

Chaillot Papers

- 31 -
April 1998

FROM DECOUPLING TO RECOUPLING

A new security relationship
between Russia and Western Europe?

Dmitriy Danilov and Stephan De Spiegeleire

A study by the Institute of Europe, Russian Academy of Sciences,
and the Institute for Security Studies of Western European Union

INSTITUT
D'ETUDES
DE SECURITE
UNION DE L'EUROPE OCCIDENTALE



INSTITUTE
FOR SECURITY
STUDIES
WESTERN EUROPEAN UNION

FROM DECOUPLING TO RECOUPLING Russia and Western Europe: a new security relationship?

Dmitriy Danilov and Stephan De Spiegeleire

April 1998

© Institute for Security Studies of WEU 1998. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photo-copying, recording or otherwise without the prior permission of the Institute for Security Studies of WEU.

ISSN 1017-7566

CONTENTS

Preface

Summary

Introduction

Some history

The current situation

EU-Russia

WEU-Russia

Analysis

Interests

 Russian interests

 West European interests

Structural (im)balances

Possible improvements

The institutional dimension

 Full membership

 Observer status and Associate Membership

 Associate Partnership

 Quasi-institutional improvements

 Other possible institutional solutions

 Advantages and prospects of some degree of institutionalization
 of Russia-WEU ties

 An EU solution for the WEU-Russia relationship?

The operational dimension

Conclusion

PREFACE

A European security policy is in the making. It received a decisive impulse in 1997, in particular with the Amsterdam Treaty. It will have to take into account a much transformed international scene in which the traditional balance of power and coexistence mechanisms are pushed aside by a renewed attempt at cooperative security that is not bound by rigidly pre-established formulas. It will be a matter not just of institutional belonging, but also of converging behaviour; of appropriate management of many varied and unpredictable circumstances, rather than of hierarchical architectures that define roles and impose responsibilities.

The issues at stake are those that lie beyond traditional territorial defence. Bilateral and other restricted multinational contexts may remain best suited to tackling selected strategic issues, but they do not suffice. The pan-European endeavour is about preventing the causes of destabilization and containing crises, and not only about addressing their consequences. And yet Western Europe is still hesitant about its ability to resolve conflicts, since the European Union's rationale has so far been to establish the social and economic conditions conducive to cooperation and reconciliation of differences, in ever-expanding functional and territorial terms. Stability and security nowadays feed on predictability, which in turn implies compatible behaviour and not necessarily pre-established uniform responses, convergent rather than identical interests, in a multidisciplinary, multilayered aggregation of actions. Commonality of purpose and like-mindedness are often more important than reciprocal commitments and formal guarantees.

The return to multilateralism that we have witnessed since the end of the Cold War has been an integral part of the wide-ranging reform undertaken by Moscow itself, in international relations and domestic matters, in what has been described as the 'common European home'. Russia has a role to play in the Common Foreign and Security Policy to which the European Union is committed. Russia is an essential term of reference and must become an active contributor to the reconciliation and rehabilitation of the common historical and cultural traditions, on a continental scale. The challenge and the historical

opportunity that lie before Russia are to consider if and to what extent it is prepared to supplement its wider responsibilities, which persist, with an equally strategic involvement alongside the other European nations, by adding security cooperation to economic integration.

The shared vision of a new Europe may emerge gradually and practically also from common, either joint or converging, responses to specific circumstances as they arise and require a decisive European contribution. They range from mediation and negotiation to peace support and interposition, particularly in areas adjoining Europe, but also in the European regions in transition.

Following ministerial indications, the Institute for Security Studies of the Western European Union and the Institute for Europe of the Russian Academy of Sciences have undertaken an in-depth analysis of the possible scope and modalities of an enhanced structural and operational relationship between the Russian Federation and

the countries that make up the emerging West European security identity. The views expressed here are shared by the two Institutes. Given the many factors at play, they do not, nor can they, constitute a blueprint. The paper is intended to promote public debate, with the increasing involvement of the public, electorates and policy-makers. It should contribute to an exchange of ideas, concerns, ambitions and frustrations, and thus clarify the sense of direction to be taken by West European and Russian policies alike.

Guido Lenzi, Director, Institute for Security Studies of WEU
Vitaliy Zhurkin, Director, Institute of Europe, Moscow
Paris, March 1998

SUMMARY

The relationship between Russia and Western Europe is an element of the post-Cold War security architecture that is only just beginning to emerge. Progress in this security relationship has lagged behind that made in the economic and political fields, and remains subject to certain natural limits. Yet the dialogue between the two sides is gaining momentum, both multilaterally but even more visibly 'minilaterally', as with the Franco-Russo-German 'troika'.

During the Cold War, the USSR was quite ambivalent about West European security cooperation. Although the USSR instrumentalized policy differences between the United States and Western Europe, there is little evidence that it really wished to 'decouple' them. Since the early 1990s, Russian thinking about WEU has become more positive, and WEU now enjoys considerable political goodwill, although some scepticism over its actual potential remains.

Today, the Russia-Western Europe relationship has to be seen in the context of the strengthening EU/WEU relationship. Western Europe is playing a leading role in the reintegration of Russia into a Greater Europe. EU is Russia's main trading partner, its main investor and also its largest donor of assistance and grants. With the entry into force of the Partnership and Cooperation Agreement, the formal relationship between EU and Russia has received another significant boost, which also encompasses the security field. Although WEU regards developments in Russia as a vital security interest, it has been reluctant to institutionalize its relationship with Russia. Russia and WEU have, however, engaged in a number of practical cooperative projects, most importantly the provision of Russian satellite imagery and long-haul air transport assets to WEU. In terms of political contacts, the relationship is also clearly moving into a higher gear, yet without becoming institutionalized.

The fundamentals of the Russia-Western Europe security relationship look quite sound: there are currently no sharp conflicts of security interest, and both sides present some attractive features to each other. To Russia, establishing a closer relationship with Western Europe is an important element in stimulating

multipolarity in world politics. Furthermore, structurally W/EU is not seen as presenting a security threat to Russia, and Europe's flexible institutional structure offers Russia some hope of finding a place in it. For Western Europe,

Russia's geopolitical and geoeconomic location and weight make finding an appropriate interface for this country within the broader European security architecture a paramount policy objective. Furthermore, Russia has certain operational assets that are complementary to those of Western Europe.

The relationship is also being pushed forward by a number of institutional and political imbalances. WEU, as a pivot between NATO and EU, may be under pressure to raise its institutional relationship with Russia to the higher levels that EU and NATO have attained. Politically, the Russia-Western Europe side of the United States-Russia-Western Europe security triangle may have to be adjusted to the other, more developed, two. Finally, various European allergies to the current 'minilateral'

frameworks may also provide an additional stimulus for genuine multilateral European cooperation.

Institutional and operational improvements in W/EU's security relationship with Russia are possible. Although none of the four existing forms of participation in WEU's activities is currently applicable to Russia, two alternatives are suggested: a reactivation (and slight alteration) of the former

Forum of Consultation; or grafting the WEU-Russia dialogue onto the more established EU-Russia dialogue. Operationally, there is much more room for deepening and widening current practical cooperation.

Four scenarios for the development of the security relationship between Russia and Western Europe are sketched. The first is the current 'healthy minimalist' one, which has some positive features but probably has to be seen as merely a starting point. The second scenario, called 'institutionalized minilateralism', is exemplified by the present bilateral and trilateral relationships between West European states and Russia. While these may have certain advantages, they tend to undermine the credibility of genuinely multilateral institutions. The third possibility would be the low-level institutionalization with WEU towards which the Russia-WEU relationship is already moving. Lastly, the WEU and EU dialogues with Russia could be brought together, which would allow for a more comprehensive approach to the security dialogue between the two sides.

Discussions about a direct relationship between Russia and Western Europe frequently arouse suspicions that it might decouple Western Europe from the United States. However, in this paper the transatlantic link is assumed to be an indispensable element of European security that is vital to both Russia and Western Europe, but which should be complemented by a direct link between Western Europe and Russia. After a long interlude, a democratizing and liberalizing Russia is gradually reclaiming its rightful place within Europe. It is to this recoupling that this paper has been devoted.

INTRODUCTION

Almost a decade after the end of the Cold War, the contours of the new European security architecture are finally becoming visible. Some of its elements may have changed, but are still recognizable, like the transatlantic alliance and the European security entity based on W/EU,⁽¹⁾ but also a more dynamic Russia in the East. Other elements are truly new, such as the emergence of liberal democratic regimes throughout Central and Eastern Europe, and the related process of eastward extension of the Euro-Atlantic institutions. But some elements still are only just starting to emerge from the post-Cold War political dust as it settles. This *Chaillot Paper* addresses one of these emerging threads of the new European security web: the relationship between Russia and Western Europe.

For many centuries, the mere mention of this relationship has evoked many ambiguities, in both Russia and Western Europe as well as in other parts of the world. Europe and Russia have attracted yet also repulsed the other in a peculiar mixture of admiration and fear, inquisitiveness and rejection, respect and disdain.⁽²⁾ But the interaction between those two entities never developed, either in tsarist or in Soviet times. Today, however, the process of integration that transformed Western Europe after World War II is gradually encompassing the entire Eurasian landmass, including its further Eastern reaches. For the first time in its history, Russia is starting to become interwoven in a broad web of institutional and functional relationships with the outside world, in a process of 'deep integration'.⁽³⁾

Western Europe is playing a unique role in Russia's reintegration into the world system, both economically and politically. But the security relationship seems to lag behind the economic and political relationships. No doubt, Western Europe has contributed to the difficult *rapprochement* between Russia and the Atlantic Alliance. Recently, the direct security relationship between Western Europe and Russia has in fact acquired some political visibility. In the days leading up to the October 1997 Strasbourg summit of the Council of Europe, President Yeltsin made a number of statements about the need for Europeans to assume more responsibility for European security without outside interference. 'We [Europeans] do not need an uncle from elsewhere. We ourselves can unite and live normally'.⁽⁴⁾ One of the practical consequences of this Russian rediscovery of Western Europe is the agreement between Russia, France and Germany to hold regular trilateral meetings at the highest political level.

But do these 'minilateral'⁽⁵⁾ forms of interaction truly represent the optimal form and content for the emerging security relationship between Russia and Western Europe? Or, put differently, could these forms be complemented by a dialogue between Russia and the existing West European multilateral organizations such as the European Union and/or the Western European Union? As so often with any new relationship, both sides still have to overcome a certain amount of psychological and bureaucratic inertia. In an attempt to promote this process, the Institute for Security Studies of the Western European Union and the Institute of Europe of the Russian Academy of Sciences have been working on a joint research project, attempting to approach this subject constructively. This paper starts out by sketching the current situation; this is

followed by an analysis of this situation and some concrete policy suggestions on how the institutional and operational forms of security interaction can be improved.

SOME HISTORY

In the Soviet period, Russian attitudes towards West European military cooperation were ambivalent. In the West, during the Cold War, it was frequently assumed that the Soviet Union's main strategy towards Western Europe was to weaken the Atlantic Alliance by 'decoupling' Western Europe from North America.⁽⁶⁾ The actual evidence in both Soviet declaratory policy and to a large extent also in actual Soviet behaviour⁽⁷⁾ towards Western Europe suggests a more complex reality. If the Soviet Union had truly wanted to decouple the transatlantic Allies, West European security cooperation would have presented an ideal target for a Soviet 'divide and rule' strategy, and would have attracted at least some Soviet encouragement. Instead, as was pointed out by one of the top Soviet specialists on this issue: 'even with the best will in the world, it is impossible to find a single proof of Soviet support for West European military-political integration in the entire post-war history'.⁽⁸⁾ Soviet scholars closely scrutinized West European attempts to play a more independent role in world politics (a trend which they called 'Europeanism'⁽⁹⁾), but they always saw it as a small footnote in an overwhelmingly Atlanticist policy, in which the United States retained the key levers over Western decision-making.

