction of greenhouse gases emission from fuel.

⁴ According to the recent statement of President Medvedev, by 2020 Russia might reduce its greenhouse gases emissions by 10–15%.

of greenhouse gases emissions in Russia is about 30 percent lower than in 1990, at the moment the country is not experiencing any difficulties in fulfilling its international obligations under the Kyoto Protocol.

But we should keep in mind that even if tomorrow all emissions of greenhouse gases cease, the global climate will still be changing for a prolonged period of time. Thus, another goal is to adapt to climate change, both to its positive and negative impacts. That would envisage measures towards efficient water use, development of drought-resistant crops, dealing with the issue of mass forced migration, enhancing social and medical protection for the elderly during the hot periods, creation of favorable conditions for migrating animals and birds (including natural corridors), development of drugs against new diseases and methods against insects harmful to animals and plants, and upgrading flood protection facilities. However, there is still a lot of work to do in that area of pan-European policy.

Russia could propose stepping up the pan-European efforts in response to the challenges of global climate change. Specifically, we could suggest the following.

- ▣ Develop a detailed package of pan-European policies and measures to adapt to global climate change that are necessary in order to ensure the European security, including the development of a Pan-European Program for adaptation to climate change as well as an Action Plan for all European countries.
- ▣ Define means to capitalize on the possible regional advantages of the European continent as a whole in relation to global warming such as increased bio-productivity of forests, higher crop and pasture yields, increased water availability for many regions, lower energy consumption, etc.
- ▣ Assess and regularly take stock of the existing expertise, form effective state-private partnerships, disseminate innovative results and knowledge from programs and projects of the EU (in 2007, for example, the EU prepared the Green Paper on Adaptation to Climate Change) as well as of other European countries, including Russia and their next-door Central Asian neighbors.
- ▣ Coordinate action in counteracting common environmental threats. Joint efforts could be suggested to develop and apply major adaptation instruments in such sectors as agriculture, the water supply, fisheries, transport, energy, construction, municipal services, health, and science.

VI. EUROPEAN SECURITY AND THE POST-SOVIET SPACE

Discussions held by the international research community raise the issue, directly or indirectly, of a possible “vacuum of military power” in the post-Soviet space. It being filled by any outside nation would be a challenge not only to Russia’s security but also to the cause of strengthening pan-European stability. In that sense the issue of the situation on the territory of the former Soviet Union is paramount for European security.

In the post-Soviet space there is a precarious and shifting balance between integration and centrifugal tendencies. In that part of Eurasia groupings of states displaying different political attitudes have formed. Some countries openly declare the United States, NATO and the EU as the main vector of their political, military and economic course. Others continue to view Russia as the leader of the post-Soviet space and are building an economic integration grouping with it within the framework of the Eurasian Economic Community (EurAsEC), and a military and political one on the basis of the CSTO.

The foundation for CIS integration is quite fragmentary if we take as a benchmark European integration that goes far beyond trade and joint investment projects. The CIS has failed to develop real coordination of economic policy and work out a joint position vis-à-vis the rest of the world. All CIS countries desperately need investment and high technologies, and in that sense they act not like partners but like competitors in attracting foreign donors. Energy cooperation is hampered by contradictions arising from selective supply and transit pricing.

So far economic integration is mostly developing along the lines of Russian investment in infrastructure, natural resources, and companies in neighboring countries. The EurAsEC states (first of all Belarus, Armenia, Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan) are eager to trade in integration declarations for low-price energy supplies, credits and humanitarian aid from Russia. Meanwhile, Moscow, despite all its stated “pragmatism” in foreign affairs, continues to distribute economic “gifts” in exchange for gestures of political loyalty from the neighbors.

Hampering military integration within the CSTO is a lack of common vision regarding the nature of the threats and likely adversaries. Cooperation in the field is so far progressing more on the platform of Russia’s bilateral ties with individual CSTO allies. Central Asia is the only region where real collective forces for combating terrorism and conducting peacemaking operations are taking shape.

