Making Enemies:

NATO Enlargement and the Russian 'Other'

David Mutimer

Assistant Professor of Political Science

Department of Political Science

Deputy Director

Centre for International and Security Studies

York University

Until the remarkable events of 1989, international relations in general, and European security in particular, were defined by the relationship of the Soviet Union to the United States. This was a relationship of increasingly controlled enmity, but enmity nonetheless. Given the centrality of this relationship, it is hardly surprising that the creation of a new international order, and of a new security system in Europe, has focussed on the place Russia is to occupy. At present, the most important site of this redefinition of the relationship between Russia and the rest of Europe is the enlargement of NATO. As three Rand Corporation analysts wrote in advocating NATO's enlargement, "this will require the West to decide what role it really wants Russia to play in European political, economic, and security affairs. The Alliance needs to make some hard choices about where and what it wants to talk about with Moscow."[1] The answer that the West seems to have provided is that it wants to talk to Moscow in the NATO-Russia Permanent Joint Council — a body in which the now-expanding Alliance will meet as a collective with Russia, both in regular sessions and in times of 'crisis' or 'emergency.'[2]

**Making Enemies:
NATO Enlargement and the Russian 'Other'**

David Mutimer

YCISS Occasional Paper Number 60
September 1999

The Permanent Joint Council, and the "Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security between NATO and the Russian Federation" of which it forms a part, are the result of years of often tense negotiation between NATO and Russia over Russia's opposition to the enlargement of the Alliance. The enlargement of NATO has met with widespread opposition throughout the Russian state and political elites. The various nationalist parties, particularly those represented within the Duma, have been outspoken in their opposition to NATO's inclusion of former Warsaw Treaty Organisation states. The Yeltsin Administration had been essentially unswerving in its opposition, even when offered the terms which were finally agreed

---

[1]Ronald Asmus, Richard Kugler and Stephen Larrabee, "NATO Expansion: The Next Steps," *Survival*, 37 no. 1 (1995), pp. 29.

[2]"Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security between NATO and the Russian Federation," Chapter II 'Mechanism for Consultation and Cooperation, the NATO-Russia Permanent Joint Council.' This chapter sets out the organisation and functions of the Permanent Joint Council.

in the Founding Act. Barely a month before signing the Act in May 1997, Yeltsin appeared to be trying to block enlargement with his endorsement of a reunion with Belarus. Even having signed the Founding Act, Russia reiterated its opposition on the day enlargement was formally decided, with Russia's Foreign Minister greeting the decision by saying that: "We still consider expansion the biggest mistake in Europe since the Second World War."[3]

In the face of this opposition, and given the importance of Russia to the reformation of international security, why has NATO proceeded with enlargement? On what grounds has the process been justified? Why, in the oft-quoted words of the American President, was the question of NATO enlargement not 'whether' but 'when and how'?[4] As part of the process leading to expansion, NATO released an extensive "Study on NATO Enlargement," which set out the goals that the Alliance hoped to achieve though admitting new members:

> 3. Therefore, enlargement will contribute to *enhanced stability and security* for all countries in the Euro-Atlantic area by:
> - *Encouraging and supporting democratic reforms, including civilian and democratic control over the military*; [Emphasis added.][5]

NATO's own answer to the question of 'why enlarge?' is therefore in order to promote stability and security, by means of transforming the states of Central and Eastern Europe into democratic, European states. The argument that NATO can provide democratic stability to the states of East and Central Europe has wide currency among the foreign policy elite of the United States.[6] For convenience, I will label this argument, promoted by the decision-makers and accepted by the majority of academic commentators, the 'Promote Stability' path to enlargement.[7] 'Promote Stability' conceives of NATO as an inward-looking organisation, promoting democratic politics

---

[3]Yevgeny Primakov, quoted in Ian Black, "NATO Opens Doors to Eastern Trio," *The Guardian*, 9 July 1997, p. 3.

[4]President Bill Clinton, "Address to the Polish Parliament, 7 July 1994," *US Policy Information and Texts*, 67, 8 July 1994.

[5]NATO, "Study on NATO Enlargement," September 1995, http://www.nato.int/docu/basictxt/ enl-9501.htm, §3.

[6]See, for example, Zbigniew Brzezinski, "A Plan for Europe," *Foreign Affairs,* 74, no. 1 (1995), pp. 26-42; Richard Holbroke, "America, A European Power," *Foreign Affairs*, 74, no. 2 (1995), pp. 38-51; Strobe Talbott, "Why NATO Should Grow," *New York Review of Books*, 10 August 1995, pp. 27-30.

[7]I take the term from Asmus, Kugler and Larrabee, "NATO Expansion", pp. 7-33.

and market economics among its members. NATO enlargement will produce stability by extending the Euro-Atlantic 'security community', in the language Democratic Peace theorists have borrowed from Karl Deutsch.[8] While most of the advocates of this view of NATO recognise that the Alliance is still a military alliance, and might be called on to provide collective defence under Article 5 of the Washington Treaty, this feature of NATO is subordinated to the promotion of political and economic stability.

There is, however, a second argument for expanding NATO, which we can label as 'Strategic Response.'[9] As one of the few commentators to argue in favour of this position puts it: "the Alliance should expand to strengthen the West's political and strategic position in Europe at a time when Russia is unable to prevent it. NATO would then be better placed to meet a resurgent Russia in the future."[10] Zbigniew Brzezinski has pointed to the danger of basing NATO's enlargement on 'Strategic Response' justifications in an intervention which has been cited repeatedly in the debates over NATO's future:

> In expanding NATO, one should note that neither the alliance nor its prospective new members are facing any imminent threat. Talk of a 'new Yalta' or of a Russian military threat is not justified, either by actual circumstances or even by worst-case scenarios for the near future. The expansion of NATO should, therefore, not be driven by whipping up anti-Russian hysteria that could eventually become a self-fulfilling prophecy. *NATO's expansion should not be seen as directed against any particular state, but as part of a historically constructive process of shaping a secure, stable, and more truly European Europe*. [Emphasis added.][11]

For advocates of expansion, then, the process should not be seen to be directed at Russia, and so take great pains to avoid suggesting that it is. For example, consider the labels 'Promote Stability' and 'Strategic Response,' which I have borrowed from an article advocating enlargement. The authors called 'Promote Stability' and 'Strategic Response' alternative 'paths'

---

[8]For references to both the Democratic Peace arguments and the notion of a 'security community' in the context of the enlargement debate, see Cora Bell, "Why an Expanded NATO must include Russia," *Journal of Strategic Studies,* 17, no. 4 (1994), particularly p. 27 and p. 31.

[9]The label 'Strategic Response' is also taken from Asmus, Kugler and Larrabee, "NATO Expansion".

[10]Allen Sens, "Saying Yes to Expansion: the future of NATO and Canadian interests in a changing alliance", *International Journal,* 50 (1995) pp. 680-81.

[11]Brzezinski, "A Plan for Europe", p. 34.

to enlargement, in order to maintain a clear rhetorical break between the two justifications by suggesting that only one path could be taken.[12]

The relationship between 'Promoting Stability' and providing 'Strategic Response' is important for my purposes in this paper, but not as alternative explanations for, or even justifications of, NATO enlargement. I am not interested here in how we might explain NATO enlargement, either in general or in the particular process which has emerged. Nor am I interested in explaining why it is that Russia is to be excluded from NATO, or why Russia has been opposed to the enlargement process. Rather, my questions concern the relationship between Russia and a NATO which expands for whatever reasons. In particular, I want to ask questions of the *meaning* of NATO expansion, about what sort of Europe an expanded NATO will serve to form, and about what place Russia can have in such a Europe. Ultimately, then, I want to ask questions about the *identity* of Russia which is being made possible by the practice of NATO enlargement. 'Promote Stability' and 'Strategic Response' are important because they seem to suggest two very different identities for NATO, and therefore for Russia.

