

The Evolution of Estonian Security Options During the 1990s

Kai-Helin Kaldas

Partnership for Peace Consortium of Defense
Academies and Security Studies Institutes (PfPC)
Athena Papers Series No. 4

October 2005

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	v
Foreword	ix
Introduction	1
Historical Background	7
Introduction	7
Estonia's Geo-strategic Location	7
The Period of Independence and Regional Cooperation.....	8
The Neutrality Option	9
The Fifty-Year Soviet Occupation	11
The Neutrality Option after Estonia Regained Independence.....	16
Conclusion.....	20
Estonia's Regional Military Cooperation	21
Introduction	21
Cooperation with Finland.....	21
Cooperation with the Baltic States	28
Conclusion.....	33
The United States and the Baltic Republics	35
Introduction	35
The Latest Round of NATO Enlargement in March 2004.....	37
International Reasons for the U.S. to Support the Last Round of NATO Enlargement	38
Maximizing Strength and Making New Allies.....	38
Acquiring Dominance and Control	40
Domestic Political Reasons for the U.S. to Support the Last Round of NATO Enlargement	41
Conclusion.....	44

Advantages and Disadvantages of Estonia's Integration with Western Security Institutions.....	47
Introduction	47
The European Union's Foreign Policy	48
NATO's Security Policy	49
New Instabilities in Transatlantic Relations.....	51
Advantages and Disadvantages for Estonia in Integrating into Western Security Institutions.....	53
Disadvantages of Integration.....	54
Advantages of Integration	56
Conclusion.....	57
Conclusion	59
Notes.....	63

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This Athena Paper is based on Kai-Helin Kaldas' thesis, completed in May 2005, as part of her work towards a Master of Arts in defense management and policy (MA DMP) from the Royal Military College of Canada (RMC).

One must look in depth at the originality of the program to fully gain an understanding of the significance of this success. Kai-Helin Kaldas was enrolled in the MA DMP program after having been selected from a roster of promising young students who successfully impressed the staff of the Baltic Defense College (BDCOL) in their Civil Servants Course. This process represents the initial stages of the MA with Scholarship Program, which was developed between October 2001 and June 2004. The MA with Scholarship proposes one of two of the Royal Military College's MA programs as mixed distance learning and residential programs.

This means that Kai-Helin had to do one half of her MA from a distance, in her country, before she would be invited (if she succeeded well enough) to complete her studies in Canada, on site at RMC. This she did with flying colors, and the end result is the document you are now holding in your hands.

She produced this thesis while holding an important advisory position to the Deputy Undersecretary of the Estonian Ministry of Defense, more than a full-time job in a 200 employees-strong ministry for a country that has just joined NATO and the EU. We are grateful that Deputy Undersecretary Sulev Kannike allowed her leave to pursue her MA. Not only does Kai-Helin have a master's degree from a respected military university, but Mr. Kannike also now recovers the services of a talented staff member who is only the richer for this experience.

The MA with Scholarship Program is an original exercise in Canadian defense diplomacy. It was created in the spirit of many Foreign Affairs and Department of Defense initiatives, and also falls within the guidelines of NATO's training and education enhancement program (TEEP), proclaimed at the Washington Summit in 1999. As such, it is fully in line with Canadian and Alliance objectives. The aim of the MA with Scholarship Program is to foster new academic and security links between Canada and some of its partners. The fact that the thesis is being published under the auspices of the PFP Consortium's Athena Papers is testimony to the scholarly quality of the work and the success of the program.

More than talent and dedication is needed. Money is also always a concern. Without the generous funding granted by MTAP; the ability of its director, Andy Rasiulis, to share the MA with Scholarship vision; the always important advice volunteered by Fernando “Monty” Montelpare; and the strict but benevolent budgetary scrutiny offered by Major John Andruszka, the MA with Scholarship Program would have never been born.

The Dean of Continuing Studies, whether it be Dr. Jim Barrett or Dr. Mike Bardon, the Principal of RMC Dr. John Cowan (and his assistant Maggie Shepherd), the Commandant of RMC, whether it be Rear-Admiral (ret.) David Morse and later Brigadier-General Jean Leclerc have continually supported this initiative, even in the darkest moments. Without this support, the MA with Scholarship Program would have met an early demise. If the leadership of the Royal Military College was instrumental in giving its assent, other extremely important ingredients for success were also needed. The tenacity of these people merits recognition, especially due to the fact that they have performed so many other miracles that have gone unrecognized.

Rebecca Dillenberg, under extremely difficult conditions, piloted this program from June 2004 until Kai-Helin’s final success in May 2005. She handled the MA with Scholarship Program (with which she was unfamiliar) above and beyond her regular duties, and performed with coolness and aplomb even in the direst circumstances. The challenges of change were also shared by the Registrar and the Academic Counselors. Sophie Gillespie, Micheline Laurencelle, Linda Plamondon, Johanne Durand, and Danielle Tardif-Smith also deserve praise for their open-mindedness and flexibility. RMC’s reputation for excellence is based in great part on their diligence.

