



NDC Research Report

*Research Division
NATO Defense College*

15 May 2014

NATO Enlargement and Russia: Die-Hard Myths and Real Dilemmas

Michael Rühle¹

The crisis in Ukraine, which culminated in Russia's annexation of the Crimea, marks a new low in NATO-Russia relations. While this relationship had been deteriorating for quite some time, Moscow's role in the Ukraine crisis revealed a geopolitical agenda that caught many observers by surprise. In the course of just a few weeks Russia clearly emerged as a revisionist power, behaving in a manner reminiscent of the "predatory nation-states from the 19th century"² and changing borders by force in order to deny a neighbouring country the choice to determine its own alignments.

At the same time, the crisis also put to rest another assumption that had been held in the West: the idea that, while Russia was opposed to NATO membership for its immediate neighbours, it was much more open-minded towards their deepening relations with the European Union.³ The issue at stake in the Ukraine crisis was Russia's loss of influence over a critically important neighbouring country, not a quarrel about a specific institutional framework. Worse, even though the crisis was brought about by the European Union's neighbourhood policy, which confronted Ukraine with a choice that was bound to amplify that country's well-known internal divisions, NATO remained the proverbial "elephant in the room". Most of those who rushed to defend Moscow's behaviour argued that Russia had to act in order to prevent Ukraine from joining NATO. Ukraine's eventual association with the EU – the real issue at stake – was, in the event, almost eclipsed by the shadow cast by NATO's enlargement and all that it seemed to represent: Russia's humiliation by a triumphant West, broken Western promises, and a determination by the West to further undermine Russia's power and influence even in neighbouring countries. In the Ukraine crisis, history returned with a vengeance.

-
- 1 Head, Energy Security Section, NATO Emerging Security Challenges Division. The author expresses his personal views. The views expressed do not necessarily reflect those of the NATO Defense College or the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.
 - 2 "A New Strategic Reality in Europe," Speech by NATO Deputy Secretary General, Ambassador Alexander Vershbow, to the 21st International Conference on Euro-Atlantic Security, Krakow, 4 April 2014 (http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/opinions_108889.htm?selectedLocale=en).
 - 3 See Henry Kissinger's differentiation between EU and NATO options for Ukraine: "The issue of relations with Ukraine goes to the heart of both sides' perceptions of the nature of international affairs. America, applying the lessons of the Cold War and its traditional universal maxims, sees the issue in terms of overcoming a potential military threat. For Russia, the issue is, above all, one of coming to terms with a painful historic upheaval. Genuine independence for Ukraine is essential for a peaceful international system and must be unambiguously supported by the US. Creating close political ties between the European Union and Ukraine, including membership in the European Union, is important. But the movement of the Western security system from the Elbe River to the approaches to Moscow brings home Russia's decline in a way bound to generate a Russian emotion that will inhibit the solution of all other issues. It should be kept on the table without forcing the issue to determine the possibilities of making progress on other issues." Henry A. Kissinger, "Unconventional Wisdom about Russia," *New York Times*, 1 July 2008.

Many commentators were quick to argue that the return of tensions between Russia and the West had given NATO a new sense of purpose.⁴ However, such a view fails to take the internal make-up of the Atlantic Alliance fully into account. While NATO did indeed show a remarkable degree of unity – avoiding alarmist rhetoric, and rapidly providing visible military reassurance to its Eastern members – it is far from clear whether this healthy initial response will ultimately lead to a new, consensual approach vis-à-vis Russia. If Russia’s behaviour does not become even more erratic, it is safe to assume that many Allies will soon seek to re-establish the cooperative relationship they deem so important. Given past experience, the debate on how to re-engage with Russia could become rather controversial. It is therefore essential that Allies agree at least on some basic parameters and do not allow this debate to get bogged down by peripheral arguments.

This paper seeks to contribute to this debate by looking at three areas of NATO-Russian relations. First, it examines the argument that the West promised Russia not to enlarge NATO. Second, it looks at NATO’s enlargement policy as a permanent challenge to Russia’s status and interests. Finally, it offers some reflections on the way ahead for the NATO-Russian relationship, including NATO’s enlargement process.