The first path, 'Promote Stability,' suggests that NATO has become an institution for the political and economic development of its members, which happens to have a collective defence capability. It suggests that security, in the NATO context, now means the creation and maintenance of democratic polities and market economies. On the other hand, the second path suggests that NATO is still primarily a means to collective defence, and that security in the NATO context means the defence of its members against external, military threats. The relationship of Russia to these two institutions is likely to be very different, and so to answer the question of the place of Russia in a Europe with an enlarged NATO, it is essential to determine which NATO it is that is enlarging. It is only when we know something about the identity of an enlarged NATO — an institution of 'stability promotion' or one of 'strategic response' — that we can know what Russian Other will be alongside the enlarged NATO Self. Therefore, to

---

[12]Asmus, Kugler and Larrabee, "NATO Expansion", pp. 7-33. The authors actually outline three distinct 'paths' which can be followed by NATO to introduce new members — in addition to 'Promote Stability' and 'Strategic Response', they include 'Evolutionary Enlargement', in which NATO would expand only after the former WTO states joined the EU. The 'Promote Stability' path is their preferred option, with 'Evolutionary Expansion' dismissed out of hand.

know the identity of Russia that is being forged in NATO enlargement, it is essential to understand the nature of security practices within the enlarging NATO. In order to show why this is so, and to show how I will investigate the answers, I first explore the idea of identity formation, of the creation of Self and Other, in more detail.

Constituting Identity and Difference

I began this discussion with a quotation speaking of the West needing to "decide what role it really wants Russia to play in European political, economic, and security affairs." This phrasing is rather jarring, coming as it does in the midst of fundamentally realist analyses of European security. Most of the discussions of NATO enlargement, and certainly most of the rest of these authors' texts, are firmly committed to a traditional conception of both states and security.[13] Arguments are marshalled with reference to objectively knowable interests; Russia's future behaviour is most often discussed in terms of 'geopolitics'; and arguments about possibilities are couched in the language of varying distributions of power — most notably the present 'weakness' of Russia. To talk of 'the West' *deciding* what *role* Russia will play in a new security order echoes a very different language of international relations. It raises the possibility of thinking about enlargement not in terms of strategy and stability, but rather in terms of identity — and, of course, difference. As David Campbell writes:

> Identity is an inescapable dimension of being. No body could be without it.
> Inescapable as it is, identity — whether personal or collective — is not fixed by
> nature, given by God, or planned by intentional behavior. Rather, identity is
> constituted in relation to difference. But neither is difference fixed by nature,
> given by God, or planned by intentional behavior. Difference is constituted in
> relation to identity. The problematic of identity/difference contained, therefore,
> no foundations which are prior to, or outside of, its operation. Whether we are
> talking of 'the body' or 'the state', or particular bodies and states, *the identity of
> each is performatively constituted.* Moreover, the constitution of identity is

---

[13]Asmus, Kugler and Larrabee, 'NATO Expansion' was the first of three articles by Asmus and RAND colleagues published in *Survival* on aspects of enlargement. The other two are: Ronald Asmus and Robert Nurick, "NATO Enlargement and the Baltic States", *Survival,* 38, no. 2 (1996) pp. 121-42; and Ronald Asmus, Richard Kugler, and Stephen Larrabee, "What will NATO Enlargement Cost?", *Survival,* 38, no. 3 (1996) pp. 5-26.

achieved through the inscription of boundaries which serve to demarcate an
'inside' from an 'outside', a 'self' from an 'other', a 'domestic' from a 'foreign'.
[Emphasis added.][14]

In other words, actors in international relations — states such as the United States or Russia, as well as collectivities of states, such as NATO — constitute in their (inter)actions *identities* in relation to one another. While the implications of this argument run much deeper than the 'role Russia (or NATO, for that matter) is to play' in European politics, such role construction is a key part of the performative constitution of identity. The resonance of the last line I quoted from Campbell with the practice of NATO enlargement is striking, for what else is NATO doing if not inscribing boundaries which serve to demarcate an 'inside' from an 'outside', a 'Self' from an 'Other'? I am saying rather more here than that NATO expansion will demarcate a new line in Europe, dividing those covered by the Article 5 guarantee from those not — as important as that line undeniably is. The decision over admission criteria is very much an act of identity construction — creating the limits within which 'members' must fit in order to be 'inside', in order to be defined as 'Self' in the NATO context, rather than 'Other'.[15]

By engaging in practices, international actors performatively constitute themselves and the others with whom they engage. NATO enlargement, as one such practice, can therefore be considered in terms of the identity it constitutes for the NATO Self. But as Campbell reminds us, identity is known only in relation to difference; the Self is known only in relation to the Other. Therefore, NATO enlargement can also be considered in terms of the identity it is constituting for the non-NATO Other. Given the exclusion of Russia from the enlarged NATO, and the history of the relationship between NATO and the Soviet Union, we can thus think about NATO enlargement in terms of the reshaping of Russia as the Other to the NATO Self. The question of what *sort* of Self-Other relationship that will be is the central question of this article.

---

[14]David Campbell, *Writing Security: United States Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1992) p. 8.

[15]The day before Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic were announced as the first new members from the former Eastern Europe, it was reported by *The Guardian* that if the criteria for entry were *simply* military readiness, Romania and Slovenia would be in the first wave, and Hungary and the Czech Republic were not. David Fairhall, "NATO's chosen recruits prove unfit for service", *The Guardian*, 8 July 1997, p. 9.

The constitution of identities/differences in the practices of NATO during the Cold War has been most extensively recounted by Bradley Klein, who reveals the manner in which NATO military strategy and practice was intimately connected to the construction of a particular NATO Self and Russian/Soviet Other:

> The important point here is not that the Soviet threat is or is not a mythic construct, but that the creation and perpetuation of NATO required a particular representation of Soviet strategy. The imaginative construction of the Soviet threat as a constitutive dimension of the Cold War cannot be chalked up to false consciousness or deliberate deception on the part of policy makers . . . In this sense, when it comes to NATO, the external referent of the Soviet threat begins to pale in importance to the concerns expressed by strategists themselves regarding the need to construct certainty about life at home.[16]

Klein's argument is that the pursuit of a particular form of 'security' in and through NATO constituted both the Soviet Union as a threat to the West, and at least as importantly, it constituted 'the West' which was to be secured. It is important to recognise that the practices used to 'secure' the West were inseparable from the creation of that Western Self and of 'the East' as its Other. In a very real sense, the construction of identity and difference in the Cold War NATO was part and parcel of NATO's 'security' practices. It is for this reason that we must inquire into the nature of NATO's security practices as it enlarges in order to know what identity enlarging NATO will construct for itself and its Other.

Judith Butler provides a way of thinking about the kinds of questions I am asking, about the constitution of Self and Other in practice, in the course of her attempt to explore the way speech constitutes subjectivity and agency:

> Consider the situation in which one is named without knowing that one is named, which is, after all, the condition of all of us at the beginning and even, sometimes, prior to the beginning. The name constitutes one socially, but one may well imagine oneself in ways that are quite to the contrary of how one is socially constituted; one may, as it were, meet the socially constituted self by surprise, with alarm or pleasure, even with shock. And such an encounter underscores the way in which the name wields a linguistic power of constitution in ways that are indifferent to the one who bears the name. One need not know about or register a way of being constituted for that constitution to work in an efficacious way. For the measure of that constitution is not to be found in a reflexive appropriation of

---

[16]Bradley Klein, "How the West was One: Representational politics of NATO", *International Studies Quarterly*, 34 (1990), p. 313.

that constitution, but, rather, in a chain of signification that exceeds the circuit of self-knowledge.[17]

The NATO practice of enlargement is 'naming' Russia in a particular way, forming for Russia a particular social location which will shape the future identity of Russia whether Russia appropriates the identity or not. As Butler notes: "Because I have been called something, I have been entered into linguistic life, refer to myself through the language given by the Other, but perhaps never quite in the same terms that my language mimes. The terms by which we are hailed are rarely the ones we choose . . ."[18]

In the rest of this essay, I conduct a reading of a series of NATO documents in order to reveal the meanings and practices of security which are encoded in them, and to see how they will serve to 'name' both NATO and Russia. While individual documents tend to be static, series of documents agreed in the same institutional setting can reveal transformations in shared meanings. Thus, *changes* in the language of the collective expressions of NATO, as reflected in the documents discussed below, are indicative of changes to the intersubjective meanings constitutive of NATO. The documents are an important source of these meanings, as the documentary record of an institution is openly used as a 'collective memory' of that institution. These collective memory records allow institutions to engage in reflexive self-monitoring, a practice crucial to the construction of stable social agency.[19] In the next section I consider two Cold War texts to show how the intersubjective understandings of security and the Soviet Union are revealed in these documents. I then conduct an extended reading of a series of NATO texts

---

[17]Judith Butler, *Excitable Speech: A Politics of the Performative,* (London: Routeledge, 1997), pp. 30-31.