The other contributing factor to RMC’s *renommée* is certainly its faculty. Dr. Peter Dunnett, Dr. Brian McKercher, Dr. Bill Simms, Dr. Ron Weir, Dr. Jean Fugère, and Dr. Joel Sokolsky all have demonstrated the lateral thinking and willingness to accept change that is expected of first-rank academics and academic program managers. Very often they have supplied advice, and even more often have offered solutions that would ensure that the MA with Scholarship Program would remain viable. Their academic guidance has helped Kai-Helin succeed; in addition, they have helped their country forge new types of relations. This places the faculty of the RMC squarely at the juncture between thinking about and applying foreign and defense policy. Very few academics in Canada can say this.

Finally, this endeavor was not geographically limited to Canada. In Tartu, Estonia, thanks also go to Brigadier-General Michael Clemmesen (Denmark), and Brigadier-General Algis Vaiceliunas (Lithuania), the Commandants of BDCOL, and to Ole Kvaerno and Tomas Jermalavicius, Deans at BDCOL,

also respectively from Denmark and Lithuania, for their patience and steadfastness in this endeavor. Canadian military attachés based in Poland—first Colonel Tony Wojcik and later Captain Navy Kevin Carlé—and their staff sometimes had a thankless coordinating job to do. Finally, the PfP Consortium, through its publications series, has agreed to publish this thesis for us to enjoy and to use.

I am proud to have designed and managed this program from October 2001 until June 2004. I am proud not only because of a job well done, but more for the comradeship and the friendship that has emerged as this program developed. No one could ask for better colleagues, and no one could be more thankful to them for the advice, support, and patience that they have so generously offered. The only thing remaining that could be wished for is continued support and funding of this initiative, if only to propel the transformation of the Alliance and speed up the integration of new NATO members. The MA with Scholarship Program is an initiative leading to real results, which gives academia the veneer of “soft power.” The program is a method of practical engagement of which the Department of Defense can be proud, and which should continue. It is my fondest wish that the efforts that have been invested in this not go to waste, and that many more foreign students will grace the RMC parade square on convocation days to come.

Frederic Labarre, MA
NATO Defense College
Rome, Italy

FOREWORD

International relations and strategic studies are comparatively new academic disciplines that have been firmly established in universities only since the late 1940s. Yet, for all that, and also for the richness of events that have made or marred international life or otherwise shaped it, the study of these domains remains largely theoretical and/or historical. More recently, operational research has attempted to quantify the many factors that influence strategic actors' decision processes.

This work is different. It is an academic paper written by a practitioner, but it deploys a sound academic and theoretical basis to illustrate in detail how a security dilemma is resolved in practice. To do so, it considers the juncture between history and political decision-making using small state theory. It speaks of the difficult choices that Estonia has had to make, and the trying political and philosophical journey that was required to ensure the definitive survival of the newly (re-) independent country. Similar processes were followed by a number of other post-Soviet republics, notably in the other Baltic states, but also in countries that had never been independent, such as in the Caucasus and Central Asia. The originality of this thesis and part of its usefulness lie in the fact that, for the first time, we have an accurate historical, political, and strategic depiction of what went right. There are no better lessons learned than those from a case where a nation recognizes, after the completion of the work, the moments where it succeeded, and how it succeeded in guaranteeing its own security, and thence to participate actively and constructively in international life. This is what Estonia (and the other Baltic states) did, and it did so punching well above her weight.

This paper illustrates the complex mental navigation that decision-makers need to perform to effectively steer a course for their small state, between the attraction of a successful alliance (NATO) and the appetites of a nostalgic former empire. But this is the common strategic perception. This paper also implicitly considers the other structural pressures on newly independent countries; the question of legitimacy; the difficult transition from a command to a market economy; and the tension-filled relations between the Russian minority and the Estonian majority. Not to be forgotten are the gamut of ordinary challenges that face modern societies: environmental responsibility, agricultural policy, human resource and social development, health care, democratic tur-

bulence—all these factors are intimately intertwined with the general notion of security.

Nowadays, when scholars speak of this general definition of security, they speak of “human security” as a sophisticated evolution of the conditions that make life worth living. The concept itself has emerged in response to the emergence of so many failed states in the wake of the collapse of communism. This strong contrast between what is and what should be blurs the fact that the single most important pursuit of states—and this is even more the case for newly independent states—is survival.

So many of us see NATO’s enlargement process through Western eyes. Some of us believe that the values embodied (and promoted) by the Alliance are—if not universally applicable—so attractive that they create their own demand for fulfillment, triggering a seemingly inescapable logic of enlargement. Estonia’s security dilemma was not initially motivated by value-based considerations. This fact is patently obvious in this paper, for it does not even consider the Alliance’s 1995 *Study on Enlargement*, which put great emphasis on the need for applicant countries to settle internal and external differences of a socio-political nature before being seriously considered for admission. This study is original because it places the notion that NATO membership was not *automatically* the preferred solution back into consideration.