The existence of a number of “frozen” conflicts in the post-Soviet space further complicates integration efforts. For a period of time their presence (backed by Moscow’s perceived role as referee and the deployment of its military bases, troops, facilities and peacekeeping forces on the territory of neighboring states) worked to “tie” CIS republics to Russia. But by the late 1990s, as any visible prospects for the settlement of the conflicts failed to emerge, the situation began to change, giving way to the “repulsion effect”, a search for outside sponsors and mediators, attempts to resolve the situation independently of the CIS/Russia involvement and eventually by force.

The West’s policy of promoting its interests in the post-Soviet space is seriously impacting the situation in the CIS. Russia’s “near abroad” is becoming an area of most acute international competition, where Moscow’s efforts to establish itself as a leading force in the region meet active opposition from many countries. Over recent years, China has also joined the fray.

Against this background, it is worth taking a quick look at the external military presence in the post-Soviet space.

So far, no substantial foreign military contingents have been deployed in the Baltic countries, which joined NATO five years ago, despite recurrent crises in relations with Russia and the absence of CFE arms and armed forces limits for the region. Apart from the stationing of several NATO fighters, the construction of a radar station in Latvia, and the renovation of an airfield in Lithuania, no serious military activity by the alliance has been visible.

A total of three bases (hubs) used by the United States and other NATO countries to support military operations in Afghanistan have been deployed in the CIS. From them only one is left: after a diplomatic spat in 2006, Uzbekistan told Washington to leave the Khanabad base, and Kyrgyzstan in 2009 decided to wind up the US military presence at the Manas air base (although announced later that it can be used as a transit point).

NATO battleships regularly appear in the Baltic and Black Seas. Membership of the alliance by several littoral states is cited as a legal ground for such moves.

Russia is present militarily on the territory of seven out of the ten countries that are its partners in the CIS as well as South Ossetia and Abkhazia. Various Russian military contingents and sites deployed in the post-Soviet space play a rather important (though differential) role for the country’s security⁵.

⁵ In Ukraine – the Black Sea fleet. In Kazakhstan – the Baikonur space launch site, an early warning radar station, anti-missile and anti-aircraft testing grounds. In Armenia – ground troops at base 102 in Gyumri. In Tajikistan – the 201st division base, an air force unit and an electronic and optical space monitoring facility in Nurek. In Moldova – a peacekeeping detachment and guards at munitions depots in Trans-Dniester. In Kyrgyzstan – the Kant air base. In Belarus – an early warning radar station and a submarine communication station. In Azerbaijan – an early warning radar station.

Among the many security problems in the CIS area the following are the most acute and dangerous in terms of possible harmful consequences:

- ▣ ethnic or religious armed conflicts, most often of a cross-border nature;
- ▣ possible NATO membership for Ukraine (even though Georgia is of lesser real significance for Russia, its NATO admission is more dangerous for another reason – it is fraught with a possible fresh outbreak of armed conflict around Abkhazia and South Ossetia);
- ▣ destabilization in Central Asia;
- ▣ in the long run it is the growing influence of China in Central Asia, both economic and politico-military;
- ▣ possible augmentation of “slow-burning” threats to Russian security in the post-Soviet space (narcotics trafficking and its consequences, cross-border crime, smuggling, trade in humans, degradation of the environment, epidemics and illegal migration).

In the CIS political space Russia should conduct more nuanced, diversified and focused policies.

1. Specify Russia’s interests

Russia’s interaction with former Soviet republics must be based on specific Russian economic, military, demographic, humanitarian interests and broadly interpreted security interests (border protection, fight against organized crime, drug trafficking, terrorism, illegal migration, etc.). Russian national interests should be defined more specifically and precisely vis-à-vis each particular CIS state, and should take account of the regional aspect of security provision along the national border of the former Soviet Union. Wherever publicly accepted interests of Russia and neighboring countries coincide, even their broad military cooperation does not arouse Western opposition (as is the case with Armenia or Kazakhstan).