[18]*Ibid.*, p. 38.

[19]On the importance of reflexive self-monitoring, see Anthony Giddens, *The Constitution of Society* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 194), pp. 41-51. Alexander Wendt and Raymond Duvall, "Institutions and International Order", in Ernst-Otto Czempiel and James Rosenau (eds.), *Global Changes and Theoretical Challenges* (Lexington MA: Lexington Books, 1990) p. 59, put it as follows:

> Agents are conscious, purposive, and socially recognised individual or organizational actors the practices of which intentionally and unintentionally produce and reproduce social structures. State actors, for example, are agents in this sense; they are capable of *reflexively monitoring* and learning from their actions; they make choices; and they are socially recognized by other state actors as subjects of international life capable of engaging in a whole range of practices.

dating from 1989 up to and including the 1995 "Study on NATO Enlargement", looking for changes in their constitutive understandings, in order to determine, first, the nature of the NATO Self, and then the Russian Other which may come from enlarging the Alliance.

Constitutive Meanings in the Cold War

Both the nature of security and the role of the Soviet Union in the practices of NATO in the Cold War are well accepted. 'Security' involved the protection of members of the Alliance from an external military attack, principally by means of deterrence but also by defence if necessary and by threat reduction if possible. Bradley Klein has shown the intimate relationship between that security and the particular Western identity that NATO secured. On the other hand, the Soviet Union was the principal source of potential military threat. In the terms developed above, the role the Soviet Union played was that of the potential enemy, in a military confrontation focussed on — though not restricted to — the inter-European divide.[20] The question I am asking here is how were these meanings reflected in the documentary record of the Alliance? If I can identify the language used to signify this understanding of the heart of the Cold War security organisation of Europe, it should be possible to analyse the ways in which this language has changed since the end of the 1980s in order to reveal the alterations in the understandings of security and of the role of the Soviet Union/Russia in the practices of the NATO alliance.

The most important reflection on the nature and practices of the Alliance, following its founding and before the changes of the late 1980s, was the Harmel Report of 1967. This report has served ever since as an authoritative statement within NATO on the nature of the Alliance.[21]

---

[20]It is worth noting that throughout the Cold War there was considerable academic argument about whether or not the Soviet Union *actually* posed an acute military threat. What is important is that it was treated as a threat in the practices of the European military, principally although not exclusively within NATO, and it did nothing to change the role in which it was cast — until, that is, the Gorbachev era. See Alexander Wendt, "Anarchy is what states make of it", *International Organization*, 46 (1992) pp. 418-22. See also, Klein, "How the West was One", pp. 320-22.

[21]I provide several examples below of later NATO texts citing Harmel, including the 1989 'Comprehensive Concept of Arms Control and Disarmament', in which the Alliance aimed to create "a coherent and comprehensive approach to the enhancement of security and stability." In other words, from its release up to the moment of the end of the Cold War, Harmel was considered the seminal statement of the

It is therefore an ideal basis for an investigation of the documentary memory of the Alliance, and so I will read the Harmel Report for the way in which it indicates these key intersubjective meanings, and then briefly show that these meanings had not changed immediately prior to the end of the Cold War.[22]

Security

In §5, the report sets out the heart of the Alliance, and in doing so addresses the two questions which are my focus: how was security understood, and what role did the Soviet Union occupy in NATO's understandings of security practice?

> 5. The Atlantic Alliance has two main functions. Its first function is to maintain adequate military strength and political solidarity to deter aggression and other forms of pressure and to defend the territory of member countries if aggression should occur. Since its inception, the Alliance has successfully fulfilled this task. But the possibility of a crisis cannot be excluded as long as the central political issues in Europe, first and foremost the German Question, remain unsolved. Moreover, the situation of instability and uncertainty still precludes a balanced reduction of military forces. Under these conditions, the Allies will maintain as necessary a suitable military capability to assure the balance of forces, thereby creating a climate of stability, security and confidence.
>
> In this climate the Alliance can carry out its second function, to pursue the search for progress towards a more stable relationship in which the underlying political issues can be solved. Military security and a policy of detente are not contradictory but complementary. Collective defense is a stabilizing factor in world politics. It is the necessary condition for effective policies directed towards a greater relaxation of tensions. The way to peace and stability in Europe rests in particular on the use of the Alliance constructively in the interest of detente. The

---

nature of the Alliance. By way of just one example, a book published in 1990, which reflected on NATO's past and looked to its future as it turned forty, was able to state: "There is broad consensus in Western Europe that this strategy, first articulated in the *Harmel Report* of 1967, remains the most appropriate foundation for allied security policies." Stephen Flanagan and Keith Dunn, "NATO's Fifth Decade: Renewal or Midlife Crisis", in Keith Dunn and Stephen Flanagan (eds.), *NATO in the 5th Decade* (Washington, DC: National Defense University Press, 1990), p. 224.

[22]The Reykjavik Summit in December 1986 can be seen, in many ways, as the beginning of the end of the Cold War, and so as the point after which we might expect to see fundamental changes in the constitutive understandings of European states. For this reason, I use the two North Atlantic Council Communiques immediately following this meeting as my end point in this section.

> participation of the USSR and the USA will be necessary to achieve a settlement
> of the political problems of Europe.[23]

The use of the term 'security' in this paragraph is revealing. In the first instance, it is 'military capability' assuring 'the balance of force' which creates 'security' (as well as stability and confidence). The second instance reinforces the fundamentally military character of security in the NATO context by clearly separating 'military security' and a 'policy of detente'. Unsurprisingly, in fact, the Harmel Report is quite open and explicit in stating the military, confrontational nature of security which is commonly accepted to characterise security in the Cold War.

Given the stress that is placed on fostering democratic institutions and market economies in the discussion of enlargement, it is worth asking how these ideas are treated in the Harmel Report. The quick answer is that they are not. The closest that the text comes in §5 is the mention of 'political solidarity', but this is seen as *contributory to deterrence and defence*. It is not particularly surprising that NATO did not go further than this in discussing democratic institutions, given the variation of domestic constitutions among NATO members in the Cold War. Nevertheless, as Klein has argued, there is a deep connection between NATO's military security and the *forging* of political solidarity in the face of that variability:

> The genius of NATO as a security alliance was the way in which its particularly
> modern accounts of development and security were enframed within a widely
> legitimate strategic discourse of deterrence. By effectively wedding itself to
> defense of a distinctly modern, Western, Atlantocentric project, strategic
> discourse enabled strategists to deflect criticism of the Alliance's extraordinary
> internal contradictions as a mechanism for deterrence and Western military
> defense . . . Until proven wrong by the outbreak of [a major international] war,
> NATO's strategy was thus the only feasible means of securing that precarious
> historical construct called 'the Western way of life.'[24]

In the Cold War NATO, military security served to produce political solidarity ('the Western way of life'), a solidarity which then contributed to deterrence. Such a relationship between security, liberal democracy and market economics — assuming that the latter two constitute the

---

[23]"The Future Tasks of the Alliance (Harmel Report)", *NATO's Official Homepage: Web Archive*, http://www.nato.int/docu/home.htm, § 5.

[24]Bradley Klein, *Strategic Studies and World Order: The Global Politics of Deterrence* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), p. 121. See also Klein, "How the West was One", pp. 311-25.

basis for political solidarity — is very different from the promise of the Study on NATO Enlargement, in which the creation of common institutions of themselves create security and stability.