Neutrality and alternative regional security arrangements were also considered very seriously by many of these newly independent states, and—as this thesis shows—there was also significant lobbying in Estonia in favor of these options by regional powers that faced a security dilemma of their own. This paper sheds new light on the development of such security options, seen from an insider’s perspective. From an analytical point of view, these debates cannot be divorced from the strategic consequences for the region and wider Europe, nor from the domestic implications of pursuing a given course of action (even if a decision doesn’t spill over into a regional crisis). For example, the neutrality option was heavily influenced by the relative experience of Estonia and other Scandinavian countries. During the Second World War, Estonian neutrality meant losing its sovereignty to the USSR, but for Finland it was the recipe for success. Today, both countries are influenced by that memory as they compose their national security strategies. Finland’s victory over the Soviets in the 1939 Winter War gives it bragging rights, but victory was not at all decisive, if we consider *Finlandization* during the Cold War. But it did achieve the primary aim of national survival. Estonia’s point of view (and experience) was exactly the opposite, but the evaluation and the negotiation of the advice given by Finland also needed to go through a careful assessment of ways and

means. In this sense, Estonia and Finland are radically different, and this contributed to the disqualification of neutrality as a security option.

Historical, academic, and sometimes psychological considerations cannot—indeed, must not—make an abstraction of the structural constraints of such a model. Neutrality would come at a prohibitive cost for Estonia in terms of its standing force structure. Estonia ultimately understood that focusing only on the means of achieving “hard security” would cost too much in terms of “soft (social, or human) security.” Social insecurity and its consequences for internal stability—guns being purchased at the expense of butter—loomed large in calculations of the country’s overall security. More insecurity would also be triggered by the connotations of a sudden military buildup from the perspective of Estonia’s neighbors. In other words, economic, demographic, and internal pressures also figure as “adversaries” that informed this decision.

The national strategic equation of any country is always influenced by such considerations, but we all remember the rhetoric of “like-mindedness” and “shared values” as a motivator for Estonian membership in NATO. This work shows us that such rhetoric was manifestly the product of well-intentioned politicians, but it never entered the vocabulary of those charged with finding a geopolitical solution to the question of state survival. Estonia’s decision-making process, illustrated here, can serve as a model of responsible state behavior for other nations.

It is also a model of analysis. All three Baltic states have, for the most part, managed to avoid the kind of ethnic conflagration that is now a source of such turmoil in the former Yugoslavia, to take but one example. As a result, the quality of advice and advisors who are sent as part of so many foreign military aid programs is widely divergent. Whereas the former Yugoslavia benefited from Dayton-imposed advice (more akin to intervention) adapted to failed states, the Baltic states offered a near-perfect social context in which to work. Thus the arrogance of the Western point of view was sometimes a source of resentment; abandoned throughout the Cold War, having successfully escaped Russia’s cold embrace, and having avoided ethnic rage, the Baltic states could be justified in these feelings. One way for advisors to avoid being resented is to do their homework on their adoptive country. This paper is a textbook example of how an analysis should be conducted, and what type of effort any advisor sent to any foreign country should make prior to landing in an advisory role.

Finally, it opens the mind on the subject of the application of state sovereignty in a globalized world. Many critics of multilateral organizations, international legal regimes, and globalization in general complain about the erosion of sovereignty. The elaboration of options for Estonia’s security has not

avoided the most difficult questions; joining NATO was always fraught with danger, particularly when the NATO-Russia rift over Kosovo is taken into account. Yet it was in consideration of the alternatives (especially neutrality) that Estonia decided to join NATO, despite the risks. All that this means is that real pressures can sometimes be ignored in favor of security solutions that seem to nullify a state's newly acquired sovereignty. Thus the nation is actually exercising its freedom of maneuver in dealing with actors with greater relative power. It certainly puts a dent in the notion that internal factors such as ethnic nationalism and economic determinism have their own inescapable logic, leading nations in predetermined directions. Again, the Estonian example stands in contrast to the sad parade of states that failed, whether through the shortsightedness of their leadership, the intolerance of their constituents, or, to be perfectly fair, the lack of engagement of the international community.

This paper demonstrates how Estonia made the sovereign decisions that would guarantee its security, so as to secure the appropriate amount of "residual" sovereignty necessary for internal stability. It is also untrue to suggest that an alliance like NATO is an impediment to sovereignty anyway, since the rule of consensus preserves this prerogative. The Alliance's decisions are a collection of individual state decisions—the expressions of national sovereignty. State power is alive and well, even for small states. Estonia's achievements would be inexplicable otherwise. The current state of transatlantic relations is further proof of this notion. Hegemonism has its limits, and functionalism cannot support the cold logic of realism. Small states can be—and are—the masters of their destiny. Accounts like these present a challenge to conventional strategic wisdom, historians, and theorists, and provide a model for responsible statecraft for others to follow, be they governments or foreign advisors.

Frederic Labarre

Rome

14 July 2005

INTRODUCTION

This thesis is about Estonia's security policy since the country regained its independence after the collapse of the Soviet Union.¹ There were roughly three main policy options available to Estonia in 1991: remaining a neutral country, cooperating regionally with Finland and the other two Baltic states (Latvia and Lithuania) in security matters, or striving for integration with Western security institutions such as the European Union (EU), the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), and the Western European Union (WEU).² It is a well-known fact that Estonian politicians chose the last option. I will argue that this was the best alternative of the three available options.