Traditional Soviet views of the Western European Union were tainted by one of the organization's original *raison d'être*: the controlled remilitarization of West Germany and the monitoring of the restrictions imposed on Germany by the Brussels Treaty. As these provisions were gradually diluted, WEU repeatedly became the object of strong Soviet criticism.⁽¹⁰⁾ Initiatives in the field of West European armaments cooperation typically met with Soviet opprobrium. The Independent European Programme Group (IEPG) was for instance seen as 'the executive body of an emerging West European military-industrial complex'.⁽¹¹⁾ Many initiatives taken by WEU in the 1980s, like the sending of vessels to the Gulf, the Hague 'Platform on European Security Interests' and WEU's Iberian enlargement,⁽¹²⁾ were met quite critically by Soviet commentators. At the same time, however, Western Europe was frequently seen as a counterweight to US 'extremism' on various security issues, particularly during the Reagan administration. An influential commentator, Alexander Bovin, repeatedly referred to West European 'common sense' and 'higher political standards' (as opposed to American 'adventurism' and 'cowboy mentality').⁽¹³⁾ As WEU gradually continued to develop its own policy initiatives, Soviet views of the organization became more positive,⁽¹⁴⁾ with one scholar in the late 1980s even calling it one of the most 'promising' institutions for West European military integration.⁽¹⁵⁾

With the collapse of the Soviet Union, this evaluation of WEU continued to evolve in an ever more positive direction but the relationship with WEU remained a very low priority for Russian foreign policy.⁽¹⁶⁾ Official Russian documents of the first half of the 1990s testify to the second-rate role which was attributed to WEU within the European security system. An enumeration by the then Foreign Minister Kozyrev stated that: 'Currently many different institutions have been created on the European continent: CSCE, NATO, European Community, Council of Europe and others.'⁽¹⁷⁾ WEU continued to be one of the 'others', even when it formally acquired a place in the category of regional organizations within the overall Russian 'concept of all-European partnership'. This concept is understood as 'the development of Euro-Atlantic interaction on the basis of the transformation of CSCE into an effective all-regional

political organization, and of the North Atlantic Cooperation Council (NACC) into an independent structure of political-military cooperation. The aim is to coordinate the efforts of NATO, EC, the Council of Europe, WEU and CIS . . .⁽¹⁸⁾ This statement highlights the anomaly that although WEU was mentioned in Russia's declared policy, it was the only organization towards which Russia had no concrete policy.

Over the past few years, it has been as difficult to find negative official statements or articles in Russian publications about West European defence and politico-military cooperation as it has been to find positive ones about NATO's enlargement. When the countries of Central and Eastern Europe (CEE), including the three Baltic countries, were offered Associate Partner status in WEU in May 1994, Foreign Minister Kozyrev stated that Russia had no objections to this move.⁽¹⁹⁾ After the Berlin ministerial meeting of the North Atlantic Council (NAC) on 3-4 June 1996, which approved the concept of the use by WEU of NATO assets for WEU-led operations, Russian Minister of Defence Grachev officially welcomed 'the increased role of WEU in solving West European problems' and evaluated what he called the 'increased independence of WEU from NATO' as a 'very positive fact'.⁽²⁰⁾

In any case, WEU remains a barely detectable 'blip' on the political radar screen in Russia today: analysis of the organization and its activities is carried out by a very small circle of experts and specialists, while the general public in Russia has practically no knowledge of WEU.⁽²¹⁾ To the extent that it is perceived in the public debate, however, the organization does appear to enjoy some degree of political goodwill. As Sergey Rogov recently put it: 'It is important to realise that, in Russia, the WEU is not perceived as a threatening military bloc. This fact could facilitate cooperation between Russia and the WEU. The WEU has no large military machine and militant bureaucracy, and has a flexible arrangement for membership and association. Theoretically, it could create operational structures more appropriate to the new challenges of European security, and it could probably do it in a less expensive way.'⁽²²⁾ This nicely sums up the main ingredients of current Russian thinking about WEU in expert circles: it is seen with a mixture of sympathy and interest, but also with some scepticism about its independent role and actual operational and political possibilities.⁽²³⁾

THE CURRENT SITUATION

Especially after the signing of the Amsterdam Treaty, which strengthened the ties between WEU and EU, the security relationship between Western Europe and Russia has to be seen in the broader context of the relationship between Russia and both EU and WEU.

EU-Russia

Relations between Russia and the European Union receive remarkably little attention in the international public debate, although they are acquiring increasing substance in a number of important areas, including security. The EU is Russia's largest trading partner (see Table 1), accounting for around 40% of total Russian trade in 1991 and an estimated 45% in 1995.

Table 1 Russia-EU Trade 1993-1997

(ECU million)	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997 (est.)
Exports to the EU 12 (EU12 + A, SF, S)	15543.0 (17618.6)	18400.6 (22427.3)	19919.9 (21959.7)	22900	21400
Imports from the EU 12 (EU12 + A, SF, S)	11541.2 (13166.4)	12168.7 (14359.0)	13523.8 (16124.1)	13523	18700
Trade balance (EU12 + A, SF, S)	4001.8 (4452.2)	6231.9 (8068.3)	6396.1 (5835.5)	3800	2700
Exports to Germany	5439.6	6686.4	6987.2		
Imports from Germany	5889.7	5589	5497.9		
Trade balance with Germany	450.2	1083.1	1494.7		
Exports to France	2162.6	2326.5	2751.9		
Imports from	1281.5	1107.2	1423.7		

France					
Trade balance with France	881	1216.8	1291.4		
Exports to Italy	3313.5	4034.9	4054.1		
Imports from Italy	1464.8	1821.4	2194.4		
Trade balance with Italy	1848.7	2205.7	1862.8		

Source: Eurostat

Russia enjoys a large trade surplus with the EU - ECU3,000 million in 1996 - even though in particular sectors (e.g. textiles or services), the situation is reversed. Even in some of the most sensitive areas, such as steel and textiles, where a number of difficulties persist, the two sides have been able to come to an agreement.⁽²⁴⁾ Russia attracted a total of some USD2,703 million foreign investment between January 1994 and 30 June 1996, less than half of which came from the EU, compared with 30% from the United States. If one adds to this the fact that Russia is the European Union's sixth most important trading partner, and that Europe is substantially dependent on supplies of energy from Russia, the powerful mutual economic interests need no detailed explanation.

Table 2 European Union trade with some of its main trading partners in 1997 (ECU bn)

	Import	Export	Balance
United States	100.0	94.4	-5.6
Russia	21.4	18.7	-2.7
China	31.5	10.5	-21.0
Japan	46.5	24.3	-22.2

The EU has established itself as one of the main economic partners of the Russian Federation. It has, in addition to bilateral aid, provided assistance to Russia under the Technical Assistance to the CIS (TACIS) programme since 1991. From 1991 to 1996 the aid provided under the programme totalled ECU1,000 million, representing about 55-60% of the entire TACIS budget (see Table 3). In addition to this technical assistance, the EU has also provided ECU354 million in grants for food and medical products and ECU28 million in humanitarian aid (e.g. the European Commission has approved various grants for humanitarian aid to victims of the conflict in Chechnya).⁽²⁵⁾

Table 3 TACIS funds allocated to Russia, 1991-96 (ECU million)

	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	Total
Nuclear safety and environment	12.89	0	0	0	0	5.5	18.39
Restructuring state enterprises and private sector development	72.2	29.76	54.5	43.4	40.6	31.3	226.8
Public administration reform, social services and education	46.64	24.57	44	18.85	52.8	33.8	220.7
Agriculture	50.85	21.49	12.5	16.3	17	10.6	128.7
Energy	41.5	16	21.1	19.5	18	11.5	127.6
Transport	32.87	14.25	13.55	13.9	12.6	8.5	95.67
Policy advice	0	0	0	18.97	0	0	18.97
Telecommunications	0	4.93	5.1	4.1	5.4	3	22.53
Facilities	0	0	0	0	0	26	26
Other	0	0	10	15	14.79	2.8	42.59
Total	212	111	160.8	150	161.2	133	927.9

It may be important to emphasize that many of these TACIS funds have been used for projects with direct security implications that are a priority under EU-Russian political cooperation, such as the training of military officers, nuclear safeguards, chemical weapons conversion and crime prevention.

Besides these increasing economic ties, Russia and Western Europe now also share one of Europe's longest direct land borders: the 1,300 km Finnish-Russian border. As EU enlarges, the Union will have even longer frontiers with Russia, and will become a neighbour of Russia's neighbours Ukraine, Belarus and Moldova. It will border on the Kaliningrad enclave and contain several hundred thousand Russian speakers.

This increased functional interaction has spurred the European Union into creating a new institutional framework for its dialogue with Russia. Already in November 1993, the President of Russia, the European Council and the European Commission signed a Political Declaration in Brussels that provided the basis for 'permanent political dialogue and a system of regular consultations at different levels on the whole spectrum of political, economic and other issues of mutual interest'. Ever since, regular discussions, including on issues of European security, have taken place in the biannual meetings of Political Directors and the Ministerial troika.

The most important step in the EU-Russian relationship, however, was the signing of a Partnership and Cooperation Agreement (PCA) with Russia in Corfu in June 1994.⁽²⁶⁾ This agreement foresaw a wide range of European Community-Russian trade,

commercial and economic relations, but also a broad political dialogue between these two 'partners'. Institutionally, the agreement provided for the establishment of a Cooperation Council (at ministerial level), a Cooperation Committee (at official level) and a Parliamentary Cooperation Committee. Ratification of Russia's PCA, however, dragged on for quite some time in a number of European countries, primarily because of events in Chechnya.

On 13 May 1996, the EU Council of Ministers approved an 'Action Plan for Russia', in which 'Security in Europe' and 'Foreign Policy' were two of the five areas singled out for cooperation.⁽²⁷⁾ In the area of security in Europe, a provision was made for 'Security Working Group' troika meetings with Russia, the first of which took place on 10 October 1996 and focused on cooperation in the elaboration of a 'Security Model for the twenty-first century' within the OSCE framework, where the EU underlined its interest in the 'full involvement of Russia in the development of a comprehensive European security architecture in which Russia has its due place'. These 'security working group' troika meetings with Russia have taken place at regular intervals, and it may be useful to point out that at no point did the turbulent negotiations between NATO and Russia in the period 1995-97 affect this EU-Russia dialogue, either at the official or the public level.

At its meeting in Brussels on 6 December 1996, the General Affairs Council took stock of the main steps that had been taken in the implementation of its Action Plan for Russia. It pointed out that 'significant portions of the plan' had been implemented and decided to set the following priorities for the immediate future:

Security in Europe

- *Regular dialogue with Russia on security issues: continued inclusion of the topic as a priority item on the agendas of the biannual Political Directors and Ministerial troikas with Russia; Security Working Group troika with the Russian side in each Presidency.*
- *Continued cooperation with Russia in the development of the security model for the twenty-first century following the OSCE Lisbon summit.*
- *Expert level troika meetings with Russia in the areas of global disarmament and non-proliferation.*
- *Continued dialogue with the Russian authorities in support of the ongoing and constructive efforts to arrive at a peaceful settlement of the situation in Chechnya: continued support for the useful role being played by the OSCE Assistance Group there.*
- *Further monitoring of Russian Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) ratification process with a view to studying the possibility of assistance with some aspects of problems associated with Russian CWC destruction programmes.*
- *Assessment of officer retraining programmes and further major commitment to support the International Science and Technology Centre, building on its sizeable achievements so far.*

Foreign policy

- *On-going development of constructive political dialogue with Russia, through effective use of Summit, Ministerial and Political Director troika agendas.*
- *Regular review of Working Group level troika meetings to ensure that they correspond to the interests of both sides in terms of substance and prioritization of agenda items.*
- *A regular UN Working Group troika in advance of the UN General Assembly.*
- *Maintenance of regular ad hoc contact by the Presidency and the Head of the Russian delegation to the OSCE in Vienna, to provide for effective follow up to the Lisbon summit.*
- *Training programmes for Russian and EECA diplomats.*
- *Continued dialogue with the Russian authorities within the framework of the OSCE and the UN, with a view to preventing/managing crises and undertaking action in the field of rehabilitation of conflict areas.'*

The EU has clearly signalled its commitment to continue to deepen its relationship with Russia,⁽²⁸⁾ as was made clear recently by Commissioner Hans van den Broek: 'It will be important for the enlarged EU to deepen considerably its relationship with Russia on the basis of the Partnership and Cooperation Agreement which is due to enter into force later this year. This should lead to further trade liberalisation which will complement technical and economic cooperation as well as regular political contacts up to the highest level.'⁽²⁹⁾

Summing up, the EU has already established a broad-based relationship with the Russian Federation that includes the security field. It may also be worthwhile to point out that the European Union has on a number of occasions made positive statements on the WEU-Russia dialogue and has encouraged its further development.