We find in Harmel a fairly explicit acknowledgement of the practical understanding of security as the protection of members against external attack, to be achieved in the first instance by military means, but with a political component. That political component is designed to create a climate among the potential adversaries that is less than conducive to armed conflict — in the language of the Harmel Report, dialogue is aimed at creating 'stability'. This is crucial, as it leaves the prevention of, or resistance to, military attack as the unchallenged heart of the Alliance concept of security. This understanding is clearly reflected in the official language of the Alliance on the verge of the collapse of the Cold War security order in Europe. In June 1987, the North Atlantic Council wrote:

> We reaffirm the validity of the complementary principles enunciated in the Harmel report of 1967. The maintenance of adequate military strength and Alliance cohesion and solidarity remains an essential basis for our policy of dialogue and cooperation — a policy which aims to achieve a progressively more stable and constructive East-West relationship.[25]

The Soviet Other

The language used to characterise the Soviet Union and its role is less explicit than that which expresses the common understandings of security among the members of the Alliance. In a way, this is unremarkable, for labelling the Soviet Union as 'the enemy' in an unambiguous fashion would be unnecessarily provocative. Nevertheless, it is not difficult to find markers of the role which the Soviet Union is seen to occupy in these documents. For instance, §5 of the Harmel Report refers to the need for Soviet and American leadership in resolving the underlying political problems which are the ultimate source of 'tension' in Europe. There are a number of other instances in the official utterances of NATO in which the Soviet Union is either singled out, or

---

[25]North Atlantic Council, "Statement on the Ministerial Meeting of the North Atlantic Council at Reykjavik", June 12 1987, *NATO's Official Homepage: Web Archive*, http://www.nato.int/docu/home.htm, § 1.

referred to together with the United States as occupying a distinct and leading role in key features of security, notably nuclear arms control.[26]

The Soviet Union is singled out as the external counterpart to the United States — put simply, this language recognises the generally acknowledged superpower role of the USSR. The particular character of the relationship with the Soviet Union is reflected in other passages of these two documents. At §4 of the Harmel Report, for example, NATO writes:

> Amongst other developments, the Alliance has played a major part in stopping Communist expansion in Europe; the USSR has become one of the two world super powers but the Communist world is no longer monolithic; *the Soviet doctrine of " peaceful co-existence" has changed the nature of the confrontation with the West but not the basic problems*. [Emphasis added.][27]

In 1967, the language of Communist expansion is still used with reference to the USSR, along with the recognition that the function of the Alliance has been to stop that expansion. Perhaps more directly, the emphasised passage speaks of the Soviet Union in *confrontation* with the West. The military nature of this confrontation, and the threat which it poses to the Alliance, are stated clearly in the North Atlantic Council Communiqué from June 1987:

> 2. Serious imbalances in the conventional, chemical and nuclear field, and the persisting build-up of Soviet military power, *continue to preoccupy us.* We reaffirm that there is no alternative, as far as we can foresee, to the Alliance concept for the prevention of war — the strategy of deterrence, based on an appropriate mix of adequate and effective nuclear and conventional forces, each element being indispensable. This strategy will continue to rest on the linkage of free Europe's security to that of North America since their destinies are inextricably coupled. Thus the US nuclear commitment, the presence of United States nuclear forces in Europe and the deployment of Canadian and United States forces there remain essential. [Emphasis added.][28]

This passage is extremely useful in tying together the nature of security and the role of the Soviet Union: security is achieved through military preparation and is threatened by the Soviet Union. Given the importance of US nuclear commitments to this security, the singling out of the US and

---

[26]See, for example, "Statement at Reykjavik", § 4.

[27]"Harmel Report", § 4.

[28]"Statement at Reykjavik", § 2.

the Soviet Union for a separate practice of nuclear arms control can be seen to reflect the Soviets' status as the principal enemy Other in NATO's understandings of European security.

None of these conclusions are in any way surprising, but they are not intended to be. The nature of security in Europe and the role the Soviet Union played in European security during the Cold War are extremely well known. What is important is the language used to reflect those understandings in the official discourse of the Alliance, and its essential continuity between 1967 and 1987. It is on the basis of this reflection that we can look to the documentary utterances of NATO since the end of the Cold War and look for altered understandings in the altered language. We need to identify changes:

C   in the *practical understandings of the means of guaranteeing security*, in order to indicate a move away from military security guaranteed by confrontational means. In the context of enlargement, we need also to look particularly for practices of guaranteeing *security through building democratic and market institutions*. It is not sufficient to look for broad declarations of changes in security, but rather we must see evidence of an alteration in the way NATO expects to act in order to achieve security.

C   in language *singling out the Soviet Union, its direct juxtaposition to the United States and the language used to consider its military potential*. We must see, in other words, if Soviet (and then Russian) military power 'continues to preoccupy' NATO.

The first set of markers, those relating to the practical understanding of security, are crucially important to my arguments. Ideas of liberal democracy have been central to NATO's practices of identity formation since its founding. These have been the markers of NATO's identity, the 'Western way of life' that NATO is to secure. The claim of those who see enlargement as 'Promoting Stability', which is the position of NATO's own enlargement study, is qualitatively different. Now security is to be *provided* by democratic institutions. That very way of life is promoted as giving unmediated access to security, rather than constituting an uncertain and threatened object which needs the military might of NATO to be secured. In order to understand the way in which Russian identity is being forged in NATO expansion it is, therefore, necessary to test this claim.

Identity and An Enlarged NATO

Security and the NATO Self

On May 30 1989, just before the political transformation of Eastern Europe began, the North

Atlantic Council released "A Comprehensive Concept of Arms Control and Disarmament", the

most current public statement of NATO's security policy.[29] The understanding of security that

was to be addressed in the "Comprehensive Concept" is spelled out in the document's first

paragraph, in a fashion that underlines its fundamental continuity:

> 1. The overriding objective of the Alliance is to preserve peace in freedom, to
> prevent war, and to establish a just and lasting peaceful order in Europe. *The
> Allies' policy to this end was set forth in the Harmel Report of 1967. It remains
> valid*. According to the Report, the North Atlantic Alliance's "first function is to
> maintain adequate military strength and political solidarity to deter aggression and
> other forms of pressure and to defend the territory of member countries if
> aggression should occur." [Emphasis added.][30]

The security of the Alliance is thus a military security, guaranteed by confrontation with an

aggressor. In case the message of continuity was not clear in a simple statement of this

understanding, NATO *quoted* the 1967 statement of fundamental purpose, and *emphasised* its

continued validity. NATO's new "comprehensive approach to the enhancement of security and

stability"[31] is founded on the understanding of security as it was formulated by Harmel. As far

as the governing body of the Alliance was concerned, there was no real difference between a

condition which would lead to Vaclav Havel becoming President of Czechoslovakia by year's

---

[29]I must emphasise the qualifier 'public'. The basic document of the security policy of NATO was
the strategic concept. In November 1991, NATO released a new strategic concept, but this was the first time
that the Alliance's strategy document had been unclassified.

[30]The North Atlantic Council, "The Alliance's Comprehensive Concept of Arms Control and
Disarmament", May 30 1989, § 1. The use of the Harmel Report in this later document is an excellent
example of the argument I made above concerning the role of these documents as a 'memory record' of an
institution — and also an indicator of the importance of the Harmel Report in particular. In the
Comprehensive Concept, NATO reminds itself of its own fundamental objective — engages in reflexive self-
monitoring — by means of *citing* and *quoting* the Harmel Report. The importance of that report is indicated
by its (repeated) role as the authoritative statement of NATO's fundamental purposes.

[31]"Comprehensive Concept", § 64.

end and a condition 22 years earlier which would lead to Soviet troops crushing Alexander Dubcek's reforms.[32]

By the next year, the revolutions in Eastern Europe had run their course. NATO recognised that the changes in Europe meant that the Alliance needed to undertake a fundamental review of the strategy formulated at the time of Harmel. Its initial response was to announce, in the "London Declaration on a Transformed Alliance", that security could be managed cooperatively, rather than confrontationally.[33] In order to effect that promise, NATO convened a Strategy Review Group, producing a New Strategic Concept which was approved by the North Atlantic Council in December 1991.[34] The understanding of security in this document is worth examining in some detail, as it is still the principal strategic document of the Alliance. In other words, it is the New Strategic Concept of 1991 which will define the strategic practices of the Alliance even after enlargement.[35] It is, therefore, here that we must look to see whether or not NATO has begun to function as an organisation capable of 'enhancing stability and security' through the creation and maintenance of institutions of democratic government.