2. Maintain the integration vector

Integration between Russia and CIS countries – in the event of a drastic overhaul of economic and business ties established during the Soviet era and the 15 years since the demise of the Soviet Union – has significant potential for economic growth and wealth increase in all the participating countries. Russia’s position objectively makes it a likely center of such integration. At the same time one should not overlook the fact that political intentions alone are not enough and real integration requires comparable levels of economic, social, political and cultural development, compatibility

of economic models and political systems, a rather high level of mutual understanding in foreign affairs.

3. Cooperate for security

The CSTO will not only maintain its viability but is in a position to boost it. While doing so, the organization will most likely gradually transform into a body focused on fighting terrorism and Islamic extremism (in Central Asia), providing protection against new threats and ensuring development of military and technical cooperation.

Joint peacemaking has a future in Central Asia, especially if bitter antagonisms between the countries in the region are overcome. If NATO halts its eastward expansion and the CSTO gains in strength, the two organizations and relevant EU mechanisms could cooperate militarily in the fight against new threats.

4. Promote conflict settlement

Russia must step up efforts to settle old post-Soviet conflicts and prevent any new ones. “Frozen” conflicts push its neighbors towards outside actors and encourage them to opt for a military solution for their problems.

Under any scenario and with all the nuances of each particular settlement the baseline model must make sure that:

- ▣ territorial integrity of neighboring states is reiterated;
- ▣ the greatest possible autonomy or a special status is granted to the unrecognized enclaves;
- ▣ all the victims of the conflicts are compensated for the damage they suffered and war criminals are brought to justice;
- ▣ neighboring states are discouraged from entering any politico-military unions which Russia is not a party to;
- ▣ programs of economic reconstruction and socio-economic cooperation on a regional or bilateral basis, including for the unrecognized enclaves, are worked out;
- ▣ refugees return to their homes or receive appropriate compensation;
- ▣ Russian or other peacekeeping forces are deployed to guarantee the implementation of the entire set of settlement agreements.

Such model may become an important component of a new European security system and a subject for promoting cooperation between Russia (the CSTO) and the West (NATO, the ESDP). In the future, with regard to Central Asia, it is not inconceivable to bring China on board.

5. New accents in the drive against NATO expansion

In its efforts to thwart NATO expansion Russia should put most emphasis on its role as the main and most influential guarantor of territorial integrity and sovereignty of neighboring CIS countries provided, naturally, that they maintain their military and political neutrality. It is especially important after the events of August 2008 for strengthening the unity of the CIS and the CSTO.

After a spectacular display of military might helped it regain some of its former respect, Russia should now work to solidify it through reasonable restraint and flexible and constructive policies.

This line could be aimed among other things at making, by exploring various avenues of cooperation, the actual role of Russia in transforming and accomplishing NATO's new tasks more significant compared to even that of some "old" – and all the more so "new" – members (in particular, taking account of NATO's growing difficulties and very high stakes in Afghanistan).

6. Promotion of the CSTO

It is in Russia's political interests to perform in international affairs the role of leader of the CSTO group of nations. The effectiveness of this line will depend on the viability of this organization and its attractiveness as a partner to other international players. Specifically, it may position itself as a prospective contributor to international efforts to restore stability in Afghanistan.

CONCLUSION

Implementing President Medvedev's 2008 initiatives for a new architecture of European security would pave the way for at least three strategic objectives to be attained.

First, **to stabilize the international political situation in Europe and reverse the emerging negativity towards Russia.**

Russia's new-found viability and confidence in foreign affairs have alarmed the West and are often presented as evidence of a drive towards a more expansionist and assertive foreign policy. Up to a point this new perception plays into Russia's hands as it makes other international actors pay attention to its position and regard it as an important player in the world arena.

Still, the costs of negative attitudes towards Russia are significant and could further increase in the foreseeable future. This trend has to be reversed. Our objective interest today is to generate not so much fear of Russia (because it is strong and barely containable) but respect towards it (because it is strong and keen to pursue responsible and cooperative policies).

Furthermore, if Russia sticks with its current policy in the Caucasus it is important for it that the new international and political realities that have emerged in the region are not challenged on the grounds of restoring the status quo ante. One of the ways to resolve the issue is to legitimize these realities within a broader package of agreements. Such an approach was tested in the 1970s when the Helsinki process "sanctified" the European borders that emerged after World War Two as well as the new political configuration of the continent in conjunction with the solution of economic and humanitarian problems. It is quite possible to borrow from that experience in the current situation.