WEU - Russia

In its official documents, WEU typically mentions Russia as 'an important element' in the new European security architecture and stresses the importance of developing relations with it. In WEU ministerial communiqués, Russia has always been the first country to be mentioned in the section devoted to 'relations with third countries'. In its most authoritative statement on European security interests to date,⁽³⁰⁾ WEU mentions Russia along with Ukraine as the 'most significant partner' in the region for WEU countries. Developments within Russia are considered a vital security interest for WEU: 'The formation of a politically stable and developing Russia in which democracy, rule of law and human rights are irreversible is a vital security interest of the WEU. A Russian foreign policy, based on cooperativeness, partnership and neighbourliness, will strengthen European stability and security.' WEU has also acknowledged that enlargement of the European security structures should 'go hand in hand with the strengthening of cooperation with all those European countries that wish it, including Russia and Ukraine'. Yet it is striking that, in its public statements qualifying its relationship with Russia, WEU has generally remained less forthcoming than the EU, which defines Russia as a 'strategic partner'.⁽³¹⁾

The main parameters for WEU interactions with Russia (and Ukraine) were established by the WEU Permanent Council in March 1995: they essentially consist in ad hoc consultations at different levels,⁽³²⁾ while trying to avoid duplication in other forums. In October 1995, Andrei Kozyrev, then Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, wrote a letter to Javier Solana, at the time Spanish Chairman-in-Office of the WEU Council of Ministers. In this letter, he pointed out that Russia sees 'in the strengthening of contacts with WEU, one of the promising ways of establishing a genuine partnership in European affairs'. Mr Kozyrev also proposed some concrete steps on 'the future development of the dialogue and cooperation between Russia and WEU', including the creation of a Russia-WEU Consultative Council. The letter did not specify the form of this council, aside from the fact that it 'would be responsible for coordinating bilateral cooperation at all levels, i.e. political, parliamentary, military and scientific'. In his reply, Mr Solana, on behalf of all WEU member countries, welcomed the concrete suggestions, but added that these initiatives would have to be developed within the framework established by WEU in March 1995, and added that the idea of a 'consultative council' was noted 'but not as one to pursue in the immediate future'. This remains essentially the official WEU stance on the institutional parameters of the dialogue between Russia and WEU. Nevertheless, Russia and WEU have identified a number of practical initiatives, especially the following:

- the supply of Russian satellite imagery to the WEU Satellite Centre in Torrejon;
- an agreement on the provision of Russian long-haul air transport capabilities to the WEU for use in 'Petersberg' operations;
- cooperation on specific international negotiations such as the Open Skies Treaty - with concrete proposals from the WEU side;
- briefings on a number of issues under discussion in WEU (such as the 1995 WEU Common Concept, or - more recently - the reflection exercise promoted by the French WEU presidency in the first half of 1997 about European security interests);
- interparliamentary contacts (with participation of Russian parliamentarians in the sessions of the WEU Assembly and other joint initiatives between the Duma and the WEU Assembly); and
- joint research between the WEU Institute and Russian academics.

In March 1996, the WEU Council identified a number of areas where the relationship could be improved: intensified contacts between WEU and the Russian embassy in Brussels; more high-level visits; short-term attachments of Russian academics to the WEU Institute; exchange of information on certain topics (such as lessons from WEU operations in Yugoslavia, humanitarian task forces, African peacekeeping); and expert-level consultation. In addition, the Russian side has also made a number of concrete proposals that are still on the table, including in the armaments field (proposed contacts between Rosvooruzhenie, the Russian arms export agency, and the Western European Armaments Group (WEAG)).

The relationship appears to have shifted gradually into a somewhat higher gear, as Table 4 shows.

Table 4 Russia-WEU contact points

21 December 1995	Visit of Spanish WEU Presidency to Moscow
29 January 1996	Meeting of Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs Afanasievsky with members of WEU Council
14 March 1996	Tripartite meeting (Secretary-General, Permanent Representative of Presidency and Ambassador of Russian Federation)
Spring 1996	Points of Contact are appointed in the Secretariat, Presidency and the Embassy of the Russian Federation, leading to frequent bilateral and trilateral meetings, usually to prepare higher-level meetings, to discuss details of practical cooperation or to present information on WEU activities
30 April 1996	Tripartite meeting
15 May 1996	Tripartite meeting
6-7 June 1996	Visit of Secretary-General Cutileiro to Moscow at the invitation of Foreign Minister Primakov
8 October 1996	Meeting at WEU HQ (Secretary-General and Permanent Representative of Presidency) with Secretary of Russian Security Council Lebed
25 November 1996	Tripartite meeting
25-26 November 1996	Seminar in Moscow with Russian Duma and WEU Assembly
11 December 1996	Meeting at WEU HQ with Minister of Foreign Affairs Primakov
4 March 1997	Tripartite meeting
15 April 1997	Joint Seminar between Institute of Europe of Russian Academy of Sciences and WEU ISS, Moscow
23 April 1997	Meeting at WEU HQ with Secretary of Russian Defence Council Baturin
22 May 1997	Tripartite meeting
27 May 1997	Reaction of WEAG Chairman General Schlieper to Ambassador Churkin on

	cooperation
10 September 1997	Tripartite meeting
Autumn 1997	Contact between military attaché of WEU Presidency in Madrid and the Russian Embassy in Madrid with the WEU Satellite Centre (informal, since then one formal meeting every three months)
22 October 1997	Tripartite meeting
3 November 1997	Conference between Institute of Europe of Russian Academy of Sciences and WEU ISS, Paris
4-5 November 1997	Assembly meeting with Russian Duma
December 1997	WEU Council agrees to the principle of ad hoc meetings between the Russian Ambassador and WEU Ambassadors 'at 28' for dialogue and debate on specific issues of mutual interest
January 1998	Ad hoc meeting between Ambassador Churkin and the members of the WEU Permanent Council
February 1998	Visit of the Director of WEU Satellite Centre to meet representatives of Rosvooruzhenie to talk about details of future cooperation

The WEU Council has recently discussed its relationship with Russia more often than ever. On the other hand, WEU has to this day resisted institutionalizing its relationship with Russia in the sense proposed by Foreign Ministers Kozyrev and Primakov. In the latest exchange of letters between WEU Secretary-General Cutileiro and Russian Foreign Minister Primakov, WEU has in effect rejected any strict parallelism between Russia-WEU relations on the one hand, and Russia-EU and Russia-NATO relations on the other.⁽³³⁾

ANALYSIS

Interests

Russian interests

WEU has a number of special characteristics that could make it particularly attractive to Russia. First of all, the creation in Western Europe of a system of common defence has a positive vector at its roots - namely, the deepening of the integration processes within the European Union. Especially because of this, the practical approach towards security in W/EU is perceived as having a broader, more comprehensive character than in NATO, which continues to be seen in Russia predominantly as a defence union. This wider European approach opens before Russia the prospect of more extensive cooperation with W/EU than NATO could ever provide. This in turn would reduce the reliance on military means for ensuring European stability, which corresponds to one of Russia's security priorities, i.e. the demilitarization of its relations with the West.

Secondly, West European military-political integration inherently poses no direct threat to Russian security from a purely pragmatic point of view. The collective defence functions of WEU have de facto been delegated to NATO, and a common European defence is only envisaged in a longer-term perspective. Relations between Russia and NATO are of a fundamentally different nature: although the former adversaries acknowledge that they no longer represent a military threat to each other, they still cannot fully turn away from the principles of military strategic parity, and this limits the field of their genuine partnership.

Thirdly, WEU's structural inability to carry out large-scale military operations creates a benevolent moral-psychological climate in Russia and this in turn allows Russian officials to cooperate with WEU. Even though this organization is based on a mutual military commitment that is analogous to - even stronger than - that of NATO, WEU has not acquired an inimical image in the USSR and has never been perceived as a primary instrument of the West's policy towards the East. It is indeed significant that, contrary to what has happened with NATO, the intensive development of WEU's military dimension and its process of enlargement have not provoked a negative reaction in Russia.

Fourthly, Russia recognises that peacekeeping and humanitarian operations are acquiring greater importance in the military sphere. WEU puts particular emphasis on these so-called 'Petersberg tasks',⁽³⁴⁾ which allow it to find a military niche and to strengthen its role and prestige, even with limited military means. Such an orientation fully corresponds to Russian interests. First of all, one of the most important criteria in determining Russia's acceptance of the West's military and political institutions (as is clearly reflected in Russia's attitude towards NATO) is their transformation into structures that are designed to implement predominantly political and peace-support functions, as a part of the new system of pan-European security. The military structure of WEU corresponds better than NATO to this criterion. Secondly, from the Russian point of view, the relative weakness of the military component of WEU also

makes it more interested than NATO in using operational assets from third countries (such as Russia).

Fifthly, the re-activation of WEU required the creation of a multi-layered institutional structure with a fairly broad and flexible range of forms of interaction with non-full member countries. This might also significantly ease the search for institutional mechanisms between WEU and Russia, which has encountered complications in its attempt to find an acceptable framework of relations with NATO. Looking ahead, it is not impossible that further changes will occur in WEU's legal basis, which could offer an opportunity to reconsider the organization's relationship with some third countries. Furthermore, from a Russian point of view, the emergence of any integrated, all-European security system implies a strengthening of its Eastern component. This could be in Russia's interest, as it would be connected to Russia's ambition to assume more responsibilities in guaranteeing security within the CIS (especially along its southern borders). If Russia, by itself or on behalf of the entire CIS, took on such responsibilities (under an international mandate), it could well present itself as the Eastern partner of a 'deepening' W/EU.

Finally, the development of West European integration and transatlantic relations in the sphere of security seem to point in the direction of a marked strengthening and rapprochement of the relevant West European institutions (WEU and EU's CFSP) and consequently of increased European roles and responsibilities. These developments would be perceived quite positively in Russia, as they could translate into an institutional embodiment of a West European component of NATO and its transformation into a new Euro-Atlantic Alliance, which in turn may give Russia added incentives and instruments for cooperation with it.

West European interests

At the basis of WEU's declared policy of developing its relationship with Russia (started in March 1995) lies a general motivation, which is similar to Russia's, and which was aptly described by the presidency-in-office of WEU: '. . . [A] substantive dialogue between WEU and Russia constitutes an important element in the cooperative European security architecture which we are all helping to construct. [WEU welcomes] the process of developing such a dialogue which complements Russia's relationship with the European Union and NATO.'⁽³⁵⁾ WEU's activation in the international arena, the strengthening of its role, the declaration of its adherence to all-European values and its desire to strengthen its position as an important element of the European security system, suggest that WEU is called upon to 'develop relations with Russia in accordance with its size, its potential and its strategic importance'.⁽³⁶⁾

In the light of its geostrategic, geopolitical and geoeconomic location and weight, as well as its current multiple transition woes, there can be little doubt that Russia is currently, and will remain for the foreseeable future, of paramount importance to West European security and stability. The 'normalization' of Russia is probably one of the West's foremost strategic objectives. There can therefore be little doubt that Western Europe has a particular interest in finding an appropriate interface with Russia in the European security architecture.

It is important to stress that there are currently no fundamental conflicts of security interest between Russia and Western Europe.⁽³⁷⁾ Even on the thorny issue of how to fit Central and Eastern Europe into the emerging security structure, both Russia and the West share a broad interest in stabilizing this traditionally pivotal area for European security. With the exception of the issue of NATO enlargement, both sides also recognize the key role that the inclusion of these countries into West European institutions (EU, but also WEU) will play for European stability. On most other issues, the two sides do not seem to have directly clashing interests. Also, each side's vital interests in its respective Southern 'arc of instability' is acknowledged by the other side, and on many other issues (such as Muslim fundamentalism, managing the China factor, and most of the so-called 'new risks') interests tend to be at least compatible.

Western Europe may also have an interest in exposing Russia to the unique decision-making process that typifies West European organizations. The internal dynamics behind this process may be painful at times, but they do indicate that decisions can be made in the absence of a single pre-eminent power - an important lesson in contemporary international relations, which are increasingly based on building coalitions through complex and intricate deals rather than on throwing political weight around.