At the end of 1990, with the Review process firmly underway, the North Atlantic Council met and endorsed a statement on security in the new Europe which suggested dramatic change in NATO's fundamental understanding of security:

---

[32]Remarkably, two months before the release of the "Comprehensive Concept", the European Parliament had adopted a "Resolution on the security of western Europe", which, at its core, reflected the same understanding of security as is evidenced by the Comprehensive Concept. See, in particular, European Parliament, "Resolution on the security of western Europe", § 6, and compare to Comprehensive Concept, § 35. What makes the European Parliament's expression of this same conception of security in 1989 surprising is that the Parliament has been a voice for changing the institutionality of at least Western security since it became an elected body ten years earlier. We might thus expect alternative understandings of security to find earlier expression here than elsewhere, particularly than within NATO. Finding almost identical language describing security in an EP resolution and in NATO's Comprehensive Concept shows the degree to which the military, confrontational nature of European security was accepted, throughout Western European international society, up to the point of the Cold War's collapse.

[33]North Atlantic Council, "London Declaration on a Transformed Alliance", June 1990, § 6.

[34]The full name of the committee was the Ad Hoc Group on the Review of NATO's Military Strategy. The proceedings of the Group are classified, as it was not decided until the end of the process to declassify the new strategic concept.

[35]In the Preamble to the "Founding Act", NATO cites the New Strategic Concept of 1991 as its guiding strategy document.

> Having worked to overcome past divisions, our countries must now direct their efforts *to avoiding grave economic disparities becoming the new dividing lines on the continent*. All countries have the right to exist in security. In the midst of change, tendencies towards greater insularity must be resisted. We seek to spread the values of freedom and democracy that are at the heart of our transatlantic partnership so that past labels of East and West no longer have political meaning. [Emphasis added.][36]

This paragraph suggests that security in NATO's eyes is becoming, by the end of 1990, a much more expansive concept. Security is an economic and political concept, much more than a military one. The threat to security is characterised as 'economic disparities' within Europe — the fact of economic inequalities is, *of itself*, a threat to security. Such a conception of security derived from peoples' relative living standards is radically different from the external military threats of the Cold War era. These are the sorts of threat which can be combatted by promoting the institutions of democracy and prosperity.[37] In 1990, we therefore seem to have evidence of the sort of practical understanding of security which it is now claimed will underpin NATO enlargement.

This holistic conception of security does not survive unscathed into the "New Strategic Concept". The statement of the basic security risks facing the Alliance is found in §10:

> 10. Risks to Allied security are less likely to result from calculated aggression against the territory of the Allies, but rather from the adverse consequences of instabilities that may arise from the serious economic, social and political difficulties, including ethnic rivalries and territorial disputes, which are faced by many countries in central and eastern Europe. The tensions which may result, as long as they remain limited, should not directly threaten the security and territorial integrity of members of the Alliance. *They could, however, lead to crises inimical to European stability and even to armed conflicts, which could involve outside powers or spill over into NATO countries, having direct effect on the security of the Alliance.* [Emphasis added.][38]

While both the December 1990 Communiqué and the December 1991 New Strategic Concept refer to economic difficulties as the root of potential insecurity, the two documents construct the nature of this insecurity in very different ways. In the New Strategic Concept, it is no longer the

---

[36]"North Atlantic Council Ministerial Communiqué", December 1990, Document M-2 (90) 76, § 2.

[37]See, for example, "North Atlantic Council Ministerial Communiqué", December 1990, § 8.

[38]North Atlantic Council, "The Alliance's New Strategic Concept", November 8 1991, § 10.

fact of economic disparity which threatens the security of all Europeans, but rather the potential for violence inherent in economic dislocation which "could involve outside powers or spill over into NATO countries". First of all, the referent object of security in the New Strategic Concept is once again states ('powers' and 'countries') rather than all Europeans, in the 1990 document. Secondly, while the origin of the threats to security is recognised to have altered, the essentially military nature of security has been re-established by the end of 1991.

This is not to say that the operative understanding of security within the Alliance is unchanged by the New Strategic Concept. The text recognises that the security of the Alliance used to require a confrontational guarantee against a predetermined opponent, but that now the means to security are more reactive to an unstable environment.[39] More importantly, the document begins to express the meaning of this shift in operational terms:

> But what is new is that, with the radical changes in the security situation, the opportunities for achieving Alliance objectives through political means are greater than ever before. It is now possible to draw all the consequences from the fact that security and stability have political, economic, social, and environmental elements as well as the indispensable defence dimension. Managing the diversity of challenges facing the Alliance requires a broad approach to security. This is reflected in three mutually reinforcing elements of Alliance security policy: dialogue, cooperation, and the maintenance of a collective defence capability.[40]

In the context of the current policy of NATO enlargement, what is also noteworthy about this statement is the continued centrality of collective defence — that is, the "indispensable defence dimension" of security. It is true that the defence dimension is no longer unidirectional. Forward defence was explicitly renounced by the New Strategic Concept: "This means in particular . . . that the maintenance of a comprehensive in-place linear defensive posture in the central region will no longer be required."[41] Nevertheless, "forward deployment of forces" is still a possibility, although the subsequent text suggests that this is least likely in the central area, and much more likely on what were called, in the Cold War, the 'peripheries'.[42] The importance of this text is the maintenance of a clearly geographical inside/outside divide in the strategic

---

[39]See particularly, "New Strategic Concept", § 14.

[40]"New Strategic Concept", § 25.

[41]*Ibid.*, § 46

[42]*Ibid.*, §46

concept. 'Forward deployment' still means locating military forces on the geographical margins of the Alliance, in order to confront a potential adversary sooner rather than later. In the context of an expanded NATO, this means the shifting of a potential front line in the direction of Russia.[43] Thus, while the understanding of security within the Alliance seems to be broadened by the New Strategic Concept, collective defence maintains pride of place and the front lines are reinscribed. It is well worth reiterating that the 1991 Strategic Concept is still the basic strategic document of the (now expanding) Alliance.

The 1991 Strategic Concept was accompanied by the creation of the North Atlantic Cooperation Council (NACC), to which all members of the former WTO were invited. The council allowed for a political dialogue with the states of Eastern and Central Europe, including Russia. However, in operational terms, the first step towards integrating these states with NATO came in 1994 with the Partnership for Peace (PfP). This operational integration is limited entirely to the military — although in a broad sense, including civilian control and various non-combat military roles.[44] The connection of these collaborative military efforts to security is

---

[43]In defending a NATO enlargement which will not provoke Russia, Zbignew Brzezinski writes: "Since any foreseeable expansion of the alliance is likely to be pacific, the specific military dispositions arising from the enlarged membership need not involve the *forward deployment* of NATO troops — especially American and German forces — on the territory of the new Central European members." [Emphasis added.] Brzezinski, "A Plan for Europe", p. 34. What is noteworthy about this text is that the use of 'forward deployment' in the context can only mean one thing: that Russia is the 'front line'. Moving troops 'forward' still involves moving troops towards Russia. This is a particularly useful example of how the practical understandings embedded in the discourse come through. Expansion is not to be "seen as directed against any particular state", but the alliance *is itself* so 'directed' that moving troops towards Russia is 'forward basing'.

[44]North Atlantic Council, "Partnership for Peace: Invitation", Press Communiqué M-1 (94) 2, 10 January 1994. Consider in particular the following passage, in which I have emphasised the key text:

> The Partnership will expand and intensify political and military cooperation throughout Europe, increase stability, diminish threats to peace, and build strengthened relationships by promoting the spirit of practical cooperation and commitment to democratic principles that underpin our Alliance. NATO will consult with any active participant in the Partnership if that partner perceives a direct threat to its territorial integrity, political independence, or security. At a pace and scope determined by the capacity and desire of the individual participating states, we will work in concrete ways towards *transparency in defence budgeting, promoting democratic control of defence ministries, joint planning, joint military exercises, and creating an ability to operate with NATO forces in such fields as peacekeeping, search and rescue and humanitarian operations*, and others as may be agreed. [Emphasis added.]

made explicitly in the "Framework Document" which constituted the PfP. Given the importance placed above on the way in which security is to be practised within NATO as a way of evaluating its understanding of the nature of security, the operative articles of this document are worth examining in detail. §2 of the Framework Document sets out the nature of security in a NATO-plus of the PfP, and I have highlighted the key passages:

> . . . In joining the Partnership, the member States of the North Atlantic Alliance and the other States subscribing to this Document recall that they are committed to the *preservation of democratic societies, their freedom from coercion and intimidation*, and the maintenance of the principles of international law. They reaffirm their commitment to fulfil in good faith the obligations of the Charter of the United Nations and the principles of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights; specifically, *to refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, to respect existing borders and to settle disputes by peaceful means*. They also reaffirm their commitment to the Helsinki Final Act and all subsequent CSCE documents and to the fulfilment of the commitments and obligations they have undertaken in the field of disarmament and arms control. [Emphasis added.][45]

In the first highlighted passage we see reference to democratic societies, so important in the defence of NATO enlargement. However, the commitment in the PfP is to the preservation of these societies, and in particular "their freedom from coercion and intimidation". This echoes Klein's arguments about the constitutive role of military threats: here again the 'Western way of life' is used to validate military strategy, and thereby constitute that very way of life. Seen in another way, democratic constitutions are in some way an entry criterion, but the security to be provided within the PfP is that of securing those admitted from external threats. The centrality of military force in constituting such threats is seen in the second highlighted passage.