The Myth of the “Broken Promise”

Addressing the Russian Parliament on 18 April 2014 to justify the annexation of the Crimea, President Putin stressed the humiliation that Russia had suffered due to many broken promises by the West, including the promise not to enlarge NATO beyond the borders of a reunified Germany. Over the past twenty years, numerous references to this alleged promise have been made, both by Russian and by Western observers. Horst Teltschik, security adviser to Chancellor Helmut Kohl, added another angle to this narrative of Russian betrayal by the West, claiming that in the mid-1990s US President Bill Clinton had offered Russia membership in NATO, yet no one had followed the offer through.⁵

This narrative of broken Western promises is far more than a historical footnote. Interpreting events since 1990 has become a central element of the political discourse between Russia and the West. For Russia, this narrative is essential in order to justify its current policies, be it vis-à-vis Ukraine or elsewhere. The image of a country whose sincere attempts to integrate with the West were rejected resonates deeply with Russian and Western audiences alike. The image of Russia as the underdog that only seeks to right historical wrongs imposed by flawed Western policies is part of the discourse within Russia as well as within Western circles. It is hardly surprising, therefore, that the “broken promises” narrative has resurfaced in the context of the Ukraine crisis. Dwelling on the past remains the most convenient tool to distract from the present.

But is there any truth to these claims? Until recently, historians examining this question had to rely on interviews with the political actors of the period in question, as well as on the considerable amount of published memoirs. However, over the past few years countless records and minutes of meetings of the political protagonists have been released, allowing a more nuanced assessment of the events that took place between the fall of the Berlin Wall in November 1989 and the Soviet acceptance of a reunified Germany in NATO in July 1990. Yet even these additional sources do not change the fundamental conclusion: there have never been political or legally binding commitments of the West not to extend NATO beyond the borders of a reunified Germany, nor has there ever been a concrete invitation to Russia to join NATO. A closer look at the specific political situation at the time nevertheless helps clarify how such myths were able to emerge.⁶

4 See “The future of NATO: First principles,” *The Economist*, 26 March 2014.

5 Horst Teltschik: “Russland braucht keine Belehrungen (*Russia does not need to be lectured*),” *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 7 May 2008.

6 See Mary Elise Sarotte, “Perpetuating U.S. Preeminence: The 1990 Deals to ‘Bribe the Soviets Out’ and Move NATO In,” *International Security*, Vol. 35, No. 1, Summer 2010, pp. 110-137; Mark Kramer, “The Myth of a No-NATO-Enlargement Pledge to Russia,” *Washington Quarterly*, Vol. 32, No. 2, April 2009, pp. 39–61. Both articles contain numerous references to other sources.

The key to understanding the events lies in the unique political situation in which the political actors of both East and West found themselves in 1990, and which shaped their ideas about the future European order. Gorbachev's reform policies had long spun out of control, the Baltic countries were demanding independence, and the countries of Central and Eastern Europe were showing signs of upheaval. The Berlin Wall had fallen; Germany was on the path to reunification. However, the Soviet Union still existed, as did the Warsaw Pact, whose Central and Eastern European member countries did not talk about joining NATO, but rather about the "dissolution of the two blocks". NATO membership for these countries thus seemed utterly far-fetched. Washington, in fact, was worried whether NATO – the central legitimizing framework for the United States to be considered a "European power" – was still seen as desirable by its West European members. The debate about the enlargement of NATO initially evolved solely in the context of German reunification. In these negotiations Bonn and Washington managed to allay Soviet reservations about the reunited Germany remaining in NATO. This was achieved by generous financial aid, and by the "2+4 Treaty" ruling out the stationing of foreign NATO troops on the territory of the former GDR. However, it was also achieved through countless personal conversations in which Gorbachev and other Soviet leaders were assured that the West would not take advantage of the Soviet Union's weakness and willingness to withdraw militarily from Central and Eastern Europe.

It is these conversations that left some Soviet politicians with the impression that NATO enlargement, which started with the admission of the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland in 1999, had been a breach of these Western commitments. Some statements of Western politicians – particularly German Foreign Minister Hans Dietrich Genscher and his American counterpart James A. Baker – can indeed be interpreted as a general rejection of any NATO enlargement beyond East Germany.⁷ However, it should be noted that these statements were made in the context of the negotiations on German reunification, and that the Soviet interlocutors never specified their concerns. In the crucial 2+4 negotiations, which finally led Gorbachev to accept a unified Germany in NATO in July 1990, the issue was never raised. As former Soviet Foreign Minister Shevardnadze later put it, the idea of the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact dissolving and NATO taking in former Warsaw Pact members was beyond the imagination of the protagonists at the time.⁸

And there is more. Even if one were to assume that Genscher and others had indeed sought to forestall NATO's future enlargement with a view to respecting Soviet security interests, they could never have done so. The dissolution of the Warsaw Pact in the summer of 1991 and the end of the Soviet Union only half a year later created a completely new situation, as the countries of Central and Eastern Europe were finally able to assert their sovereignty and define their own foreign and security policy goals. As these goals centred on integration with the West, any categorical refusal of NATO to respond would have meant the *de facto* continuation of Europe's division along former Cold War lines. The right to choose one's alliance, enshrined in the 1975 Helsinki Charter, would have been denied – an approach that the West could never have sustained, politically or morally.