From the point of view of the EU's CFSP, Russia is also particularly attractive as one of the areas the member States could prioritize for a genuinely common approach. All member States agree that Russia remains one of the key foreign and security policy issues on the continent, and there is also little substantive disagreement on the overall strategy to be pursued. Furthermore, Russia's size suggests that the dialogue with Russia may be more productive and effective if dealt with on the basis of the combined political and economic power of the Union, rather than in individual dyads. In the logic of Jean Monnet, Russia could thus represent a catalyst for CFSP.⁽³⁸⁾

On top of these particular West European interests in Russia, there appear to be a number of operational complementarities between Russian and West European defence postures that argue in favour of exploring this relationship more actively than has been the case so far. As Western Europe is starting to pool its operational capabilities for joint use mainly in the lower reaches of the security spectrum, some critical operational deficiencies have become apparent in three key areas: communications, strategic intelligence (especially, but not exclusively, satellite intelligence), and certain specific types of long-haul air transport capabilities.⁽³⁹⁾ Particularly in these last two areas, the Russian Federation has a number of assets that could be used, by mutual consent, for West European-led Petersberg-type operations. This point is also surfacing in current Russian debates. In a recent article in Russia's widest-circulation newspaper, Yevgeny Kozhokhin, the Director of the Russian Institute for Strategic Studies, clearly articulates this argument: 'The United States can do much, but far from everything. The issue of Europe's operational possibilities, in [the event that] the United States refuses to get involved in events that may harm European interests, is already topical today. But in this case it is Russia that can act as the required ally in conducting a large-scale peacekeeping operation. Its potential in space reconnaissance and transportation aviation will be most welcome.'⁽⁴⁰⁾

Structural (im)balances

Above and beyond both sides' interest in improving their mutual relationship, there are a number of 'structural' imbalances that may paradoxically be pushing the Russia-W/EU relationship forward. There appears to be a clear dual institutional imbalance in the current European security structure, which in turn reflects some more profound political imbalances.

First of all, the institutional relationship between Russia and EU is today more developed than the relationship between Russia and WEU, to the point that EU has more direct interaction with Russia on broad security issues than WEU does. In a situation in which the Treaty on European Union refers to WEU as an 'integral part of the development of the Union', which may be called upon to 'elaborate and implement decisions and actions of the Union which have defence implications', this imbalance will have to be addressed.

Secondly, a similar institutional imbalance exists between Russia's relationship with NATO on the one hand, and with WEU on the other. After the signing of the NATO-Russia 'Founding Act', relations between NATO and Russia have become far more institutionalized than relations between WEU and Russia, which seems anomalous both from a West European and from a Russian point of view. If we accept the image of WEU as a 'pivot' between NATO and EU, then it seems only logical that the pivot be adjusted to reflect the changes in the elements that hinge on it (more precisely, the more developed Russia/EU and Russia/NATO relationships).

This dual institutional imbalance reflects a more profound political imbalance in what should in all likelihood be the fundamental triangle around which a European security equilibrium will have to be structured: United States-Western Europe-Russia. Whereas both the United States-Western Europe and the United States-Russia security relationships - however different - seem fairly well established, the direct Russia-Western Europe security link remains relatively underdeveloped and will remain so until the security relationship between Russia and W/EU has been more clearly defined.

Finally, there also appears to be a persistent political tension within Western Europe between the drive to delegate various aspects of foreign and security policy to multilateral forums and the desire of certain capitals to maintain their own privileged relationship with Russia. Multiple visits by West European leaders to Moscow,⁽⁴¹⁾ as well as the creation of a new troika involving Russia, France and Germany are clear signs of the latter trend. These new bilateral and trilateral initiatives are not only viewed with suspicion by various countries in Western and Central Europe, but they could undermine the credibility of any attempts to 'Europeanize' national foreign and security policies in existing institutions such as W/EU.

At the same time, however, the relationship with Russia does not rank very high on WEU's list of priorities. WEU has been immersed in other discussions about its own institutional and operational future, and especially on improving its relationships with both EU and NATO. The second priority has clearly been the rapprochement with the organization's Associate Partners, which received a big boost under the German Presidency in the second half of 1997.⁽⁴²⁾ In the light of WEU's limited independent

political capabilities,⁽⁴³⁾ this leaves little room for 'managing' the dialogue with as politically important a third country as Russia. This is also clearly reflected in WEU's institutional structure: whereas there are special units within WEU that are responsible for the dialogue with the United States and Canada (the 'Transatlantic Forum Activities', which has a distinct annual presidency) or with Mediterranean countries (the Council's Mediterranean Working Group), there is no such unit dealing with WEU's dialogue with Russia or Ukraine. This may be partially explained by the fact that the member countries who are most active about this direct dialogue with Russia, like France and Germany, still prefer bilateral security discussions.

Still, for a number of reasons - some conjunctural, some more structural - the dynamics of this W/EU-Russia relationship may be experiencing some pressures for change. To some extent, this is the result of certain internal dynamics within the emerging Russia-WEU relationship. A willingness to intensify ties has been officially asserted by both sides, and some corresponding steps have been taken, mainly in practical areas. The established mechanism of dialogue and consultation between WEU and Russia, and also more generally the successful start of the first practical projects of cooperation, may provide some endogenous momentum for both widening and deepening the relationship.

But most of the impetus for closer relations will probably result from external factors. One of the key driving forces could be the changing relationship between NATO and Russia. Irrespective of whether this relationship develops positively or negatively, it will permit a clearer definition of the role, scope and place of the WEU-Russia relationship. Even in the best-case scenario (the successful implementation of the measures included in the NATO-Russia Founding Act), the build-down of Russia's psychological reticence towards NATO is likely to take some time. In this intermediate period, WEU's special historical development and current role in the European security landscape may offer both sides an attractive complementary forum in which to discuss some of the issues that may prove difficult to work out with NATO.⁽⁴⁴⁾ In some worst-case scenarios (if the Founding Act were to remain a dead letter or if the agreement were abrogated after some crisis⁽⁴⁵⁾), WEU might once again provide an expedient forum for keeping the operational dialogue between Russia and the West on security issues alive.

Another conjunctural development likely to facilitate the development of a genuine Russia-WEU security relationship was the signing of the new Treaty on European Union on 3 October 1997. Although the Intergovernmental Conference was an overall disappointment, the new provisions in the security field⁽⁴⁶⁾ suggest that the ratchet of European security and defence cooperation has moved on another notch, especially as far as the relationship between WEU and EU is concerned.⁽⁴⁷⁾ Another important consequence of Amsterdam is that because of the failure to agree on a precise timetable for the merger of WEU and EU, WEU is certain to survive as an autonomous organization into the twenty-first century. This in turn means the organization will remain under some pressure to adjust its relationship with Russia to the current NATO and EU levels.

But both sides' real interest in establishing closer relations in the security field is not restricted to these conjunctural reasons. At a more fundamental level, it seems clear that as Russia becomes more integrated into the world, and more specifically into

Europe, after at least seventy years of self-imposed isolation, this integration is likely to affect its security perceptions and postures as well.⁽⁴⁸⁾ Western Europe will become increasingly relevant for Russia even in the field of security, because:

- Russia will remain of direct importance to Western Europe for the foreseeable future, and this will promote a reliable long-term engagement;
- for both political and economic reasons, both sides share an interest in stabilizing the new democracies in the intermediate area between them;
- there are no direct contentious security issues that could jeopardize their security relationship;
- because of their relative geographical propinquity (which will increase as the European and Euro-Atlantic institutions move closer to Russian borders), many important security challenges will be shared;
- and because of the particular internal dynamics of today's Western Europe, Russia's voice in a European framework would carry relatively farther than in a Euro-Atlantic framework.

A final element that deserves mention is that most future security crises which Western Europe will be called upon to address will require a judicious mix of policy measures in which economic and political levers will be used in conjunction with military instruments. This fact also opens the door to a greater number of possible synergies between the two sides in situations where there are shared interests.

All sides are still adjusting to the new post-bipolar environment. The current structure of the European security system provides some tactical flexibilities that have not been fully explored. It seems likely, therefore, that the possible advantages of a tripolar system (in the European case, United States-Russia-Europe)⁽⁴⁹⁾ will be pursued by all sides in the near future, particularly as (and if) Russia continues further to develop into a 'normal' unit of the international system. To give but one example, the rigid '16+1' formula for discussions with Russia within the Atlantic Alliance is a visible remnant of bipolarity, which does not always reflect the real alignment of positions on various issues. Within a more flexible formula for interaction, i.e., a real forum at seventeen instead of a '16+1' dialogue, some new political alignments might emerge on certain issues, possibly leading to a more genuinely inclusive decision-making system. Besides these conjunctural and more structural reasons for closer cooperation, involving Russia in some way in developments within WEU would thus also yield some psychological dividends in building down various residual Russian and West European suspicions inherited from the Cold War. As is the case for the discussions between Russia and NATO, this does not imply giving Russia a veto or even a *droit de regard* over any of these developments, but at least including it more systematically in the evolving discussions on themes of European security. How might this be achieved?

POSSIBLE IMPROVEMENTS

The institutional dimension

The starting point for redefining the relationship between WEU and Russia is the recognition that none of the current existing forms of participation in WEU activities is acceptable for the relationship with Russia. There are currently four different types of status for countries in the WEU family:

- Members (as defined in the modified Brussels Treaty - 1954)
- Associate members (Petersberg - 1992, Rome - 1992, Luxembourg - 1994)
- Observers (Petersberg - 1992)
- Associate Partners (Petersberg - 1992, Kirchberg - 1994)

Full membership

Full Russian membership of WEU is impossible at this stage, because Russia is not a member of either the European Union or the Atlantic Alliance. EU membership was spelt out as a specific requirement for WEU membership in the 1992 Petersberg declaration, and after the Amsterdam Treaty the logic of this linkage has become even more binding. Although there is no explicit legal requirement to have NATO membership, that is how Articles IV and V of the modified Brussels Treaty have been interpreted. Article IV stipulates 'close cooperation with NATO', the 'undesirability of duplication' of NATO command structures, and the reliance on NATO for information and advice. But especially the strong wording of Article V of the Treaty, requiring that all members afford 'all the military and other aid in their power' to any party that is the object of an armed attack in Europe, makes full Russian membership highly unlikely for the foreseeable future. Full membership is already complicated today, and extending it to a country of the size, weight and geopolitical exposure of Russia could entangle WEU in a number of military contingencies in which it is neither able nor willing to intervene.

Furthermore, the long-term future of WEU remains uncertain. At the Intergovernmental Conference (IGC), no unanimity was achieved on a timetable for the merger of WEU and EU (to which all WEU Member States committed themselves in the Maastricht Treaty). At the same time, the modified Brussels Treaty, contrary to what is sometimes maintained,⁽⁵⁰⁾ has no automatic expiry date. Therefore, WEU is likely to continue to exist into the next millennium. Whatever happens, it seems fairly likely that WEU will both acquire new full members and become more intertwined with the European Union. Both these factors make Russian full membership a distant possibility at best. It is important to point out, however, that legally there are no explicit geographical limits on membership of WEU. For that reason it would not only be politically inopportune, but also legally untenable to exclude Russian membership ad infinitum, especially since the preamble of the modified Brussels Treaty clearly states that the parties are resolved 'to promote the unity and to encourage the progressive integration of Europe'.

Observer status and Associate Membership

Since Observer and Associate Member statuses are only reserved for members of, respectively, the European Union and NATO, Russia is at this point not eligible for either. Although during his most recent trip to Brussels,⁽⁵¹⁾ Prime Minister Chernomyrdin envisaged for the first time the possibility of Russia joining the European Union, both sides acknowledge that this is a long-term prospect at best. And although all countries involved seem careful not to exclude Russian membership of NATO,⁽⁵²⁾ the NATO-Russia Founding Act represents almost certainly the upper limit of what is currently politically and institutionally feasible between Russia and NATO. Therefore Associate membership (which to all intents and purposes represents virtually full operational integration into the organization) remains an extremely unlikely prospect.

It may be worthwhile to point out, however, that some of the possibilities afforded by these forms of status within WEU are already open to Russia. Nothing prevents Russia from associating itself with WEU decisions. Russia could, for instance, state its approval of WEU's 'Common concept' or of other WEU declarations on certain issues on which there is mutual agreement. It could also - as has been done by Ukraine - declare some of its assets and/or capabilities as possibly available to WEU for Petersberg operations. It could also, just like any other country, participate in WEU-led operations (be they of the NATO CJTF type or not), although it would not have the same status as WEU participants.