The fundamentally military purpose of the PfP is then reinforced in §3, which lists the specific practices in which the PfP states engage: transparency in defence planning and budgeting; civilian control of the military; readiness for UN or OSCE Peacekeeping; training for joint peacekeeping, search and rescue and humanitarian operations; and, finally, working towards interoperability.[46] This paragraph is particularly revealing, as it demonstrates that the

---

[45]North Atlantic Council, "Partnership for Peace: Framework Document", Annex to Press Communiqué M-1 (94) 2, 10 January 1994, § 2.

[46]*Ibid*., § 3.

actual practices of security cooperation between Alliance members and the Eastern and Central European (ECE) states are entirely concerned with the military. While the confrontational aspect of the understanding of security in the Cold War Alliance language is conspicuous by its absence, the lack of any practical measure for security, other than military, is equally striking. Taken as a whole, the PfP document seems to reinforce the 'indispensable defence dimension' of security, and NATO's nearly exclusive focus on this dimension in its practices.

Originally, all forms of collaboration between NATO states and ECE states were conducted by the NACC, but "[p]ractical defence-related issues, including military cooperation and exercises, originally incorporated within the NACC Work Plan, have been subsumed into Partnership for Peace activities."[47] The PfP, therefore, was explicitly designed as a framework for military cooperation, and so before drawing conclusions about the practical conception of security within NATO practice, I should examine the practices which are still conducted under the auspices of the NACC.

There are two broad areas of activity related to security within NACC. The first is 'Political Consultation' and involves "Regular consultations . . . on political and security-related issues of interest to member states, including regional conflicts."[48] The singling out of 'regional conflicts' is again indicative of the essentially military character of security in the NATO context, as is the division between 'political' and 'security' issues. However, the second area, 'Economic Issues', is perhaps even more revealing: "The Economic Committee's work with Cooperation Partners focuses on defence budgets and their relationship with the economy; security aspects of economic developments; and defence conversion issues."[49] Economic issues in the NACC are seemingly limited explicitly to those concerning the relationship between the military and the economy.[50] What is noticeably lacking in these practices of political and

---

[47]"The North Atlantic Cooperation Council (NACC)", *NATO Basic Factsheet Number 1*, March 1996. It is important to note that these Factsheets are not agreed texts, and so the specific language of the Factsheet is not revealing in the same ways the other texts are. What is important, then, is the forms of practice that are organised under NACC, which this Factsheet reports. It is for this purpose that I refer to the Factsheet.

[48]*Ibid*.

[49]*Ibid*.

[50]There are two further areas of practical cooperation within NACC, neither of which refer directly to 'security' in the descriptions of their activities. The first concerns 'Information Issues', which involves

economic collaboration are those designed to foster liberal democratic constitutions and market economies — except insofar as they involve civilian control of the military and military spending. Rather, NATO is building practices of military and defence harmonisation with the ECE states — in operational terms through the PfP, and in terms of broader political consultation and defence policy through NACC.

These practices reflect directly the understanding of the relationship between 'political' and 'economic' issues and security as it is expressed in the New Strategic Concept.[51] Economic, social and political difficulties do not constitute threats to security in their own right, but only when mediated through the possibility of military violence — and even then they are not matters of NATO security, "as long as they remain limited" to the territory of those outside the Alliance.[52] In the context of enlargement, this means that NATO security may now be threatened by instabilities arising from economic and political dislocation in Russia spilling over the new eastern border of NATO along Russia's western frontier.

The understanding of security which is encoded in these constitutive documents, and more importantly in the practices to which they have given rise, can be seen quite clearly still to be fundamentally military. For all the recognition of changed security environments, and the importance of political and economic aspects of security, the practical understandings of security within NATO reflect the "indispensable defence dimension". The practices of incorporation directed towards the ECE states have been predicated on the primacy of the military, and have been directed towards military harmonisation across the old East-West divide. Or, in the words of NATO's Strategic Concept: "the new environment does not change the purpose or the security functions of the Alliance, but rather underlines their enduring validity."[53]

---

practical cooperation on information exchange, broadly conceived, arising from the rest of the NACC Work Plan. The second is cooperation on 'Scientific and Environmental Issues', and here the military bias is again evident. The issues singled out for high level meetings between NATO and Partnership countries, as opposed to general expert meetings organised by NATO, are "disarmament technologies, environmental security, high technology, science and technology policy." NACC, *Factsheet*.

[51]"New Strategic Concept", § 10.

[52]*Ibid*., § 10.

[53]*Ibid*., § 15.

The importance of these arguments for understanding the relationship between an enlarged NATO and Russia cannot be overstated. The reading of a benign process of enlargement assumed by the 'Promote Stability' arguments is predicated on the commitment to enhance security and stability *by means of building democratic and market institutions*. To test that commitment, I suggested that we needed to find expressions within NATO *practice* which shifted the guarantees of security away from the military and towards democratic and market institutions. This detailed examination of the practices of NATO reveals that such altered practical understandings of security are not there. This is not to say that the commitment to democracy and markets is not real, but rather that it has a different relationship to the practices of NATO security than 'Promote Stability' arguments suggest. Democratic transformation is not the direct means to 'security' in the new Europe, but is rather the route to the privileged 'Western way of life' which is both protected and produced by the practices of military security within NATO. The question then raised is what role Russia might have in a European security structure centred on NATO, and productive of a Western way of life for those inside.

The Russian Other

Through reading closely the documents expressive of NATO's practical understandings of security, I have begun to suggest the way that enlargement as a practice will constitute the identity of the expanded NATO Self. My ultimate focus is on the Russian identity which is being forged in this practice, but the two are inseparable. It is worth recalling David Campbell's words: "identity . . . is not fixed by nature, given by God, or planned by intentional behavior. Rather, identity is constituted in relation to difference. But neither is difference fixed by nature, given by God, or planned by intentional behavior. Difference is constituted in relation to identity."[54] Therefore, understanding the NATO Self as it is produced and reproduced in and through enlargement takes us a long way toward knowing the Other. However, before drawing conclusions about the Other, and particularly about Russia as that Other, I must read those same constitutive documents for what they have to tell of Russia's place.

---

[54]Campbell, *Writing Security*, p. 8.

Russia's location in the understandings and practices of the new and expanding NATO is not so clearly read from the texts and their practical manifestations as is the understanding of security. Nevertheless, there are some tendencies which do need to be drawn out. The first of these emerges in the treatment of the changes in the Soviet Union in comparison to those in the other ECE states in NATO's Strategic Concept. Two paragraphs are particularly relevant:

> 11. In the particular case of the Soviet Union, the risks and uncertainties that accompany the process of change cannot be seen in isolation from the fact that its conventional forces are significantly larger than those of any other European State and its large nuclear arsenal comparable only with that of the United States. These capabilities have to be taken into account if stability and security in Europe are to be preserved . . .

> 14. From the point of view of Alliance strategy, these different risks have to be seen in different ways. Even in a non-adversarial and co-operative relationship, Soviet military capability and build-up potential, including its nuclear dimension, still constitute the most significant factor of which the Alliance has to take account in maintaining the strategic balance in Europe. The end of East-West confrontation has, however, greatly reduced the risk of major conflict in Europe.[55]

The first point to notice is that it seems Soviet military capability still preoccupies the Alliance in 1991. Clearly, much has changed since the Strategic Concept was released, including the demise of the Soviet Union.[56] The degree of change, and of continuity, in NATO's understanding of the present security environment is reflected in the Study on NATO Enlargement:

> In 1991, the Strategic Concept stated, "The threat of a simultaneous, full-scale attack on all of NATO's European fronts has effectively been removed . . ." Since then, the risk of a re-emergent large-scale military threat has further declined. Nevertheless, *risks to European security remain, which are multi-faceted and multi-directional and thus hard to predict and assess. NATO must be capable of responding to such risks and new challenges as they develop if stability in Europe and the security of its members*, old and new, *are to be preserved*. [Emphasis added.][57]

---

[55]"New Strategic Concept", § 11 and 14.