7 In his speech in Tutzing on 31 January 1990, Genscher said that "it is for NATO to declare unequivocally: irrespective of whatever happens within the Warsaw Pact, there will be no expansion of NATO's territory to the East, that is, closer to the borders of the Soviet Union. Such security guarantees are important for the Soviet Union" ("Sache der NATO ist es, eindeutig zu erklären: Was immer im Warschauer Pakt geschieht, eine Ausdehnung des NATO-Territoriums nach Osten, das heißt, näher an die Grenzen der Sowjetunion heran, wird es nicht geben. Diese Sicherheitsgarantien sind für die Sowjetunion ... bedeutsam.") reprinted in http://www.2plus4.de/chronik.php3?date_value=31.01.90&sort=003-001

8 Interview with Eduard Shevardnadze, "We Couldn't Believe that the Warsaw Pact Could Be Dissolved," *Der Spiegel Online*, 26 November 2009 (<http://www.spiegel.de/international/europe/interview-with-eduard-shevardnadze-we-couldn-t-believe-that-the-warsaw-pact-could-be-dissolved-a-663595.html>); see also Gerhard A. Ritter, *Hans-Dietrich Genscher, das Auswärtige Amt und die deutsche Vereinigung*, C. H. Beck Verlag, Munich 2013, pp. 89-152.

Russia in NATO?

But what about the other way to come to terms with Moscow, namely by admitting Russia into NATO? Contrary to the claims of Horst Teltschik, US President Clinton's letter to Russian President Yeltsin does not contain a concrete offer to join NATO.⁹ The letter merely keeps the option of future Russian membership open – thus corresponding to a long-standing US policy not to rule out the possibility of Russian accession at a later stage. This approach sought to avoid Russia's isolation and offer incentives for reform; it was also consistent with the Washington Treaty, Article 10 of which states that the Allies “can invite any other European State in a position to further the principles of this Treaty and to contribute to the security of the North Atlantic area” to accede to the Treaty. However, given the need for “unanimous consent”, no US President can formalize such an invitation unilaterally. President Clinton, in any event, did not. To be sure, proposals to bring Russia into NATO were part and parcel of the enlargement debate throughout the 1990s. Those who advocated such an approach argued that only the possibility of Russia's eventual accession could prevent NATO enlargement from isolating Russia and from inviting a new Cold War.¹⁰ Despite their inherent logic, however, these proposals were too sweeping to take fully into account the difficulties of the task. Above all, they gave short shrift to the interests of those countries which were seeking NATO membership in order to be protected from Russia. Accordingly, while the potential drawbacks of NATO enlargement were seriously debated, the alternative of extending enlargement to cover Russia did not receive the same amount of attention. Russia's preference was to preclude NATO enlargement altogether – a preference that Moscow sought to achieve by repeatedly suggesting a US-Russian condominium over Central and Eastern Europe.¹¹

The issue of Russian NATO membership briefly returned in the aftermath of 9/11. As Putin's Russia had sided with the United States' “war on terror”, some observers felt that a new security paradigm warranted another look at the membership question. In an article published in 2002, James A. Baker, US Secretary of State at the time of German reunification, made a strong plea for Russian membership of NATO, arguing that new security challenges called for a transformation of NATO that would make Russian membership palatable.¹² However, the fact that Baker remained vague regarding the timing and modalities of Russia's possible accession made his plea seem yet another attempt to prepare the psychological ground for the “big bang” enlargement that was about to happen in 2004, when seven countries were set to become NATO members.