For the most part, the theoretical approach used in this thesis is "small state theory," or, more precisely, the aspect of the theory dealing with small states' conduct in foreign policy. The reason for using small state theory is twofold: first Estonia is a small country, in terms of geographical size, population, and degree of influence in international affairs; second, there is no other competing theory that better describes the behavior of small states in international relations. For example, classical realism and structural realism are inadequate to explain small states' foreign policy behavior. According to classical realism, states are driven by self-interest, and the purpose of statecraft is national survival in a hostile environment. State survival and the game of international politics revolve around the pursuit of national interests defined in terms of power. Therefore, the primary obligation of each state is the maximization of power.³ Structural realism, in turn, identifies international anarchy and the distribution of power within the international system as the major determinants of state behavior. It gives little attention to domestic influences on how states choose to act. Within this perspective, the structure of the international system and power maximization dictate foreign policy choices.⁴

Neither realism nor structural realism emphasizes interstate cooperation as the main driver of the international system. Rather, these theories hold that the effectiveness of alliances and cooperation compete with the adverse feelings of insecurity and dependence, with the latter being the main dynamic of the international system. One of the reasons for this is that states are uncertain of each other's future intentions and actions, which works against the need for cooperation. States are also afraid of becoming too dependent on others for their own security; structural realism in particular sees dependence as threatening to

a state's well being.⁵ Within this perspective, David Vital argues that small states can pursue a meaningful foreign policy only when they are acting alone, not when they are acting in concert with other larger states.⁶ At the same time, Vital holds neutrality or non-alignment to be very far from constituting a security guarantee for small states, especially in the case where a small state is in possession of a strategic geopolitical position in which a larger state is interested.⁷ Estonia's geopolitical position has played a crucial role in shaping its history. Due to its geo-strategic location, the country was occupied by foreign rulers from the thirteenth century onwards.

In small state theory, a state can be considered small if its territory or population is small, or if it lacks material wealth, organization (in terms of state bureaucracy and grass-roots movements), and influence in international politics.⁸ When small states act alone, they cannot make a significant impact on the international system.⁹ They are considered weak because they do not have the means to maximize their power, unless they act in cooperation among themselves or join larger organizations.

According to small state theory, however, small states exhibit many shared foreign policy behaviors. They have a low level of participation in world affairs, address a narrow scope of foreign policy issues, and limit their action to their immediate geographic arena. While they tend to employ diplomatic and economic instruments (as opposed to military instruments) in their foreign policy, they also emphasize international law, secure multinational agreements, and join multinational institutions whenever possible. Small states are also said to choose neutral positions and rely on superpowers for protection, partnership, and resources. They cooperate and avoid conflict with others, and spend a disproportionate amount of foreign policy resources on ensuring their physical and political security and survival.¹⁰

Jeanne Hey argues that this list of small states' most common foreign policy behaviors is in itself quite self-contradictory. It suggests that both alignment and neutrality are policy options of equal weight; the list also suggests that small states focus primarily on diplomatic and economic cooperation, but at the same time are consumed with security concerns.¹¹ Focusing on diplomacy and economic cooperation to solve conflicts is not contradictory to being obsessed with security concerns. On the contrary, diplomacy and economic cooperation might provide valuable means to remedy an existing "security deficit."

Several of the above-listed foreign policy behavior patterns could have also qualified as Estonian security policy options at the beginning of the 1990s. One of the security policy options for Estonia as a small state was to adopt the

policy of neutrality.¹² Non-alignment is also often regarded as a useful posture to serve the security interests of small states in the international system.¹³

The concept of complex interdependence complements small state theory in explaining both interstate cooperation and Estonia's security policy choices. Of the many available security policy options, Estonia chose alignment with and integration into Western security institutions. The theory of complex interdependence emphasizes cooperation among states. Even though the theory claims that survival is the primary goal of all states, it gives a significant role to international organizations in world politics. According to the concept, nations are involved in a complex network of interdependence. International organizations help to activate potential coalitions in world politics. They also allow agencies of governments that might not otherwise come into contact to turn potential coalitions into explicit transgovernmental coalitions characterized by direct communication. The theory also suggests that international organizations are frequently congenial institutions for small states.¹⁴

The theory that best explains Estonia's security policy options and behavior in international politics since it regained independence after the collapse of the Soviet Union is small state theory. This is primarily because, as mentioned at the outset, Estonia is a small country in terms of land mass, population, and international influence. Even though realism or structural realism cannot explain Estonia's choices in security policy, they do explain the behavior of the United States in supporting NATO's eastward expansion. Both theories stress the importance of the state as the main actor in the international scene. However, in the case of the U.S. role in NATO enlargement, the state did not act as a monolithic entity with its own interests to pursue. Rather, the U.S. policy of supporting the eastward expansion of NATO was the result of the activities of various social forces, such as the Baltic-American lobby and support of senior U.S. politicians for NATO enlargement.

Although the theory of complex interdependence emphasizes cooperation among states, the role of international organizations, and mentions the tendency of small states to belong to international organizations, it does not focus on small states. It does, however, deal with the issue of vulnerability in interdependence, which is very important when I discuss Estonia's behavior *vis-à-vis* the United States and the advantages and disadvantages of Estonia's integration with Western security institutions. For the most part, the theory used in this work to explain Estonia's conduct in security policy is small state theory, due to the fact that it thoroughly explains the behavior of small states in international relations.