Associate Partnership

In 1994 in Kirchberg, the WEU Council agreed on the status of 'Associate Partnership' for the countries of Central Europe⁽⁵³⁾ that had signed or were about to sign Europe Agreements. This enhanced status allowed these countries, who had until then been partners in the consultation forum (see below), a number of additional possibilities in the following areas:

- information: the right to be 'regularly' informed at the Council of the activities of its working groups. In practice, this implies that the Council decides on a case-by-case basis what WEU documents will be made available to them;
- political participation: the possibility to participate in Council meetings when such participation is not opposed by a majority of full members, and upon invitation in working groups 'on a case-by-case basis';
- operational ties: the right to have a liaison arrangement with the WEU Planning Cell; the right to associate themselves with decisions on 'Petersberg-type' operations as well as the right to participate in their implementation unless a majority of full member states are opposed; the right to participate in relevant 'exercises⁽⁵⁴⁾ and planning' under the same conditions and with the right of involvement in the command structures and in the Council's subsequent decision-making process on such operations.

In return, the nine states (later to be joined by Slovenia) signed on to parts of the WEU acquis, especially by committing themselves to the peaceful settlement of interstate differences and by refraining from resorting to the threat or use of force. Since Kirchberg, the Associate Partners have also been increasingly involved in WEU's

operational development for Petersberg missions, and further initiatives in this area are being explored.

Russia - unlike Ukraine, which in a letter dated 27 August 1997 officially announced to the WEU Presidency its readiness to become an Associate Partner - has so far never officially inquired about Associate Partnership, although a number of people both inside and outside the Russian Government have toyed with the idea. If Russia were to make a proposal analogous to the Ukrainian one, some practical problems would arise from the fact that this status was specifically designed for countries who had or were about to sign Europe Agreements with the European Union. Since Russia - like Ukraine - has only been offered a Partnership and Cooperation Agreement by the European Union, the status, *stricto sensu*, does not apply to it. Furthermore, looking ahead, this is probably the one status whose modalities will change most rapidly, which would argue for reserving this status for CEE countries that will become members of the Union.

Quasi-institutional improvements

From time to time, various ways of enhancing the Russia-WEU relationship without entering into a real institutional arrangement have been suggested. These ideas have ranged from intensifying the current official contacts through liaison officers in the respective military headquarters to systematic stocktaking meetings between the Russian ambassador and a WEU 'troika' (e.g. the outgoing and incoming presidencies together with the Secretary-General) that could be established. Another possibility could be a joint political declaration, analogous to the EU's political declaration of November 1993, which could be signed at a ceremony with the Russian President at some WEU Council meeting. It is hard to see, however, how such quasi-institutionalization would redress the fundamental imbalances between the EU/Russia, NATO/Russia and WEU/Russia relationships described earlier.

Other possible institutional solutions

WEU has had some experience in structured cooperation with European countries that are not members of either EU or NATO. Such cooperation has been carried out with CEE countries (before they became Associate Partners) in the framework of what was called a Forum of Consultation.⁽⁵⁵⁾ The politically 'easiest' institutional way of formalizing ties between WEU and Russia may therefore be to resuscitate the structured 'dialogue, consultation and cooperation' framework for countries of Central Europe that was created by WEU at its extraordinary meeting with states of Central Europe in Bonn on 19 June 1992. This initiative allowed for a structured dialogue with these countries on a pre-established number of issues. The following measures were adopted: yearly meetings of foreign and defence ministers; twice-yearly meetings in Brussels of a 'Forum of Consultation' at the ambassadorial level; the possibility of meetings between an ad hoc WEU troika and senior officials from the countries involved; and an exchange of documents and information. In recent exchanges, it has become apparent that this is what Russia had in mind in 1995.

One technical problem with resuscitating such an arrangement is that the original wording of the declaration about the consultation forum seemed to suggest that it would be a multilateral forum. Especially if Ukraine (and possibly other countries

such as some former Yugoslav republics⁽⁵⁶⁾) were to be accorded similar status, this might create some unnecessary complications. But this is mostly a problem of form rather than of substance, since the 'forum' could be re-labelled a 'dialogue partnership', which would remove the multilateral connotation.

Adding another layer to WEU's already extremely complex institutional web is not an ideal solution from the point of view of institutional streamlining, but there is consensus in the WEU Council (as expressed in various communiqués) that Russia is an 'important partner'. The logical implication of these repeated acknowledgements would be to give the dialogue with this country more continuity, regularity and substance. Therefore some increased institutional complexity (which would after all be marginal: there would be five instead of four statuses) might be the minimal price to pay in order to give Russia a modicum of institutional visibility within WEU.

The issue of the different types of status within WEU is one that will have to be revisited at some point in the near future. So far, the logic behind this multiplicity has been essentially an institutional one: to find a special status tailored for non-WEU members of the EU and NATO and for countries that have signed Europe Agreements. This was politically extremely convenient, and remains so, as we have seen in the previous discussion. Even if they do not facilitate the organization's operational efficiency, the different types of status provide a dynamic quality, which opens up the conditional prospect of a further upgrading of Russia's role within the organization.

Advantages and prospects of some degree of institutionalization of Russia-WEU ties

The Forum of Consultation is a relatively flexible structure which opens the possibility of, first of all, a dialogue on a broad spectrum of security problems in conjunction with cooperation on practical projects; secondly, consultation at various levels (from ministerial to expert); thirdly, incremental institutional transformation of the dialogue, its development and the prospects of moving it in the future in the direction of deeper forms of cooperation. On the one hand, it would remove substantive political and practical problems which would emerge if one were to include Russia in the multilateral mechanism of cooperation that already exists. On the other hand, using the previous (multilateral) *de jure* structure, Russia and WEU would *de facto* acquire a mechanism of bilateral cooperation which would be indispensable from the point of view of the peculiarities of Russia's situation.

In parallel with the possibility of using the institutional experience of WEU, such a format would correspond both to current Russian proposals and to the aims of WEU in the development of its links with Russia, especially taking into account the recommendations formulated by the Assembly of WEU in 1994: to 'offer the Russian Federation permanent cooperation including a regular system for information, dialogue and political consultation at ministerial level⁽⁵⁷⁾ and at that of the Chairmanship-in-Office, the Secretary-General and senior officials of the ministerial organs of WEU.'⁽⁵⁸⁾

The framework of a Forum of Consultation would also give WEU grounds for taking upon itself the role of an instrument of dialogue between Russia and the EU in the sphere of security (as has already been done in relations with CEE countries). This

would guarantee the congruence of this dialogue with the Partnership and Cooperation Agreement between the Russian Federation and the European Union. More specifically, the measures which were formulated by the Council of the European Union in November 1995 would be realized:

the development 'in the framework of existing mechanisms, of an open, stable and substantial relationship of dialogue and partnership between the [European] Union and Russia in the field of security . . . encouraging Russia to take full advantage of its developing contacts with WEU.'⁽⁵⁹⁾

Using the existing mechanisms for institutional relations between the two sides would remove those arguments against institutionalization of special relations with Russia (which would, to some extent, be justified).

The adoption of the Forum of Consultation model in the development of relations between Russia and WEU will at some point beg the question of their future prospects, i.e., how to define the partners' policy and the character of their relations, while taking into account their current institutional limits. Indeed, a simple expression of a desire to work towards cooperation introduces elements of uncertainty, if not negatively influencing both the substance and the dynamics, as is confirmed by the two-year history of links between Russia and WEU.

A 'programme' of cooperation between WEU and Russia depends on the choice of one of three possible variants.

It is possible that cooperation in the framework of a Forum of Consultation will be considered not only the more acceptable solution in present circumstances but will actually turn out to be the limit in any practical sense (first variant). Although this in principle limits the potential for cooperation, it nevertheless generally corresponds to the current situation and both sides' current interest. Nevertheless, successful cooperation within the framework of a Forum of Consultation, and mutual interest in its deepening, could eventually induce the removal of its limitations which are inherent in this status (as demonstrated by the experience of relations between WEU and CEE countries) and it would thus be politically more forward-looking to take these possibilities into account ahead of time.

The qualitatively higher level of participation of CEE countries in WEU paved the way for their acceptance as Associate Partners. Formally, this status was offered to them as countries which had signed, or were preparing to sign, Europe Agreements with the European Union. Furthermore, given sufficient political will, this formal impediment could be overcome, thereby allowing for the possibility, at least in principle (although not immediately), of Russia's accession to the status of Associate Partner (second variant).

Firstly, Europe Agreements do not, from a legal standpoint, represent a strict legal condition for Associate Partnership with WEU, and the creation of such a status does not touch upon the legal basis of the Union.

Secondly, the PCA between the Russian Federation and the European Union opened up fairly broad prospects (including 'the future creation of a free-trade zone between

Russia and the Community'), which would also give WEU a basis for shifting from dialogue and consultation with Russia to partnership relations.

Thirdly, the status of Associate Partner would only open broader possibilities of cooperation with WEU, but would not imply the prospect of adherence to the EU (and/or NATO). From this point of view, there is not a single impediment to the opening up of the possibility of such a status to Russia, together with the CEE countries (the status of which will change in the event of their membership of the EU and/or NATO).

Fourthly, an important argument in favour of the possible recognition of Russia as an Associate Partner of WEU is its special significance in the West's policy. Although the variant of Russia as an Associate Partner of WEU is not excluded in principle and, in general, could serve as an institutional guideline for the development of their relations, its acceptance would be problematic for a number of political reasons:

- for WEU, the acceptance of such a prospect would obviously imply a narrowing of political flexibility in its relations with Russia, and a certain complication of its dialogue with CEE countries which is specifically undesirable in the case of continued uncertainty about the future content of relations between Russia and NATO. In any case, WEU does not find itself in a complicated situation of choice as is to some extent the case between NATO and Russia, which gives it the possibility not to take far-reaching decisions.
- for Russia, the desire to achieve this status of cooperation would demonstrate not only its policy towards achieving real partnership (in the future), but would also imply its refusal (now) to attempt to create special relations which would correspond to Russia's specific situation.
- for the countries of Central and Eastern Europe, having the same status as Russia would complicate the creation of one security strategy in the WEU family (possibly also for WEU itself). The special European unity would be disrupted and a Russian element that in many aspects is strange to it would be introduced. This Russian element would have a fundamentally different weight in the relationship in comparison with the other 'equal' WEU Associate Partners.⁽⁶⁰⁾

One could try to get rid of these negative factors in the process of structuring the relationship between WEU and Russia, and to overcome the potential limitations of their development within the framework of a Forum of Consultation, by resorting to a more flexible institutional model (third variant).

Its essence would consist in starting cooperation in the very simplest and acceptable terms of the Forum of Consultation while at the same time foreseeing the possibility of developing it beyond the limits of the former competences which have been created along WEU-CEE lines. Thereby Russia would be accepted as a partner of WEU (as it is accepted as a partner of the European Union in accordance with the Agreement with it) but in a first stage it would retain the status of partner in consultation and dialogue. Such a formula would allow both sides to:

- maintain a sufficient degree of mutual political flexibility, avoiding strict obligations in creating a mandate and mechanisms and modalities of a future partnership;
- work together within the framework of a reanimated 'renewed' Forum of Consultation, which would allow the development of an incremental interaction which could spill over into a potentially higher level of relationship;
- avoid the formula 'special relations' by using existing institutional practices while at the same time taking into account Russia's special role;
- guarantee more fully the congruence between the character of Russia-WEU links, Russia's relations with EU and NATO and its role in the European security system.

Whichever of the three variants mentioned above is selected, the lowest common denominator of cooperation between WEU and Russia remains the reactivation of the status of the Forum of Consultation.

In accordance with such a format, the established system of contacts between WEU and Russia (especially via the Russian Embassy in Brussels) would be used on a regular basis. Functionally, the system would be broadened on the basis of regular WEU-Russia visits at ministerial level (Foreign Affairs and/or Defence). This would make it possible to guarantee the participation of Russian representatives in the working groups and subsidiary organs of WEU by mutual agreement. Specifically, propitious conditions would be created for the inclusion of Russian academics in the activities of the Institute for Security Studies of WEU (a willingness to do this was reflected in the reply by Mr Cutileiro to Mr Primakov). Upgrading WEU-Russia relations to this qualitatively new level opens possibilities for creating a permanent group of experts.