[56]Significantly, the relative size of the Russian and other European military, particularly nuclear, forces, is not one of these changes.

[57]NATO, "Study on NATO Enlargement", § 10.

While this language might suggest a recognition that the Strategic Concept is outmoded, in fact it almost precisely reproduces the earlier text. First of all, the passage explicitly quotes the Strategic Concept. More to the point, most of the rest of the passage, while not enclosed in quotation marks, is also a direct quotation. I have emphasised the words lifted directly from the earlier document.[58]

The second point to be raised about the treatment of the Soviet Union in the Strategic Concept is its singularity; that is, the USSR is identified as distinct from all of the other former Eastern Bloc states. This is most noticeable in §11, in which NATO speaks of "the particular case of the Soviet Union", and tellingly again compares it directly to the United States. In the terms I set out earlier, this language reflects no substantive change from that used in the Cold War documents: the USSR is particularised, it is assessed directly with the United States, and is done so specifically in the context of its military capability.

The singling out of Russia continues even in the very different context of the Study on NATO Enlargement. It is seen first in the general discussion of the present security environment. Russia is singled out for a unique PfP agreement, and more general cooperation with the Alliance is discussed in the language of equals — that is the whole of the Alliance and Russia. The singularity of Russia is seen in even more striking fashion elsewhere in the Enlargement Study. Chapter 2, detailing the contribution of enlargement to European security, comprises three parts: the first on enlargement in the broad context of European security, the second on its relationship to other security institutions, and the third on relations with Russia![59]

While the whole of the section of the Enlargement Study concerned with Russia deserves careful examination, I will select one key paragraph which reflects the difference between Russia and any other ECE state, and speaks most directly to the Russian role in European security following enlargement:

> 27. NATO-Russia relations should reflect Russia's significance in European security and be based on reciprocity, mutual respect and confidence, no "surprise" decisions by either side which could affect the interests of the other. This relationship can only flourish if it is rooted in strict compliance with international

---

[58]"New Strategic Concept", § 9.

[59]See NATO, "Study on NATO Enlargement", § 13.

commitments and obligations, such as those under the UN Charter, the OSCE, including the Code of Conduct and the CFE Treaty, and full respect for the sovereignty of other independent states. NATO decisions, however, cannot be subject to any veto or droit de regard by a non-member state, nor can the Alliance be subordinated to another European security institution.[60]

Clearly NATO is explicitly abandoning the maintenance of a confrontational stance with Russia, opting rather for 'reciprocity, mutual respect and confidence' (although with the stinging limitation of the final sentence). Nevertheless, Russia is placed clearly outside the Alliance — by virtue of its 'significance' in European security. The origin of that significance is not directly stated in this paragraph, but it is reasonable to surmise from the rest of the section that it stems from Russia's place as "a major European, international and nuclear power."[61]

The formal relationship between Russia and NATO following enlargement is established by the 1997 "Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security between NATO and the Russian Federation". The title itself is enough to support my contention that Russia is being identified as a singular presence in Europe, comparable to NATO taken as a whole. This impression is reinforced in the first paragraph of the Preamble, which begins: "The North Atlantic Treaty Organization and its member States, on the one hand, and the Russian Federation, on the other hand . . ."[62] Indeed, the whole of the Founding Act establishes the comparability of Russia, not with the individual members of the Alliance, but with the Alliance as a collective. The practices which are established by the Founding Act are practices of cooperation and consultation between these two equivalent international personalities. In other words, the one element of the enlargement process explicitly concerned with defining Russia's place in the post-enlargement Europe strongly reinforces the continued singularity of Russia in issues of European security — and almost necessarily cements its exclusion, for how can a Russia considered equivalent to NATO as a whole be included within NATO?[63]

---

[60]*Ibid.*, § 27.

[61]*Ibid.*, § 24.

[62]"Founding Act", Preamble § 1.

[63]This, of course, is one of the arguments advanced in support of excluding Russia. It is simply too large to bring in while NATO is maintained as it has functioned. While this may well be true, the principal argument of this paper concerns the effects of maintaining NATO *as it has functioned*.

The constitutive language of the Alliance still singles out Russia, and continues to juxtapose it to the largest members of NATO or to the Alliance as a whole. What is more, it seems still to draw this line on the basis of Russia's military potential. Russian military power, it seems, still preoccupies the Alliance, and leads to Russia's necessary exclusion. To complete a consideration of the Russian role in Europe following enlargement, it is therefore worth asking what differences there are between being inside and outside. This question is particularly important in light of the PfP and NACC practices. Through these two institutions, NATO has engaged the ECE states, including Russia, in collaborative military endeavours, aimed at strengthening European security broadly. What then is left to differentiate members of the Alliance from members of NACC and PfP who are not brought into the Alliance? The answer is readily apparent, even if apologists for enlargement wish to hide it whenever possible. The difference can be shown in any number of ways, but in keeping with the nature of this analysis, I will begin by comparing two short passages of text. The first is from the Strategic Concept, which sets out: "three mutually reinforcing elements of Allied security policy; dialogue, co-operation, and the maintenance of a collective defence capability."[64] This should be compared to the title of first statement of the NACC, a month after the Strategic Concept's release: "North Atlantic Cooperation Council Statement of Dialogue, Partnership and Cooperation."[65] NACC provides the ECE states with access to two of the three elements of Allied security policy, dialogue and cooperation, but not the third, the maintenance of a collective defence capability.

But surely there is more to it than this? Enlargement is not merely the act of redrawing a *geographical* boundary between the Western, NATO Self and the excluded Other, it is also about reforming the Self inside the NATO container. Chapter 5 of the "Study on NATO Enlargement" sets out the requirements of NATO membership in some detail:

> 70. Bearing in mind that there is no fixed or rigid list of criteria for inviting new members to join the Alliance, possible new member states will, nevertheless, be expected to:

---

[64]"New Strategic Concept", § 25.

[65]NACC, "North Atlantic Cooperation Council Statement of Dialogue, Partnership and Cooperation", M-NACC-1 (91) 111 (Rev), 20 December 1991.

- Conform to basic principles embodied in the Washington Treaty: *democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law*;
- Accept NATO as a *community of like-minded nations joined together for collective defence and the preservation of peace and security*, with each nation contributing to the security and defence from which all member nations benefit. [Emphasis added.][66]

In order to come within the NATO container of security, the ECE states must form themselves into an identity with those that are already there. They must adopt what Klein called 'the Western way of life', take on a Western identity and join the Western Alliance. As Klein also makes clear, such an adoption does violence to other ways of life:

[T]he ultimate question forestalled by modern Western strategy has been the one who or what 'we' in 'the West' are. In other words, the politics of strategy has to do with selecting this or that particular account of human life as dominant. Numerous forms of life are ruled out of the picture as inconsistent with the cultural claims of a singular, modern, progressive industrial order. There are many candidates for that liminal space which escapes Western 'identity': Gypsies in Great Britain . . . Balkan guest workers in West German cities . . . Lapp reindeer herders . . . A whole series of marginal categorizations and boundaries could be enumerated, and they need not be limited to the ethnographic. Fractures of class, gender, and race — of partisan politics and religious identity — all demark potential sites of contestation with the Western Alliance. Yet these are unacknowledged, *except as internal threat to the unity and 'identity' of the West.*[67]

Enlargement expands not only the Alliance, but also this process of identification and marginalisation. Those in the East must accept this "particular account of human life as dominant" in order to enter the Alliance; if they choose not to do so, they remain as an "(external) threat to the unity and 'identity' of the West."

The Study on NATO Enlargement indicates what is entailed by adopting the Western way of life: it is accepting liberal democratic government and the individual liberty at the heart of market capitalism — precisely those elements of the enlargement process emphasised by the proponents of 'Promote Stability'. These are also, however, principles endorsed by NATO and

---

[66]NATO, "Study on NATO Enlargement", § 70.