Around that same time, Putin complained to Western interlocutors about Russia's absence from Western political and economic structures, and suggested a “French” model for Russian membership, which would extend to NATO's political but not military structures. Like Boris Yeltsin's statements on previous occasions, suggestions advanced by Russia about its joining NATO appeared ill-conceived and superficial, expressing a general frustration about the country's isolation rather than a genuine commitment to NATO's wider purposes. There has always been doubt about whether Russia is really aware of what NATO membership means. Leaving aside the question whether Russia would fulfil certain membership criteria, such as democratic control of the armed forces, its willingness to subject national political interests to decision-making by consensus always appeared as unlikely as the willingness of the Russian military establishment to join an integrated multinational structure. Moreover, portraying NATO as a hostile alliance remains part and parcel of Russian domestic politics. Finally, President Putin's own characterization of NATO as a “superfluous” and “obsolete” organization also does not indicate a genuine attempt by Russia to seriously contemplate NATO membership. In sum, NATO membership for Russia

9 See “Alter Traum (*Long-standing dream*),” *Der Spiegel*, 17/1995, pp. 22-23.

10 See Charles F. Kupchan, “Reviving the West,” *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 75, No. 3, May/June 1996, pp. 92-105.

11 See Letter of Russian President Boris Yeltsin to US President Bill Clinton, 15 September 1993, reproduced in SIPRI Yearbook 1994, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1994, Appendix 7A, pp. 249-250 (“... together with NATO, to offer official security guarantees to the East European states with a focus on ensuring sovereignty, territorial integrity, inviolability of frontiers, and maintenance of peace in the region.”). See also Ronald D. Asmus, *Opening NATO's Door: How the Alliance Remade Itself for a New Era*, Columbia University Press, New York 2002, p.107.

12 James A. Baker, “Russia in NATO?” *Washington Quarterly*, Vol. 25, No. 1, Winter 2002, pp. 95-103.

never appeared feasible. Such demands may continue to resurface from time to time (put forward mainly by Western observers), particularly during periods of crisis, yet they are an expression of helplessness rather than a serious strategic option.¹³

The NATO Enlargement Conundrum

Does all this mean that the West never had any obligations vis-à-vis Russia? Did the enlargement policy of Western institutions therefore proceed without taking Russian interests into account? Again, the facts tell a different story. However, they also demonstrate that the twin goals of admitting Central and Eastern European countries into NATO while at the same time developing a “strategic partnership” with Russia were far less compatible in practice than in theory.

When the NATO enlargement debate started in earnest around 1993, it did so with considerable controversy. Many observers agreed with George F. Kennan’s characterization of opening NATO’s doors as “the most fateful error of American policy in the entire post-Cold War era,”¹⁴ as it would antagonize Russia, thus jeopardizing the positive achievements of the end of the Cold War. Without recalling the entire list of pros and cons, it is no exaggeration to state that, ever since the beginning of NATO’s post-Cold War enlargement process, the prime concern of the West was how to reconcile this process with Russian interests. Hence, NATO sought early on to establish special relations with Russia. The NATO-Russia Founding Act, which established the Permanent Joint Council as a new, dedicated framework for consultation and cooperation, took years to negotiate, and was signed in May 1997 even before the first countries of Central Europe were invited to join NATO. In 2002, as Allies were preparing the next major round of NATO enlargement, the NATO-Russia Council was established, giving the relationship more focus and structure. The need to avoid antagonizing Russia was also evident in the way NATO enlargement took place in the military realm. As early as 1996, Allies declared that in the current circumstances they had “no intention, no plan, and no reason to deploy nuclear weapons on the territory of new members”. These statements were incorporated into the NATO-Russia Founding Act, together with similar references regarding substantial combat forces and infrastructure. This “soft” military approach to the enlargement process was supposed to signal to Russia that it was not at risk of military “encirclement”, the goal being the integration of Central and Eastern Europe into an Atlantic security space. In other words, the method was the message.¹⁵

Russia never interpreted these developments as benignly as NATO wanted. For Russian Foreign Minister Primakov, the signing of the NATO-Russia Founding Act was merely “damage limitation”: as Russia had no means to stop NATO enlargement, it might as well take whatever the Allies were willing to offer, even at the risk of appearing to acquiesce in the enlargement process. The fundamental contradiction of all NATO-Russia bodies – that Russia was at the table and could co-decide, but could not veto, on key issues – could not be overcome. Russia had little choice but to sit in a Council that was chaired by the Secretary General of an institution of which Russia was not even a member.¹⁶ Unsurprisingly, military-to-military cooperation remained hamstrung as well: almost all proposals in this area came from NATO.