For the successful development of cooperation, its popularization and improvement of the system of mutual information, it would be opportune - besides the existing diplomatic points of contact - to open a WEU information office at the Moscow Embassy of one of the Member States (similar to existing NATO representation). One could also foresee the creation of an open WEU documentation centre - possibly based on the RAS Institute of Europe, where there is an analogous European Union centre which functions successfully.

With the creation of a status which would guarantee the high political level and the regular character of the partnership between WEU and Russia, their practical cooperation could develop on a systematic as opposed to on an ad hoc basis.

An EU solution for the WEU-Russia relationship?

If an institutionalization of ties with WEU continues to remain an unattainable goal, the Amsterdam Treaty may have opened up another avenue for a more systematic security dialogue between Russia and Western Europe. As was mentioned earlier, the Partnership and Cooperation Agreement between Russia and the European Union entered into effect at the beginning of December 1997. Concretely, this has meant that the institutions that are mentioned in the agreement (especially the Cooperation Council and the Cooperation Committee) have now started functioning.

The further rapprochement between EU and WEU as a result of the Amsterdam Treaty may therefore make it possible to graft the WEU-Russia dialogue onto the EU-Russia dialogue. As pointed out, the December 1996 EU Action Plan for Russia was conceived very broadly (including 'security issues'). The new competencies of the European Union in the field of foreign policy and security⁽⁶¹⁾ should make the proposed arrangement politically feasible. EU can now certainly have a dialogue with Russia on the so-called Petersberg tasks (Art. 17.2), and it could 'avail itself' of WEU for such discussions. But it should also be emphasized that Article 17 does not restrict itself to those 'Petersberg tasks', as it reads: 'Questions referred to in this Article shall include [emphasis added] humanitarian and rescue tasks, peacekeeping tasks and tasks of combat forces in crisis management, including peacemaking.' Furthermore, the new TEU also establishes the European Council's prerogatives in defining 'the principles of and general guidelines for the Common Foreign and Security Policy, including for matters with defence implications', prerogatives that were accepted by WEU in the declaration annexed to the Final Act of the IGC. In other words, these changes open up the possibility of the presence of a WEU representative at EU-Russia Cooperation Council meetings.⁽⁶²⁾

Tagging the WEU-dialogue onto the EU-dialogue could be seen to be to everybody's advantage: EU could use WEU's input on various security issues on which it lacks in-house expertise; WEU could satisfy Russia's request for a more formalized dialogue with it without reversing its previous decision, and Russia would be able to portray it as a victory for its attempts to establish a direct dialogue with Western Europe on security issues. Finally, and maybe even most importantly: the dialogue between Russia and Western Europe would start off on a more comprehensive, more inclusive footing allowing for not only a broader definition of security problems, but also solutions to these various security problems.

The operational dimension

Aside from (or parallel to) these institutional issues, it is important to realize that there are some important operational complementarities between Russia and Western Europe. What is frequently underestimated in the current debate on European security is that - just as the European 'founding fathers' had foreseen - the process of European integration has been driven far more by functional impulses than through institutional ones. Many observers are today quite understandably overwhelmed by the maze of complex institutions that this process has yielded. However, this institutional process has been propelled forward by a high degree of functional spillover in specific areas, now finally also involving the defence field - be it through the proliferation of multinational military units or through the transnational integration of defence industries. Functional integration between Western Europe and Russia has not reached a stage where the logic of spillover could carry into the defence realm, but some areas could possibly already be singled out where both sides have interests in common. In this sense, practical cooperation (possibly within a loosely formalized framework) may have more positive (and fewer negative) consequences than trying to impose an institutional shell on what to all intents and purposes are still relatively distant partners.⁽⁶³⁾

If one accepts this logic, some areas where such operational forms of cooperation could be explored include:

- 'natural' complementarities: Russia has some military assets in areas where there are important West European deficiencies.⁽⁶⁴⁾ One of these which has already been explored is satellite reconnaissance, where an agreement has now been reached between Rosvooruzhenie and the WEU Satellite Centre in Torrejon on the provision of Russian imagery on a commercial basis. But there are certainly other areas where such complementarities exist. Heavy airlift is another obvious candidate (and indeed it is a field where the WEU has already signed an agreement with Ukraine, in Brussels on 30 June 1997) where Russia has assets that it could make available for Petersberg operations. Tactical ballistic missile defence might be another domain where there may be mutually beneficial interests in cooperation. More generally, military experts on both sides could be encouraged to identify other such areas of complementarity and discuss detailed arrangements under which these assets and/or capabilities could be harnessed to mutual advantage;
- military doctrine: as WEU is currently developing its own doctrine for peace support missions, an exchange of views on this topic might be extremely useful. Particularly with respect to terminology, Russian military specialists have done work that certainly deserves closer scrutiny;
- exercise policy: here, too, joint measures could be explored, including the presence of Russian observers at future WEU exercises;
- military procurement: in the light of the far-reaching structural changes occurring in the military-industrial complexes of both sides, closer ties could be established between the newly created WEAO and the Rosvooruzhenie. These agencies could try to identify areas of common requirements and possible common procurement (on a commercial basis). One concrete example is the current discussion of possible joint production of the An-77 cargo aircraft;⁽⁶⁵⁾
- new risks: particularly in some of the areas that the WEU Common Concept for European Security (Madrid 1995) identified as 'new risks', the military organizations of both sides could try to agree on some cooperative initiatives to deal better with them.

In this same category of possibilities for closer operational cooperation, it might also be worthwhile for WEU to start thinking about an interface for possible third-country (including Russian⁽⁶⁶⁾) participation in Petersberg missions, be they of the NATO CJTF type (i.e., with Russian participation in an operation under WEU's 'political control and strategic guidance' with the inclusion of NATO assets and capabilities), an operation led by a WEU country, or an autonomous WEU operation. The participation of third countries in WEU-led peacekeeping operations has never been excluded by WEU, but very little actual planning has been done in this area. To give but one example: in the planning stages of IFOR, NATO had quickly to come up with some Memoranda of Understanding that were to provide the legal basis for the participation of non-NATO troops in the operation. WEU might consider developing such generic agreements ahead of time, and might want to consult possible candidates about the elements that would go into such an agreement (e.g., possible command arrangements, participation in the planning process). Since the value that Russia could add to such WEU-led operations could be quite high, a discussion on the precise

arrangements for such participation would be quite useful. To refer once again to the IFOR/SFOR antecedent, in this specific case a special arrangement was found for Russian participation that circumvented direct operational subordination of the commander of the Russian brigade to a NATO officer.⁽⁶⁷⁾ This specific arrangement raises the question of what an analogous arrangement might look like for Russian participation in a WEU-led peacekeeping operation, with respect to command structure, political control, mechanisms of consultation and coordination, etc. A first step that might be taken to facilitate subsequent arrangements on this matter could be the proposal by Russia to provide certain assets and/or capabilities that could be allocated to WEU for Petersberg tasks.⁽⁶⁸⁾

CONCLUSION

Looking ahead, four possible scenarios for the further development of Russia-W/EU relations can be sketched.

A first scenario could be called the healthy minimalist approach. Both sides would continue to work together pragmatically in areas where there are mutual operational interests without any institutional formalization of this cooperation. This, in essence, is where we stand today in the Russia-WEU relationship: it is a situation that is not without its merits. This form of bottom-up, functional cooperation was after all the engine of post-World War II West European integration, which gradually spilled over into institutional forms of interaction. As has been described in this paper, there is much room for such functional cooperation between Russia and Western Europe in the security field, and one could legitimately expect the current level of cooperation to deepen over time. In many cases, temporizing the institutionalization of an incipient relationship can be a wise solution: it avoids raising unrealistic expectations, and possible attendant backlash reactions in the event of set-backs. Nevertheless, the authors of this report view this status quo approach as merely a starting point that is already under some pressure to be taken further.

A second scenario could be termed institutionalized 'minilateralism': improvement of the relationship between Russia and Western Europe through intensified and institutionalized bilateral and trilateral ties. This trend is clearly discernible today in the strengthening Franco-Russian, Russo-German and Franco-Russo-German security dialogues.⁽⁶⁹⁾ This option is also not without its positive aspects. To some extent, it is an expression of the concept of enhanced cooperation that is making headway in European integration. Any ties that bind Russia into the complex international policy networks at different levels should be welcomed. This particular form of institutionalization may even be subject to some of the expansionist logic that is so visible within the larger European institutions, as these 'minilateral' frameworks can also expand both in substance and in size.⁽⁷⁰⁾ Yet they also have distinct drawbacks, as they inevitably undermine the credibility of the more genuinely multilateral institutions. From a West European point of view, for instance, these smaller frameworks outside the European Union deliver another blow to the CFSP logic, and could be seen as representing a new push towards a renationalization of security policy within Europe. The big-power bias of most of these agreements is furthermore viewed with much suspicion by the smaller countries that remain outside, and may send Russia a contradictory signal about the role or larger countries in world politics that may run counter to Western striving to encourage Russia to behave in a more 'modern', genuinely multilateral way in its own neighbourhood.

This brings us to the final two options, both of which would entail giving some level of institutionalization to the relationship between Russia and the emerging European security and defence identity. The third available option would be low-level institutionalization through WEU as the only strictly West European politico-military organization. This paper has advocated the idea that the framework of a slightly modified Forum of Consultation could be adjusted for a bilateral dialogue between Russia and WEU. To some extent, the form and content of the current Russia-WEU

relationship is already gravitating towards such a low-level institutionalized solution without formalizing it.

There exists, however, another, fourth option that may appear attractive to both sides: to graft the Russia-WEU dialogue onto the Russia-EU dialogue. This would allow for a more comprehensive dialogue between both sides on broader security issues in which the purely military aspect would have a limited role to play, but where EU could on occasion, as was spelt out in the Treaty on European Union, 'avail itself' of WEU to handle the more specifically defence-related items.

Whichever route is taken, the important thing is that a consensus exists on both sides that improvements are required. Much concrete work still remains to be done on both sides, however. On the European side, and especially after Amsterdam and Madrid, it seems increasingly important to move beyond institutional and operational 'navel-gazing' and to start thinking about the broader strategic issues that are at stake. Also, in the light of its officially acknowledged importance to European stability and security (but also as a possibly less controversial issue for CFSP), Russia may provide a very useful tactical 'hook' for Europe to start assuming more responsibility on these broader strategic issues.

On the Russian side, more attention should probably be paid to the political dimension of European integration. It is hard to understand, for instance, why for more than three years Russia - despite repeated requests from the European Union - has not appointed an ambassador to the EU. This is a nice illustration that, although Russia is increasingly acknowledging the importance of political dialogue with Western Europe at the rhetorical level, the concrete implications and opportunities of this acknowledgment have not been followed through in day-to-day diplomatic practice.

The question of the attitude of the United States towards the development of a direct security relationship between Russia and Western Europe has not been specifically addressed in this paper. The 'decoupling' theme surfaced during the seminars that were organized in the framework of this project, but both authors deliberately decided to focus on the prospects of a specific relationship between Western Europe and Russia. It must be pointed out, however, that in separate discussions among Russians and Western/Central Europeans, as well as during the final conference, the overwhelming majority of comments underscored the quintessential importance, for West Europeans and Russians alike, of the American security presence in Europe. There was a shared feeling that the Russia-Western Europe relationship should be developed as a useful complement to the broader relationships between Russia and the Atlantic Alliance and the United States.

The fundamental rationale on both sides for boosting security relations between W/EU and Russia is not to 'decouple' the transatlantic relationship, but rather to 'recouple' Russia and the Western world. In the heat of the current domestic debates in Russia on the relative values of 'Westernism' versus 'Eurasianism', it is easy to forget that, in the nineteenth century, Russia was very much an integral part of the European state system and a leading figure in the Concert of Europe. In the decades prior to World War I, Russia was even - for the first time in its history - adopting many European economic, political, and social institutions. After a long interlude, a

democratizing and liberalizing Russia is gradually reclaiming its rightful place within Europe, and it is to this recoupling that this paper has been devoted.