For a small country, seeking a distant protector is standard practice in international politics.¹⁵ According to small state theory, a small nation must look to

the assistance of powerful friends for the protection of its rights.¹⁶ By choosing membership in a larger political community, a small state might sacrifice some of its sovereignty, but in return it gains greater protection and a more solid economic foundation that flow from membership in the broader organization.¹⁷ Charles Lerche's analysis is applicable to Estonia's integration to the European Union. Estonian foreign and security policy experts mostly regarded the EU as a guarantor of soft security.¹⁸ The same explanation can be adapted to security alliances as well; in fact, by choosing membership in NATO, Estonia denationalized its security and defense policy, which became part of NATO's collective defense system.¹⁹ Gärtner has also argued that for small states the decision to join alliances depends on the judgment of whether the overall benefits of doing so are greater than the costs.²⁰

Whether a small state becomes a member of an alliance depends on concrete circumstances, in particular on the state's interests in joining an alliance and the foreseeable development of the security environment. Small states very often join an alliance to protect themselves against larger adversaries.²¹ Even though the foreign policy of Russia has become more encouraging over the past decade, Russia still possesses the conventional and nuclear capabilities of a military superpower, which must be taken into account in the defense planning of other countries, such as Estonia.²² A nation is secure only to the extent to which it is not in danger of having to sacrifice its core values, such as independence or territorial integrity.²³ For instance, Estonia's membership in the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) would have put these core values in danger. The Russian military's preferred position right after the establishment of the CIS was that the CIS was simply the Soviet Union by another name.²⁴ Estonian political forces feared that the CIS would be a vehicle for a revived Russian imperium.²⁵ At the beginning of the 1990s, there existed a security deficit for Estonia, and NATO membership was viewed as a solution to remedy this deficit.²⁶

Since the beginning of the 1990s, the aim of Estonian politicians has been to acquire hard security guarantees for Estonia against Russia, mainly through NATO.²⁷ Most of the Estonian political elite (including the president and minister of defense), as well as the public, believed that the real security guarantee for Estonia in the 1990s would be speedy integration into Western security structures. It was believed that Western international security systems like the Partnership for Peace (PfP) initiative within the framework of NATO, the WEU (under the rubric of the EU), and NATO itself would provide guarantees for the freedom of Estonia.²⁸ Membership in the EU was seen to foster soft security as well as economic development, while admission to NATO was seen primarily as a method of bolstering hard security.²⁹

The methodology utilized in this thesis primarily relies on written official documents and depth interviews. A “depth interview” is an extended, highly focused conversation, with the purpose of collecting detailed information. It allows the researcher and respondent to explore an issue in significant detail.³⁰ The interviewer prepares a preliminary list of questions to start the interview and lets the interviewee do most of the talking. The persons interviewed for this thesis are Estonian government officials and military officers who are responsible for dealing with security policy. The aim of the depth interviews was to look for answers to the following questions:

- Why did Estonian politicians and security policy experts not perceive neutrality or membership in the CIS as viable security policy objectives for Estonia at the beginning of the 1990s?
- Why did the Estonian military leadership opt for a total defense concept as the foundation of Estonian security?
- Why did the politicians start to question this choice at a later stage?
- What makes total defense incompatible with NATO standards, and what are these NATO standards?
- Why was close regional cooperation with Finland not seen as a feasible security alternative for Estonia?
- What are the aims of Estonia in being a contact NATO member for Finland?
- Why was Baltic military cooperation seen as not sufficient to serve Estonia’s security interests, but rather seen as a means to acquire membership in Western security institutions?
- What were the concerns of Estonian politicians at the beginning of the 1990s when Russian troops were still on Estonia’s soil?
- Why did Estonian politicians have more trust in the United States than in many Western European states, and what created that distrust toward Western European countries?
- What are the weaknesses of Estonia’s integration to Western security institutions, if any?

Interviewees might have insufficient or false memories, forget to reveal all aspects of an issue in answering a question, or be reluctant to reveal everything they know. Therefore, official written documentation was used as a significant source to complement the depth interviews. Governments and organizations express themselves through bureaucracy, and in particular through the documentation they produce. An important characteristic of official written docu-

mentation is the fact that a researcher does not have any control over the way a document is formulated. In order to make the information produced in official documents usable, a researcher has to use the methods of selection, interpretation, and comparison of necessary information.³¹ The EU, NATO, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Estonia, and the Ministry of Defense of Estonia produced the documentation used in researching this paper.

The next chapter introduces the historical background for Estonian security policy from 1918–1939, before the country was incorporated into the Soviet Union. It reveals that Estonia was a neutral state during this period of time. The chapter also demonstrates that neutrality was not a valid security policy option for the country after regaining independence. Chapter Two focuses on Estonian regional military cooperation in the 1990s. Estonia maintained close ties with Finland and the Baltic states. This chapter explains the reasons why regional cooperation was an insufficient solution to serve the security interests of Estonia. The nation's main security interest was to acquire defense against Russia. Hannes Walter, a former head official in the Estonian Ministry of Defense wrote in December 1993, "There is only one state in the world influential politicians of which have publicly threatened to eliminate the Republic of Estonia; to say bluntly that Estonia needs a defense against the Russian threat is not an unfriendly act but acknowledgement of reality."³² The third chapter discusses the U.S.-Baltic relationship. It demonstrates that there was mutual interest in the last round of NATO enlargement: the Baltic states were interested in becoming members of the Alliance, and at the same time the United States focused on helping the Baltic countries through the accession process. The chapter explains the reasons why the U.S. supported NATO expansion to the east and the Baltic states' integration into Western security institutions. The final chapter points out that integration into Western security structures was the best security policy option for Estonia, and discusses the advantages and disadvantages of Estonia's integration into Western security institutions.