However, these institutional weaknesses paled against the background of real political conflicts. NATO’s military intervention in the Kosovo crisis was interpreted in Moscow as a geopolitical coup, by a West that was bent on marginalizing Russia’s status as a permanent member of the UN Security Council. NATO’s missile defence approach, though directed at third countries, was interpreted by Moscow as an attempt

13 For a typical German example see Volker Rühle, Klaus Naumann, Frank Elbe and Ulrich Weisser, “Open Letter: It’s Time to Invite Russia to Join NATO,” *Spiegel Online*, 3 August 2010 (<http://www.spiegel.de/international/world/open-letter-it-s-time-to-invite-russia-to-join-nato-a-682287-druck.html>) “... Russian membership of NATO would make it easier to integrate Georgia and Ukraine into European structures -- the mere willingness to become a member presupposes recognition of the territorial integrity of European countries.”

14 George F. Kennan, “A Fateful Error,” *New York Times*, 5 February 1997.

15 For a rare attempt to examine the interrelationship between NATO and EU enlargement see Michael Rühle and Nicholas Williams, “NATO Enlargement and the European Union,” *The World Today*, Vol. 51, No. 5, May 1995, pp. 84-88.

16 The NRC was even labeled as “a kind of institutionalized Potemkin village,” see Heidi Reisinger, “Does Russia matter?” *Conference Report*, NATO Defense College, 31 January 2014, p. 2.

to undermine Russia's nuclear second strike capability. Worse, the "Orange Revolution" in Ukraine and the "Rose Revolution" in Georgia brought to power elites who envisioned the future of their respective countries in the EU and NATO. To this day, Russia shirks a public debate about why so many of Russia's neighbours seek to orient themselves towards the West. Instead, the domestic political discourse centres on conspiracy theories according to which Western agents are staging political upheavals in neighbouring countries in order to weaken Russia.

Against this background, Western arguments about the benevolence of NATO enlargement never had much traction. Statements by Western politicians that NATO enlargement was also in Russia's interest appeared both naive and arrogant, for they presupposed that considerations of power, status and influence were no longer important. Above all, appealing to Russia to acknowledge the benign nature of NATO's enlargement misses a most essential point: NATO enlargement – as well as the enlargement of the European Union – is designed as a continental unification project and thus does not have an "end point" that could be convincingly defined in intellectual terms or morally justified. In other words, precisely because the two organizations' respective enlargement processes are not intended as anti-Russian projects, they are open-ended and can hardly be perceived by Russia as anything but a permanent assault on its global and regional power and influence.¹⁷

The Way Ahead

As NATO seeks to re-establish a workable relationship with Russia, three areas will require particular attention.

First, the military posture of NATO will change. Even if Russia may not constitute a direct threat to NATO, the Alliance's threat analyses, which have been focused on terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, will have to be revised in light of recent events. At the same time, NATO may have to review its political declarations, made in the context of negotiating the NATO-Russia Founding Act of 1997, about seeing no need for the deployment of substantial combat forces or military infrastructure on the territory of its Eastern member states. These statements were made in the mid-1990s in order to address Russian sensitivities, and NATO has painstakingly adhered to them. However, they were made under the condition that Russia would also show military restraint. Reviewing these political statements will not necessarily result in substantial numbers of permanently deployed NATO combat forces in Central and Eastern Europe. It is entirely conceivable that the preferred solution will be to hold larger and more frequent exercises, thus avoiding a degree of permanence that many observers in both Russia and the West would interpret as a sign that NATO has concluded that a new Cold War is inevitable. However, it is essential to send a credible signal of reassurance to those Allies that are geographically most exposed. This need for reassurance should also extend to the nuclear domain – i.e. those West European Allies hosting weapons and aircraft should reaffirm their special responsibility for the protection of NATO's Central and Eastern European members. Russia will seek to characterize each change in NATO's posture as a breach of previously made commitments or as provocative; while NATO should not be seen as dithering on this score, whatever military changes it makes must remain transparent to Russia in order to avoid misperceptions.

Second, the West and Russia need to keep talking about the enlargement policies of NATO and the EU. The contradictions are obvious: if recent events were to slow down the enlargement processes, Moscow might view this as a vindication of its approach to halt any further Western "encroachment" by the judicious use of – or threat of using – military force. At the same time, it would hold membership aspirants hostage to Russian (mis)perceptions of NATO and NATO enlargement, thus contravening the logic of the free choice of alignments. On the other hand, pushing enlargement forward in order to not be seen as

¹⁷ Ironically, it was one of NATO enlargement's chief architects, the late Ron Asmus, who speculated about NATO membership for Israel – a step that would go far beyond the Washington Treaty; see Ronald D. Asmus, "Contain Iran: Admit Israel to NATO," *Washington Post*, 21 February 2006.