Second, **to boost cooperative interaction in Europe.**

The scale and the volume of cooperation may well grow, regardless of the "new security architecture". The latter, however, could be useful in achieving at least two goals:

- creating a more benign general political atmosphere in Europe for bilateral and multilateral cooperation;
- promoting cooperation in new areas, which are growing in importance as far as national and international security in Europe is concerned.

Third, **to narrow the differences in the interpretation of political and legal aspects of ensuring Euro-Atlantic security.**

There are a lot of significant contradictions in this area. It would be unrealistic to set the maximalist task of resolving them "fully and irreversibly". Honing the wording of the corresponding political formulae will of course be important.

But it is even more important to pay special conceptual attention to the problems that are generating (or could be generating in the future) most tension.

Among them are:

- ▣ mutual responsibility of states regarding the issues of using natural resources and moving them across borders;
- ▣ the collision between the right of peoples to self-determination and territorial integrity of states;
- ▣ the means and the limits of external pressure on the internal development of states as well as their right to resist such pressure;
- ▣ threats of international political destabilization on ethnic and confessional grounds, due to separatism and irredentism, related to demographic and migration processes.

All these issues require serious discussion by analysts, not just political negotiations. A certain parallel could be drawn with the work on the “Helsinki decalogue” within the framework of the All-European Conference (1973–1975). But the above-mentioned problems require much more thorough, structured and diversified analysis.

At the core of the Russian initiative is the proposal to work out and sign a European Security Treaty. It is important that Russia has formulated specific ideas regarding the key conceptual blocks of the treaty that must be the subject of international negotiation.

At the same time it would be short-sighted to narrow the new architecture of European security down to the signing of a corresponding treaty. Negotiating it could be difficult and take a rather long time if it is more than a set of some indisputable provisions and is aimed at addressing significant security-related collisions. Moreover, the scale of the above-mentioned tasks is significantly larger than those that can be resolved with the help of such a treaty. And with regard to some of these tasks, legally binding provisions are unattainable or are not of paramount importance. Ensuring security in the Euro-Atlantic area is a multifaceted problem requiring a whole set of various institutional and international legal instruments.

In this regard it would be expedient to promote right from the start the idea of a broad and comprehensive process of reformatting the architecture of European security while the work on the treaty and its signing will represent only a part of this process – very important but not the sole. Such an approach will make it possible, among other things, to adopt a more flexible initial position and will facilitate the launch of negotiations as quickly as possible, which is extremely important from the security point of view.

At the same time it is not hard to foresee that Russian ideas on the treaty will be the subject of intense and sometimes tough criticism. We will be able to react to it rather calmly if we do not see ourselves as strictly tied to a single variant of the desired solution. Some important issues may be tackled under different formats.

In other words, along with the central, pivotal line – the work on the treaty – it is expedient to initiate and promote in parallel other processes focused on upgrading the various components of the security architecture on the continent. In its turn, the treaty could either contain references to these processes or officially launch them, or provide for some other form of correlation with them. Such diversity of interconnections inside one common “structure” would provide an additional guarantee of its viability.

The idea of holding a pan-European summit is generally receiving a rather warm reception. Its main aim from the point of view of the Russian interests is to restore a normal overall political atmosphere and free Russian-Western relations from the negative burden they have recently accumulated. This should be done as quickly as possible.

However, if we set ourselves the task of adopting a major document that would contain meticulously negotiated and elaborated ideas on renovating the Euro-Atlantic security pattern, then we will have to wait for such a summit quite long. In the 1970s, agreeing the details of the Helsinki Final Act took more than two years.

Indeed, the summit should be not the final but the opening line in the endeavor. The document it would adopt could, for instance, be essentially a declaration containing the main reference points of the emerging creative process. The upgrading of the Euro-Atlantic architecture would require consistent and longer-term oriented efforts to promote security and stability in the area whose sustainability and viability will be of crucial importance for the international developments of the 21st century.