[67]Klein, "How the West was One", p. 319.

Russia in the Founding Act.[68] Indeed, there is a range of practices taking place outside NATO enlargement aimed at transforming Russia into a democratic polity with a market economy. The IMF has been responsible for "fostering the implementation of sound macroeconomic policies and for managing lending operations conditional on the attainment of agreed stabilization targets."[69] In addition, the World Bank is involved in providing funds for sectoral reform and infrastructure projects, as well as for structural reforms and improvements in resource allocation. The European Union reached a treaty on cooperation with Russia in 1994, explicitly drawing Russia into the community of Western values. In addition, it links vital economic cooperation to the observance of basic political principles.[70]

Despite these practices, which would appear to be remaking Russia in the Western image, there has been no move to admit Russia to the Alliance. There is, therefore, more to joining NATO than adopting liberal democratic government and market economics; new members also join 'a community of like-minded nations joined together for collective defence and the preservation of peace and security.' I have demonstrated in this paper the fundamentally military character of security in the self-understandings of NATO; I cited Klein earlier on the link between that understanding and practice of security and the formation of a community of like-minded nations. This identity community that is NATO was and is forged through the practice of military security by means of deterrence and defence. Put another way, 'Promote Stability' and 'Strategic Response' turn out to be one and the same thing. Those that are not

---

[68]"Founding Act", Chapter I, which states: "acknowledgement of the vital role that democracy, political pluralism, the rule of law, and respect for human rights and civil liberties and the development of free market economies play in the development of common prosperity and comprehensive security."

[69]Paolo Miurin and Andrea Sommariva, "Financial and Technical Assistance to Central and Eastern Europe: A Critical Appraisal of the Role of International Institutions", *Washington Quarterly,* 17, no. 3 (1994). In the first few years of its involvement, the IMF came nowhere near meeting its promised targets of assistance, in part at least because Russia did not meet its macroeconomic targets. In addition to Miurin and Sommariva, for critical assessments of the early involvement of the IMF, see: "The Road to Ruin", *The Economist,* 29 January 1994, p. 27, and Jeffrey Sachs, "Toward Glasnost in the IMF: Russia's democratization policy; International Monetary Fund", *Challenge*, 37, no. 4 (1994), p. 4.

[70]Heinz Timmermann, "Relations Between the EU and Russia: The Agreement on Partnership and Cooperation", *Journal of Communist Studies and Transition Politics,* 12 (1996) pp. 203-04. There have also been similar processes of engagement with Russia in other areas of their international relations, not directly connected with the transformation of its political economy: Russia has been admitted to the Council of Europe and has been admitted to a place at the G-7 Summit table.

integrated into the West of NATO, to become part of its Self through taking on the particular
Western way of life which NATO produces, remain outside.

Iver Neumann has provided a way to reconcile the seeming contradiction between
NATO's practice of constructing Russia as the Other and the rest of the West's engagement with
Russia. In an analysis of Russia as Western Europe's Other over the space of 500 years, he
suggests that Russia is presented throughout this period as "always just having been tamed, civil,
civilised, just having begun to participate in European politics, just having become part of
Europe . . . It is therefore deeply appropriate that, for the last five years, the main metaphor used
in European discussions of Russian politics and economics has been that of *transition*."[71] The
practices of transition, by this account, can never be completed.[72] This argument suggests that
Russia is being reconstituted, once more, as the non-West by which the Western Self is known.
As Neumann argues:

> Danger resides on the borders . . . and so, as long as Russia is constructed as a
> border case, it will also be inscribed with danger. Anne Norton has suggested that
> identities are at their most transparent when they are at their most ambiguous, and
> that the most rewarding place to study them is, therefore, in their attempted
> delineation from what she calls their liminars. Russia, in whatever territorial
> shape, by whatever name, as whatever construction, *has a history as Europe's
> main liminar*. [Emphasis added.][73]

The practice of NATO enlargement is identifying Russia in that "liminal space which escapes
Western 'identity'"[74]; as the border case on NATO's outside which is, therefore, a possible threat
and is confronted by an institution predicated on 'securing' its inside by military means.

---

[71]Iver Neuman, "Russia as Europe's Other", *EU Working Papers*, RSC No. 96/34 (Florence: European University Institute, 1996), p. 46.

[72]If this account of Russia's transition as the latest in a series of attempts to produce a Western Russia, which must necessarily fail, it puts a rather different light on the arguments that the West should not admit Russia to NATO, for example, for fear of the transition failing and Russia's returning to its authoritarian past.

[73]Neumann, "Russia as Europe's Other", p. 46.

[74]Klein, "How the West was One", p. 319.

Conclusion

Bradley Klein has written that:

> The end of the Cold War creates an important moment both politically and analytically . . . But if it turns out that despite the dissolution of the blocs, strategic practices remain largely intact, then this suggests another character to the nature of international life. It may turn out that the interpretive and discursive resources that animated the Cold War are more persistent and less amenable to restructuring than celebrants of a new world order might claim.[75]

By 1990, the members of NATO had recognised the importance of the moment created by the end of the Cold War, and had begun to reshape Europe as a consequence. By 1997, the acts of reshaping have come to be dominated by the move to enlarge NATO by admitting some of the former members of the Warsaw Treaty Organisation. On its surface, nothing would seem to provide greater evidence that there is a true new world order being made in Europe — the old enemies brought into the central Cold War military institution. But Klein has sounded an ominous warning, directing our attention to the practices through which security is to be achieved. I have attempted to take that warning seriously and have examined strategic practices at the heart of the now enlarging NATO to see what 'interpretive and discursive resources' will animate a Europe that is post-enlargement, rather than simply post-Cold War.

Despite a moment of quite startling potential for change, reflected most clearly in NATO's December 1990 Communiqué in which the Alliance identified economic disparity as itself the leading threat to security, the strategic practices of NATO do remain largely intact. My reading of the documentary development of NATO from the revolutions of 1989 suggests that while the practical understanding of security has been altered somewhat, it is ultimately a relatively minor change. Security is still military security within NATO, to be defended against potential violence from the outside. The promotion of security and stability through democratic politics and market economics is simply not translated into the practices of NATO for achieving security. Rather, there is a reproduction of the Cold War division between military security on the one hand, and political and economic development on the other. The liberal, democratic,

---

[75]Klein, *Strategic Studies and World Order*, pp. 121-22.

market society of the new Europe contributes to the capabilities of military defence, is the object of military protection, and is ultimately a product of strategic practices. It is in this light that we must judge the inclusion of the former WTO states in NATO, and the identity this practice serves to create for Russia.

We are used, from the Cold War, to thinking of the enemy-Other as the proponent of an alternative social system. Identity and difference were constructed during the Cold War in terms of forms of governmental and economic organisation. Therefore, as we see in Russia practices of economic and political transformation, aimed at producing liberal democracy and a market economy, we assume that the Other is being made into the Self. However, there is nothing essential or eternal about this particular construction of Self and Other — identity and difference can be constituted on any number of markers. The present practices of NATO enlargement seem to be creating a Europe of a 'stable' inside and a potentially 'unstable' outside, against which a military, even a nuclear, defence must be maintained. For all of the practices of engaging and remaking Russia in the political and economic image of the West, NATO's enlargement practice is constituting Russia as part of that potentially unstable outside, denied access to the acme of the Western way of life. Russia, in other words, is being constituted as an Other, and as a potential enemy Other, in the post-Cold War, through the continuation of the strategic/security practices of the Cold War in NATO. By enlarging NATO in the terms in which it is being done, by expanding the Alliance on the basis of an essentially military understanding of security, the West risks making an enemy of the largest of the European states — again.

David Mutimer is an assistant professor in the Department of Political Science at York University and is the Deputy Director of the Centre for International and Security Studies. His recent publications include: "Beyond Strategy: Critical Thinking in the New Security Studies," in Craig Snyder, ed., *Contemporary Security Studies* (London: Macmillan, 1999); "Reconstituting Security: The Practices of Proliferation Control," *European Journal of International Relations*, 4:1 (1998); and *The Weapons State: Proliferation and the Framing of Security* (Boulder: Lynne Reinner Publishers, 2000).