backing down in the face of Russian pressure will prevent any serious thought being given to alternatives to full membership, at the very time when such alternatives need to be examined. Ironically, it is Russia itself that has rendered some of these alternatives obsolete: the flagrant violation of the 1994 Budapest agreement, which aimed at safeguarding Ukraine's territorial integrity through assurances by the US, the UK and Russia, has invalidated schemes that sought to work around the dilemma that NATO membership for Ukraine might have created.¹⁸ No country in Russia's neighbourhood will any longer regard such arrangements as reliably ensuring its security. Still, as President Obama has made clear, Ukrainian membership of NATO is currently not on the agenda, which means that a security arrangement has to be found that will satisfy Ukraine as well as Russia, even if it may fall short of Ukrainian ambitions.¹⁹ An alternative approach of this sort would also help avoid a situation NATO Allies have long been wary of: the prospect of a new member importing unresolved issues into the Alliance, thus rendering it ineffective.

Third, NATO's broader cooperation with Russia is likely to become more conditioned and focused on reciprocal behaviour. While the main elements of the European security architecture, such as the OSCE or the NATO-Russia Founding Act, will remain in place, cooperation simply for the sake of cooperation appears increasingly hollow. However, where common interests are at stake, such as with respect to the Northern Distribution Network for Afghanistan, cooperation should be pursued and protected from dissonances in other areas. Whether such a selective approach will work is impossible to predict. It is worth recalling that the now defunct "reset" policy of the Obama Administration had sought to implement such a selective "win-win" agenda, yet ultimately faltered because disagreements over fundamental issues, such as Syria or missile defence, inhibited progress in other areas. NATO-Russia cooperation may soon run into similar problems: NATO's support to Ukraine in defence capacity building may burden ties with Moscow, as may Swedish and Finnish interest in NATO membership. An additional complication will be President Putin's leadership style, which in his second tenure has become much more confrontational.²⁰ Still, as long as Russia appears keen to avoid complete isolation, there is hope for continued cooperation in certain areas. Much of this cooperation will be reminiscent of Cold War-type arms control and confidence-building measures. Even if current events do not lead to a new Cold War, there is an obvious need to revisit approaches that were developed during that period and which helped establish a degree of cooperation and predictability between the antagonists. Above all, cooperation under Cold War conditions proceeded from the assumption that at least some of the protagonists' interests were irreconcilable. Such an assumption could spare NATO-Russia cooperation further disillusionment.

A Selective and Sober Approach

The West will continue to seek cooperation with Russia. However, this cooperation will be focused, reciprocal, and less embellished with overblown rhetoric about a "strategic partnership". It will, hopefully, also be free from myths. The assertion that the West had promised not to expand NATO to Eastern Europe, and yet had consistently ignored Russian interests, is one such myth. It perpetuates the false notion of Russian victimhood that provides Moscow with a convenient pretext to justify its policies. Above all, it also locks the NATO-Russia relationship into a sterile debate about the past, precisely at a time when one should be thinking about the future. Even without the use and abuse of history, shaping this future will be difficult enough.

18 "... the concept of joint and overlapping US-European-Russian security guarantees for Ukraine (that were previously implemented by the December 1994 Budapest Memorandum) could be enlarged to incorporate a much wider space that would include not only Ukraine, but also involve a much larger Black Sea/Caucasian regional security and development community." Hall Gardner, "Toward a New Strategic Vision for the Euro-Atlantic," *NATO Shadow Conference II*, Brussels, November 16, 2010.

19 Henry Kissinger and Zbigniew Brzezinski have both suggested a Finland model, i.e. eventual EU membership but no accession to NATO; see Henry A. Kissinger, "How the Ukraine crisis ends," *Washington Post*, 5 March 2014; Zbigniew Brzezinski, "Russia needs a 'Finland option' for Ukraine," *Financial Times*, 23 February 2014.

20 As former US Ambassador to Russia and chief architect of the "reset", Michael McFaul, put it: "With Putin in the Kremlin, the reset was over." Michael A. McFaul, "Former US Ambassador to Russia: Debating Obama's Weakness Only Makes Our Entire Country Weak," *Time Magazine*, 19 March 2014; see also Michael McFaul, "Confronting Putin's Russia," *New York Times*, 23 March 2014. McFaul resigned as Ambassador to Russia in February 2014, after a tumultuous 2-year tenure.