This process, however, is just starting. It is therefore important not to overestimate the importance or the possibilities of the Russia-W/EU relationship which, at this stage in both sides' development, remains subject to a number of fairly obvious 'natural' limits and constraints. Given the recent inflation (and hence devaluation) of the concept of 'strategic partnership', there is little need to put grandiose labels on the improvements in the W/EU-Russia relationship that have been advocated in this paper. But these improvements, however modest, seem nevertheless politically necessary, mutually advantageous and congruent with the more fundamental trends of European security cooperation in recent years, which go more in the direction of bottom-up, pragmatic and flexible forms of cooperation within broader established institutional frameworks than in the direction of grand or new visionary architectural schemes.⁽⁷¹⁾ Particularly taking international political as well as national budgetary trends into account, this approach certainly seems the most sensible one in the circumstances. It must be hoped that W/EU's further development in this spirit will also comprise an improved security relationship with Russia.

1. With this (unofficial but ergonomical) abbreviation, we mean the institutional dyad EU/WEU as reinforced by the Amsterdam Treaty.

2. See Alexander von Schelting, *Russland und Europa im russischen Geschichtsdenken* (Bern: A. Francke, 1948); Richard Pares, 'Letters from William Pitt to Lord Bute' in Richard Pares and Alan J.P. Taylor (eds.), *Essays presented to Sir Lewis Namir* (London: Macmillan, 1956); Benedict H. Sumner, 'Russia and Europe', *Oxford Slavonic Papers* 2; Iver B. Neumann, *Russia and the idea of Europe: a study in identity and international relations* (London, New York: Routledge, 1996); more recently, V.G. Baranovsky, *Zapadnaya Evropa: voenno-politicheskaya integratsiya* [Western Europe: military-political integration] (Moscow: Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya, 1988), pp. 1-3.

3. Haggard differentiates between 'shallow' integration (relaxation of border restrictions on trade and investment and the granting of national treatment for products and firms) and 'deep integration', in which even 'domestic' policies are being coordinated. Stephen Haggard, *Developing Nations and the Politics of Global Integration* (Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1995), pp. 2-8. See also Jeffrey Sachs and Andrew Warner, *Economic Reform and the Process of Global Integration*, Harvard Institute of Economic Research, Discussion Paper no. 1733, August 1995.

4. 'Yeltsin Takes Swipe at "Uncle Sam" Role in Europe', Reuters, 3 October 1997. See also Yekaterina Grigoryeva, 'Yeltsin Goes To Oryol To Claim Global Power Role For Russia', *Nezavisimaya Gazeta*, 19 September 1997 and 'There Is No Europe Without Russia, President Boris Yeltsin's Remarks at the Council of Europe Summit, 10 October 1997', *Rossiiskiy Vesti*, 14 October 1997. The theme has also become more prominent in public discussion; see for instance Sergey Blagovolin, Deputy Director of the Institute of World Economics and International Relations, 'Rapprochement with the European countries for Russia, of course, is much more important than it was for the USSR. It has become considerably more natural for the Europeans as well. Relations with the USA, in their turn, retain for Russia an enormous significance, but as distinct from the USSR have come to rank more or less on the same level with the European direction', 'The new geopolitical situation: Let's think about the future', *RIA Novosti Military News Bulletin*, vol. 8, August 1997. For critical Russian views on the Russia-Europe relationship, see Roy Medvedev, 'Russia. A New Place in the World', *Rossiyskaya Gazeta*, 4 September 1997, and Alexander Bovin, 'Eskargo - khorosho, a vareniki luchshe! [Snails are good but Russian dumplings are better]', *Izvestiya*, 14 October 1997.

5. 'Minilateralism' refers to small multilateral frameworks. For a discussion, see Miles Kahler, 'Multilateralism with small and large numbers', *International Organization*, vol. 46, no. 31 (Summer 1992), pp. 681-708.

6. For a sample, see Edwina Moreton and Gerald Segal (eds.), *Soviet Strategy Toward Western Europe* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1984); Ray S. Cline, James Arnold Miller and Roger E. Kanet (eds.), *Western Europe in Soviet Global Strategy* (Boulder, Colo. and London: Westview Press, 1987); Herbert J. Ellison (ed.), *Soviet Policy toward Western Europe. Implications for the Atlantic Alliance* (Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 1983); Harry Gelman, *Gorbachev's Policies Toward*

Western Europe : A Balance Sheet, RAND Report R-3588-AF, October 1987; Vernon Aspaturian, US-Soviet Global Rivalry and Western Europe, Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies, Occasional Paper no. 179, 1984; Hannes Adomeit, Soviet Perspectives in Western Europe, Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies, Occasional Paper no. 177, 1984; Hannes Adomeit, 'Capitalist Contradictions and Soviet Policy', Problems of Communism, May-June 1984, pp. 7-16; John Van Oudenaren, Soviet Policy toward Western Europe. Objectives, Instruments, Results, RAND Report R-3310-AF, February 1986.

7. Various scholars, for instance, have drawn attention to the fact that, in May 1971, Senator Mansfield's resolution to withdraw US forces from Europe unilaterally was only derailed by Brezhnev's proposal, five days before the vote was supposed to take place, to open conventional arms negotiations. See, for instance, Jonathan Dean, Watershed in Europe. Dismantling the East-West Military Confrontation (Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, 1987), pp. 103-4; and Raymond L. Garthoff, Détente and Confrontation. American-Soviet Relations from Nixon to Reagan (Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1985), pp. 115-16.

8. V.G. Baranovsky, op. cit. in note 2, p. 188.

9. Defined by one Soviet scholar as '. . . an ideology of isolating [obosoblenie] Western Europe, of forming the West European Alliance as an autonomous centre in the world arena.' A.I. Utkin, Doktrina atlantizma i evropeyskaya integratsiya [The doctrine of Atlanticism and European integration] (Moscow: Izdatel'tvo "Nauka", 1979), p. 73. For a good example of the change in Soviet perceptions about West European military integration in the 1980s, see Georgiy Platonovich Burduli, 'Vozrozhdenie Zapadnoevropeyskogo soyuza'[(The Rebirth of the Western European Union)], Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya, no. 4, 1989.

10. For an extremely colourful description of WEU's history, see Y. Zhukov (Pravda political news analyst), 'Europeanization of NATO or Americanization of Europe (What Lies Behind the Talk about a Restructuring of the North Atlantic Alliance)', International Affairs, no. 8, 1984, pp. 104-11. Professor Daniil Proektor has even gone so far as to draw the comparison with the inter-war period when the Allied countries allowed Germany to rearm in spite of the provisions of the Versailles Treaty, which 'allowed Hitler to build up a new machine of aggression'; D. Proektor, 'The Green Light for Rearmament', New Times, in English, no. 19, May 1984, p. 18.

11. Vsevolod B. Kniazhinsky, West European Integration: Its Policies and International Relations (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1984), p. 346.

12. The inclusion of Spain and Portugal were primarily seen as having been inspired by a Western concern to strengthen NATO's southern flank. See Burduli, 'Vozrozhdenie zapadnoevropeyskogo soyuza', p. 49.

13. 'I will not be revealing any secrets if I say that Soviet policy takes into account the differences of view between Western Europe and the United States. But it does so by no means in order to squeeze the United States out of Europe and gain political control over the continent which it so longs for, in the opinion of "perspicacious" analysts in the West. Our objective is much more modest. We would like to utilize

Western Europe's potential to make good, via the transatlantic channel, the obvious shortage of common sense in the incumbent US administration.' Alexander Bovin, 'Political Observer's Opinion: The European Dimension', *Izvestiya*, 25 September 1985, p. 5, in FBIS, 25 September 1985, pp. G1-3. See also interview of Alexander Bovin and APN military affairs observer Colonel Vasily Morozov by Otechestven Front, Sofia. Otechestven Front, 26 June 1986, pp. 1,3, in FBIS, 1 July 1986, pp. AA7-10.

14. For instance, 'Behind these arguments . . . stand plans that go further than simply strengthening NATO's "European pillar" or being concerned about the firmness of the American position in its negotiations with the USSR. What is at stake here is a broad union of Western European countries in the political, economic and military domains, in essence : the construction of a new European structure, which envisages mutual relations in the military sphere between the seven Western European countries that are qualitatively different from those that exist within the framework of the North Atlantic alliance.' Burduli, 'Vozrozhdenie zapadnoevropeyskogo soyuza', p. 47.

15. Anatoly Viktorovich Rassidin (Senior Scientific Associate of the USSR Academy of Sciences IMEMO), 'West European Military Integration - Prospects and Possible Consequences', *Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya* no. 2, February 1989, pp. 104-15. This article can be seen as one of the first truly 'new' looks at Western European military integration.

16. '[R]elations with the WEU were not a priority in Moscow's European policy and remained in the shadow of discussions about relations with the EU and particularly with NATO.' Andrei Zagorsky, 'Russia and European Institutions,' in *Russia and Europe. The Emerging Security Agenda*, Vladimir Baranovsky (ed.) (Oxford: Oxford University Press for SIPRI, 1997), p. 530.

17. A. Kozyrev, Speech at the opening session of the OSCE Helsinki meeting, 24 March 1992. *Diplomaticheskii vestnik*, no. 17, 15 April 1992, p. 30.

18. A. Kozyrev, speech at the Russian-Polish Conference 'On the Road towards a New Partnership', Cracow, 23 February 1994, *Diplomaticheskii vestnik*, no. 5-6, March 1994, p. 19.

19. Yuri Kovalenko, [untitled] *Izvestiya*, 11 May 1994.

20. *Kommersant-Daily*, 6 August 1996, p. 4.

21. For some well informed articles, see Yevgeny Kozhokhin, 'V poiskakh novoy filosofii bezopasnosti [In Search of a New Security Philosophy]'; and Dmitriy Danilov, 'Evropeyskaya sostavlyayushchaya evolyutsii NATO [The European Component of NATO's Evolution]', in *NATO: fakty i kommentarii [NATO: Facts and Comments]*, INION RAN, 1997 (http://www.inion.ru/product/nato/nato3_2.html). Even such a politically sophisticated observer as Alexey Pushkov, for instance, talks about WEU as an institution that was created under the European Union, and goes on to claim that 'it [WEU] will never grow out of its adolescence and is for the time being primarily engaged in sustaining its own existence'. Alexey Konstantinovich

Pushkov, 'Ot "doktriny Kozyreva" do "doktrina Primakova" [From the "Kozyrev Doctrine" to the "Primakov Doctrine"]', *Nezavisimaya Gazeta*, 24 October 1997.

22. Sergey Rogov, 'Russia, NATO, and Western European Union,' in Anne Deighton (ed.), *Western European Union 1954-1997: Defence, Security, Integration*, European Independent Research Group, St. Antony's College, Oxford, 1997. Even conservative observers point out that more European responsibility in the field of guaranteeing security on the continent is 'useful' for Russia, since it gives Russia more room for manoeuvre. See for instance Alexander Gol'tz, 'Natovskaya evolyutsiya: illuzii i real'nosti [NATO evolution: illusions and realities]', *Krasnaya zvezda*, 6 November 1966.

23. For some recent examples from different ideological perspectives, see for instance Marina Sergeeva, 'Ameriki v Evrope men'she ne stanet [There will not be less America in Europe]', *Kommersant-Daily*, 15 June 1996, p. 1; Vladimir Peresada, 'Sneset NATO yaichko [Emasculating NATO]', *Pravda*, 20 June 1996; Boris Mikhailovich Khalosha, 'Podopleka evropeizatsii NATO [The Real Cause of NATO's Europeanisation]', *Nezavisimaya gazeta*, 24 May 1996; Marina Sergeeva, 'SShA vozglyavlyat protsess evropeizatsii NATO [The US will lead the Europeanisation process of NATO]', *Kommersant-Daily*, 7 June 1996, p. 4; Dmitriy Gennad'evich Evstaf'ev, 'Pereotsenka tsennostey [A Reappraisal of Values]', *Nezavisimaya gazeta*, 25 July 1996; Vladimir Peresada, 'Natovskiy "syurpriz" dlya Rossii [NATO "Surprise" for Russia]', *Pravda*, 8 June 1996; Yuri Byalyy, 'Takaya uzh igra [This is how the game is]', *Zavtra*, 13 August 1996.

24. On 8 April 1997, the EU Commission and Russia reached a new deal on steel which will pave the way for the complete liberalization of bilateral trade in steel by allowing Russia larger quotas while gradually developing normal competitive conditions (IP/97/274). On textiles, on 20 December 1996 the Commission decided unilaterally to add some new measures to existing textile agreements with a view to opening the European market to Russian exports of textiles and clothing (five categories of products are now quota-free and the quotas for all other products received a 15 per cent increase) (IP/96/1238).