CHAPTER 1

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Introduction

This chapter will show that Estonia's desire for independence is an enduring phenomenon. It also demonstrates, according to the tenets of small state theory, that it is difficult for a small neutral country to remain independent when facing larger neighboring powers that have geopolitical interests and want to expand their territories in the region where the small state is situated. To demonstrate this, the first section of this chapter deals with Estonia's geopolitical position, revealing the country's vulnerability *vis-à-vis* Russia. The second section of the chapter provides an overview of Estonia's independence in the interwar period, and the attempts made at that time to initiate regional security cooperation. As these attempts failed, Estonia became a strictly neutral country. The third section explains Estonia's neutrality option and the reasons for the Soviet Union's annexation of the country. The fourth section of the chapter discusses the fifty-year Soviet occupation that Estonia suffered, during which period there remained a strong desire for independence. The fifth and final section of the chapter will show that neutrality was not a valid security policy option for the country after regaining independence.

Estonia's Geo-strategic Location

Geo-strategic location is an important constraint on a state's survival. States cannot choose their neighbors. Since their location is constant, they must find the best ways and means of getting along with their neighbors, particularly the most powerful ones. Hence, interactions among states, as well as friendships and enmities among them, are determined largely by geo-strategic realities.¹

Estonia's geographical position has played a crucial part in shaping its history. The country is located in northeastern Europe, bordering the Baltic Sea to the west and the Gulf of Finland to the north. The length of its coastline is 3,794 kilometers. The countries bordering Estonia include Latvia to the south and Russia to the east. The length of the border shared with Latvia is 339 kilometers, and that shared with Russia is 294 kilometers. In economic terms,

Estonia's location has offered throughout its history excellent opportunities for transit and trade across the Baltic Sea. Due to this geopolitical position, the country was occupied by foreign rulers from the thirteenth century onwards: by the Germans, the Danes, the Poles, the Swedes, and the Russians. The twentieth century witnessed both Soviet and German occupations.²

Estonia proclaimed independence from Russia on 24 February 1918.³ The roots of Estonian independence date back to the nationalist awakening of the 1860s, and even to the agrarian reforms and educational advances of the first half of the nineteenth century.⁴ In 1918, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania all had to protect their newly gained independence and fight both Russian and German forces in order to remain independent states.⁵ In late February 1918, Estonia was occupied by Germany. The occupation lasted until November of that year. The end of German rule left only a temporary power vacuum. In late November 1918, Soviet Russia began a broad military offensive to recover the areas of the former Russian empire that had been taken under German occupation.⁶ This marked the outbreak of the Estonian War of Independence, which lasted until February 1920.⁷ In that war, Estonia was aided by the British and the Finnish governments.⁸ This could be considered to be one of the earliest cases of independent Estonia cooperating with other states in security matters. During their wars of independence the Baltic states also cooperated with each other; their military and political leaders had regular meetings to discuss mutual concerns aimed at winning independence from Soviet Russia.⁹

The Period of Independence and Regional Cooperation

Due to the fact that Great Britain had contributed decisively to Estonian independence during the War of Independence (1918–1920), Estonia suffered from the illusion that this relationship, which was of great importance to it, was equally important to Britain. Throughout the period of independence, the leaders of Estonia were convinced—despite Britain's formal statements to the contrary—that, should the need arise, Britain could be counted on to come to Estonia's defense. Despite maintaining economic relations with Estonia, Britain refused to commit itself to Estonian defense.¹⁰

The single overwhelming theme that dominated Estonian security policy in the 1920s and the 1930s was the preservation of the country's independence.¹¹ During the early years of its independence, Estonia tried to develop diplomatic ties with neighboring countries as well as with existing superpowers. The objective was to mitigate its tenuous geographic and strategic position, thereby allowing Estonia to enjoy sovereignty in the international system.¹² In the 1920s, the most promising source of support for Estonian independence was thought to be a regional alliance, combined with membership in the League of

Nations. Hence, Estonia joined the League of Nations on 21 September 1921, and tried to initiate regional political and military cooperation with the other Baltic republics.¹³

At the beginning of the 1920s, the creation of a Baltic union was declared to be a high priority by all Baltic states. This union was supposed to consist not only of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania but also of Finland and Poland.¹⁴ In 1920, the five countries approved the concept of a defensive military accord and a regional non-aggression pact. A treaty was drawn up, and would have gone into effect if all five states had approved it by 15 December 1920. However, in 1920, Polish forces occupied the Vilnius district, depriving Lithuania of its historic capital and largest city, and creating a permanent source of contention between the two countries, as well as removing Lithuania's common frontier with Soviet Russia.¹⁵ This conflict between Lithuania and Poland destroyed any prospect for the treaty to be formally approved by the deadline. The conflict made Baltic military and political cooperation difficult, and prevented any real alliance from taking shape.¹⁶ After failing to create a broad military alliance, Estonia and Latvia decided to proceed with bilateral arrangements. They concluded a pact in July 1921, which was meant to establish military cooperation, but in reality it did not lead to common defense plans.¹⁷

The Neutrality Option

In the 1930s, with the rise of Nazi Germany and a revived USSR, Estonia faced new security dilemmas. It had the choice to form an alliance with Germany or the Soviet Union, create a smaller Baltic union, or remain neutral.¹⁸ Estonia did not want to ally with either one of the large neighboring powers, and decided to base its security policy on strict neutrality.¹⁹ The country also found it necessary to conclude cautious non-aggression pacts with both the USSR (1932) and Germany (1939).

Nevertheless, in September 1934 a narrow "Baltic entente" among Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania emerged. The "Treaty of Good Understanding and Cooperation," signed by the three Baltic states for an initial ten-year period, called for periodic conferences among their foreign ministers and consultation on foreign policy matters. However, this entente made no provisions for common defense, and did not establish a military alliance. For most of the interwar period, the Baltic states practiced only limited cooperation, and their political and economic ties remained weak.²⁰

In the 1930s, neutral Estonia also had a brief period of bilateral security cooperation with Finland. The countries reconstructed the Tsarist naval batteries on both sides of the Gulf of Finland. The coastal artillery was supposed to be a menace to the operations of the Soviet Union's vessels.²¹ Reconstruction of the

naval batteries, however, was the full extent of the partnership; it did not evolve into a military alliance.

During the era of Estonian independence (1918–1939), the country had no significant cooperation in security or defense matters with other countries. Attempts to form a Baltic union had failed, and all other arrangements and alliances did not contain military dimensions. Estonia remained a strictly neutral country.

European stability, and hence the security of the Baltic region, suffered a severe setback with the Munich Agreement of September 1938. In an attempt to satisfy Hitler's territorial demands in Europe peacefully, the Western powers acceded to the dismemberment of Czechoslovakia. It quickly became clear that Hitler would also demand new arrangements for other areas lost by Germany after World War I. Soon after German troops marched into Prague in March 1939, Berlin demanded that Lithuania surrender the Klaipeda district to Germany. Fearing German occupation of the whole country, Lithuania complied. The Western powers—namely Great Britain and France, upon whom the Baltic countries relied for their security—did little to protest this course of events. To France and Great Britain, it was Poland's security, rather than that of the Baltic countries, that was the key to maintaining peace in Europe. The Baltic republics remained caught between the USSR and Nazi Germany, who appeared to be moving steadily towards war.²²

Hitler had long expressed interest in the Baltic region; accordingly, the Soviet Union began looking for ways to fortify its Western border, and increasingly regarded the Baltic states as an important buffer zone against a possible German attack. In the spring and summer of 1939, the Baltic states became pawns in the diplomatic negotiations of the major European powers. Covert negotiations between the Soviet Union and Germany resulted in the signing on 23 August 1939 of a non-aggression pact—the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact.²³

For Hitler, the pact meant the prevention of Soviet interference in the upcoming German-Polish war. For Stalin, the pact bought time to build Soviet defenses while offering the Soviet Union a sphere of influence in Eastern Europe.²⁴ The secret clause of this pact assigned Finland, Estonia, and Latvia to the Soviet sphere of influence. In September 1939, Lithuania was also transferred to the Soviet sphere in exchange for additional German interests in acquiring the territory of Poland.²⁵ Moscow pressured the Baltic states and Finland to conclude “mutual assistance treaties” that would enable the Red Army to occupy strategic bases on their territory. The Baltic states had to accede to Soviet demands, and a Soviet-Estonian treaty was signed on 28 September 1939. This treaty allowed the Soviets to establish military bases on Estonian soil and station 25,000 Soviet troops.²⁶ This secret protocol of the

Molotov-Ribbentrop pact disregarded Estonian neutrality, as well as Estonia's non-aggression pacts with both Germany and the Soviet Union. As a result, Estonia was forcefully incorporated into the USSR in 1940.

The Fifty-Year Soviet Occupation

The Soviet absorption of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania ended the twenty-two-year period of independence for the Baltic states, and gave Stalin an important buffer zone between the Soviet Union and Germany. Legally elected local governments were replaced by Soviet "people's governments." Soviet-style elections were held, which permitted only one candidate for each post. These elections granted "Soviet-minded" representatives of the working class domination of all seats.²⁷

The Soviet annexation did not, however, diminish Baltic passion for independence.²⁸ Although the Baltic governments decided against armed resistance and gave in to Soviet pressure, allowing the Red Army to occupy their countries, the people of the Baltic states did not welcome Soviet rule. The Soviets knew how insignificant their support in the Baltic countries was, and how strongly the populations of these countries were committed to resisting them. Therefore, they planned a series of repressive measures aimed at breaking any resistance to Soviet rule in the area. In June 1941, massive deportations of native Baltic people to Siberia took place. It is estimated that Soviet repressions and evacuations cost Estonia 61,000 citizens.²⁹ These actions were directed against political, public, and religious figures of the interwar independence period, and more selectively against people suspected of resistance or opposition activities – e.g., making anti-Soviet pronouncements, or simply refusing to cooperate with the Soviet regime. However, the repressive measures proved to be counterproductive, as they contributed to the growth of resistance in terms of both the number of resisters and the determination to resist.³⁰ After the outbreak of war between Germany and the Soviet Union in June 1941, the USSR mobilized approximately 50,000 Estonian men into the Soviet army. Thousands of men fled to the woods to escape from mobilization, and formed an anti-Soviet guerrilla movement.³¹ The Estonian voluntary defense organization, known as *Kaitseliit* (Defense League), which went underground after Estonian annexation, played an essential role in organizing partisan resistance against the occupying forces.³² Although the Soviet authorities had confiscated the League's arsenal in the summer of 1940, members succeeded in hiding some of the weapons.³³