25. The aid, managed by the European Community Humanitarian Office (ECHO), will enable the British non-governmental organization Merlin to carry out a programme in the region until March 1998. It will provide 45 polyclinics in Grozny with supplies of essential drugs, and carry out minor repairs to those that incurred war damage. It will continue its programme of trucking chlorinated water in Grozny, and make minor repairs to the water and sanitation system. It will also carry out regular surveillance of infectious diseases. This grant is ECHO's second for victims of the war this year. The first amounted to ECU1.4 million.

26. PCAs are a 'half-way house' between standard framework agreements of the sort the Commission has negotiated with a number of countries round the world and the Europe Agreements. They foresee an institutionalized political dialogue and contain detailed trade and investment related provisions, but do not establish a preferential relationship (i.e., they do not offer concessions beyond those given to GATT/WTO partners). The possibility of such a relationship in future is however raised in the PCAs with the 'European' NIS; these contain a 'rendezvous' clause providing for

consideration, in 1998, as to whether negotiations on a free trade agreement (FTA) should be initiated.

27. See 'European Action Plan for Russia', Bulletin of the European Union, no. 5, 1996.

28. Russia (together with Turkey, Ukraine and the Balkans) is singled out as one of the areas that will receive special attention from the Commission in its 1998 Work Programme; IP/97/902, Brussels, 22 October 1997. In this context it is interesting to note that European Union language with respect to Russia has arguably been more responsive to Russian sensitivities than the language of most other international organizations.

29. 'On the Road to Enlargement', presentation by Member of the European Commission Hans van den Broek at the European Liberal, Democrat and Reform Party Conference, Bucharest, 17 October 1997.

30. European security: a common concept of the 27 WEU countries, WEU Council of Ministers, Madrid, 14 November 1995.

31. See, for instance, 'The European Union and the Russian Federation', in Europe and the New Independent States (Brussels: the European Commission, Directorate-General for External Relations (DG1A) Information Unit, 1997), p. 1.

32. Consultations between Permanent Representatives of the Presidency, Secretary-General and the Russian ambassador; meetings with visiting senior officials; visits by the Secretary-General and the Presidency to Moscow; contacts between the Russian embassy with Presidency Secretariat Representatives; and contacts through Presidency embassies in Moscow.

33. As Richard Tibbels, the Head of Security Policy Section, WEU Secretariat-General, put it, 'WEU's relations with Russia and Ukraine need not duplicate, imitate or be developed in strict parallel with the relations of either the EU or NATO with those two countries. The framework of WEU's dialogues with Russia and Ukraine is thus a flexible one which puts the emphasis on substance rather than form and which allows each dialogue to develop at its own pace taking into account the interests of WEU on the one hand and the differing perspectives and interests of Russia and Ukraine on the other.' NATO's Sixteen Nations, Special Supplement, 1998, p. 44.

34. 'Humanitarian and rescue tasks; peacekeeping tasks; tasks of combat forces in crisis management, including peacemaking.'

35. Letter from Javier Solana, Chairman in Office of the WEU Council, in reply to a letter from Mr Kozyrev, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, 25 October 1995.

36. Ostend Declaration, WEU Council of Ministers, 19 November 1996, p. 9.

37. On this point, see also 'Russia and NATO: The Road Ahead', a report by the Task Force at Carnegie Moscow Centre co-chaired by Dmitriy Trenin and Andrew Pierre, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Carnegie Moscow Centre, 1996.

38. In the same logic, Fraser Cameron of the European Commission (DG1A) has even suggested writing certain 'priority areas' into the Treaty on European Union 'to ensure the necessary commitment from all member states to common action'. Fraser Cameron, 'EU tries to build an effective CFSP', European Dialogue, 1997 Supplement (http://europa.eu.int/en/comm/dg10/infcom/eur_dial/97i0a0s0.html).

39. It is important to point out that in this field, Western Europe's weaknesses in the field of strategic lift are frequently sometimes exaggerated. If one combines existing military transport capabilities (including naval ones) with current and prospective civilian excess capabilities in this field, one finds that the only actual weakness is in the area of wide-bodied, ramp-fitted aircraft. Here Russian Antonovs and the Ilyushin-76 could indeed be of great utility.

40. Yevgeny Kozhokhin, 'In the 21st Century, Russia Will Join Military Blocs', Argumenty i Fakty, no. 20, 20 May 1997.

41. For instance, the visits by President Chirac to Moscow in February and September 1997, and by Prime Minister Blair and Foreign Secretary Cook in July 1997.

42. Erfurt Declaration, WEU Ministerial Council, Erfurt, 18 November 1997. See also Monika Wohlfeld, 'WEU and Central European countries', in a forthcoming book on 'WEU after fifty' by the Institute for Security Studies of WEU.

43. The entire Political Division of WEU consists of 1 director, 4 heads of section and 9 assistants. By comparison, NATO's Political Affairs division numbers 48, 11 of whom deal exclusively with Partnership countries.

44. A number of analysts, for instance, have suggested that problems in some sensitive areas such as the Baltic states or Moldova, or even some conflicts within the CIS, might be more effectively and acceptably dealt with by WEU than by NATO, precisely because of Russian sensitivities; Philip Gordon, 'What Role for WEU', in Anne Deighton (ed.), *Western European Union 1954-1997: Defence, Security, Integration*, European Independent Research Group, St Antony's College, Oxford, 1997, p. 107; and Trevor Taylor, 'Challenges for Western European Union Operations', *ibid.*, pp. 148-9.

45. Some developments are scenario-independent: in the absolutely worst-case scenario (a radical change in Russia's political landscape), all of these institutional 'finesses' become irrelevant.

46. Chief among these are the European Council's new ability to define the general principles and guidelines for CFSP, including on defence matters; the introduction of the so-called 'Petersberg tasks' into the second pillar (CFSP), the appointment of a higher representative for CFSP, the creation of a Policy Planning and Early Warning Unit, the stronger language on the EU-WEU relationship, as well as the inter-institutional agreement on budgetary modalities for joint actions.

47. This has already become visible in a number of concrete developments, such as the agreement on synchronization of EU and WEU presidencies.

48. See Stephan De Spiegeleire, 'Gulliver's Fäden: Rußland's Regionen und die Außenwelt', Hessische Stiftung für Friedens- und Konfliktforschung, forthcoming.

49. For a more theoretical discussion on some of the advantages of tripolar systems, see Harrison Wagner, 'The Theory of Games and the Balance of Power', *World Politics*, vol. 38, July 1968, pp. 546-76.

50. Article XII of the modified Brussels Treaty merely stipulates that after the expiry of a period of fifty years, each of the parties has a right to withdraw its membership, provided it has previously given one year's notice. Depending on whether one takes the date of the original (1948) or the modified Brussels Treaty (1954), this would mean that countries could terminate their membership in 1998 or 2004.

51. During his visit to Brussels on 17-18 July 1997, Prime Minister Chernomyrdin said that 'In the foreseeable future, Russia cannot remain a non-member of the European Union', Yuliya Petrovskaya and Dmitriy Gornostaev, 'Rossiya mogla by vlit'sya v Evropu gorazdo bystree [Russia could end up in the EU much sooner]', *Nezavisimaya gazeta*, 26 July 1997, p. 1. On 22 July, the official spokesman of the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs G. Tarasov confirmed that 'in principle, we are not opposed to the prospect of Russia joining this organization at some stage. The priority right now is the entry into force of the PCA.' Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Briefing no. 48, 22 July 1997.

52. It has to be pointed out, however, that the restrictions that were discussed about full Russian membership of WEU (and particularly the Article V issue) apply - probably a fortiori - to Russian full membership of NATO.

53. Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia.

54. In the case of the series of CRISEX exercises, this has already been the case.

55. Created in accordance with the decisions taken at the Petersberg WEU Council (19 June 1992), and suspended as a result of the decisions of the Luxembourg WEU Council (9 May 1994) about the offer to the nine CEE countries to become Associate Partners of WEU.

56. In this particular context, however, a subregional framework might be more appropriate.

57. The Forum of Consultation started working in the format of meetings at ministerial level starting with (and on the basis of the decision of) the enlarged WEU Council (including full Members, Associate Members and Observers) in Rome on 20 May 1993.

58. The Assembly of the Western European Union, Document 1440, WEU's relations with Russia, Report submitted on behalf of the Political Committee by Mr Baumel, 10 November 1994, p. 4.

59. The Assembly of the Western European Union, Document 1509, Proceedings, Extraordinary session, February 1996, Minutes, Official Report of Debates, p. 105.

60. The Associate Partners of WEU, while not opposed to active engagement with Russia and the other states of the CIS, are determined, for very obvious historical and political reasons, to separate their own destiny from theirs. The concern about drawing new dividing lines on the map of Europe is for the most part a Western concern, which they do not share. See Ian Gambles (ed.), 'A lasting peace in central Europe?', Chaillot Paper 20 (Paris: Institute for Security Studies of WEU, 1995), p. 93.

61. In the preamble, Member States expressed their resolve 'to implement a common foreign and security policy including the progressive framing of a common defence policy, which might lead to a common defence in accordance with the provisions of Article 17, thereby reinforcing the European identity and its independence in order to promote peace, security and progress in Europe and in the world'. This Article 17 (formerly Art. J.4) stipulates that 'The common foreign and security policy shall include all questions relating to the security of the Union [emphasis added] . . . The Western European Union (WEU) is an integral part of the development of the Union providing the Union . . . It supports the Union in framing the defence aspects of the common foreign and security policy as set out in this Article. The Union shall accordingly foster closer institutional relations with the WEU with a view to the possibility of the integration of the WEU into the Union, should the European Council so decide.'

62. Such an arrangement would be analogous to that currently being discussed in the context of the creation of EU's Policy Planning and Early Warning Unit, which will also have a WEU representative.

63. What is frequently ignored in the current debate on European integration is that in most fields of political life, in cooperation there is a point of diminishing returns. The point here is that there are a number of very concrete costs of cooperation (what economists would call 'transaction costs', although they are clearly not of an exclusively economic nature), and that at a certain point these costs start to outweigh the benefits of cooperation. Many signs in the current debate on European security seem to indicate that we may have reached this point, as both in the European Union (with the concept of 'enhanced cooperation') and in WEU (with the 'framework nation' concept) institutional ways are being developed to allow for more flexible arrangements between subgroups of members within an overall institutional framework.

64. One Russian military observer has even intimated that historically these deficiencies were stimulated on purpose to guarantee American dominance within the Alliance. Alexander Goltz, 'Natovskaya evolyutsiya: illuzii i real'nosti,' Krasnaya zvezda, 6 November 1966.

65. See Giovanni di Briganti, 'Partners Cool on FLA Initiative/Germany, France Consider Involving Russia, Ukraine in 8-Nation Project', *Defense News*, 20 October 1997, p. 4; Theresa Hitchens and Christina Mackenzie, 'Blow to European Unity/German Threat Stymies Creation of Aerospace Giant', *Defense News*, 23 March 1998.

66. During his visit to Moscow in June 1996, WEU Secretary-General José Cutileiro explicitly mentioned this possibility in his interview with *Izvestiya*: Konstantin Eggert, 'Vdya iz tena, ZES ishchet kontakt s Rossiey [Coming out of the shadow, WEU looks for contact with Russia]', *Izvestiya*, 8 June 1996.

67. This was done by subordinating the Russian contingent directly to Colonel-General Leontiy Shevtsov, as General Joulwan's Russian deputy, while in the theatre the Russian brigade was under the tactical control of the US-led Multinational Division (North).

68. Ukraine, for instance, had already transmitted such a list to WEU in October 1996; and Canada, while not offering any troops, has also expressed its readiness to participate in WEU operations and has inquired about possibilities in this field.

69. This trend could be seen against the background of a wider trend which is exemplified by the role of the Contact Group.

70. The pressure within the Weimar triangle to coopt Ukraine may be a good example of this expansionist logic, as are the many subregional frameworks in Central Europe.

71. This trend is visible both within NATO with the CJTF concept, within EU with the proposals for 'enhanced cooperation' or 'flexibility', and even within WEU with the 'framework nation' concept.