By the end of June 1941, Estonia was occupied by Nazi Germany. In the three-year occupation period that followed, about 8,000 Estonians were killed. By 1944, Germany had mobilized about 32,000 Estonians into its army. Dur-

ing the World War II battles of 1944, Estonians mobilized into the Soviet army were fighting Estonians mobilized into the German army. Estonians collaborated with Nazi Germany during the occupation period with the aim of obstructing the return of the Soviet occupation and to re-establish Estonian independence after the end of the war. In March 1944, a National Committee of the Republic of Estonia was formed to resume Estonia's independence. In August 1944, when the Germans were fleeing Estonia and the Soviets had not yet arrived, an Estonian government was formed which proclaimed Estonia's independence. The government also declared Estonia's neutrality in the ongoing war.³⁴ At the end of September 1944, the Soviet armed forces recaptured Tallinn, which marked the beginning of the second Soviet occupation. To escape from the return of Soviet brutality and terror, approximately 70,000 people fled the country.³⁵

Again, massive repressions started to take place. In the period from 1945–1951, mass deportations of native Baltic people took place on an annual basis. The people deported were mostly relatives of the guerrillas or members of families friendly to them, as well as members of the “bourgeoisie.”³⁶ The biggest deportation took place in March 1949, when over 20,000 Estonians were sent to Siberia.³⁷ Partisan warfare against Soviet troops continued. In the early 1950s, the open resistance movement was slowly dying out (even though the last known partisan was not captured until the 1970s). Arrests and deportations diminished the potential reserves of the resistance movement.³⁸ This did not mean, however, that Estonians surrendered to the Soviet regime.

At the same time, however, there were plenty of people who were interested in collaborating with Soviet rule, people who either genuinely believed in communism or were simply careerists. By the first half of the 1950s, however, due to the USSR's antagonistic behavior and acts of terror towards the population of Estonia, the number of people who continued to support the Soviet regime out of socialist idealism lessened.³⁹

Most of the collaborators with the Soviet regime were people who were somehow disadvantaged under the Republic of Estonia; they took advantage of the Soviet regime to launch successful careers and gain influence. There were also people who had realized that if they were to be useful to their country, they had to join the Communist Party, because only Party members could occupy significant positions in the government and national enterprises. The Soviet authorities were well aware of the weakness of their foothold in Estonia. Moscow distrusted the Estonian people as a whole, including the Estonian Communist Party.⁴⁰ By the 1970s, the old methods of shooting or deporting unreliable people of Baltic origin had been replaced by imprisonment (in

penitentiary facilities as well as in psychiatric hospitals) and, in some cases, by exile abroad.⁴¹

Even though some Western countries, such as the United States, never recognized the Soviet takeover of the Baltic states and regarded their statehood as uninterrupted since the establishment of their independence, they did not directly provide military assistance to the Baltic states in their struggle for freedom.⁴² However, during the fifty years of Soviet occupation, Estonia as well as the other Baltic states continued to maintain their consulates in the United States. The active Baltic communities in the U.S., Canada, Australia, and Scandinavia as well as in other European countries tried to draw the attention of the West to the wrongful occupation of the Baltic states. In Washington, the U.S. State Department maintained a separate “Baltic desk” throughout these fifty years, and the Secretary of State congratulated each of the countries on its national day. Starting in 1951, the Voice of America transmitted broadcasts in Baltic languages.⁴³

The “Prague Spring” of 1968 was a significant turning point for Baltic dissidents and nationalists.⁴⁴ The Czechoslovakian initiative to create “socialism with a human face” was seen as a threat by the Soviet Union. The Communist Party of the USSR, in turn, wanted to root out any lingering manifestations of nationalism in the Soviet Union. After 1968, direct contacts between Estonian nationalists and the West began to develop. It became easier for Estonians to travel to Finland and to Soviet satellite countries in Eastern Europe. There were also cultural interactions with the West.⁴⁵

In October 1972, Estonian nationalists presented a joint appeal to the United Nations, listing Soviet abuses of human and political rights, and demanded the restoration of Estonian independence. The appeal had no effect. By the end of the 1970s, dissident groups in the three Baltic states had started to coordinate their activities. The first exercise in unified Baltic action was a joint Baltic petition on 23 August 1979 (on the 40th anniversary of the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact) to foreign governments, the USSR, and the Secretary-General of the United Nations. The declaration demanded that the text of the pact, along with its secret protocol, be published.⁴⁶ This initiative also had no effect; nevertheless, it marked a new departure in Baltic dissident politics. For the first time since the cessation of armed resistance to Soviet rule, the Baltic dissident movements overtly committed themselves to the cause of the restoration of their independence, only this time using peaceful means.⁴⁷

In 1975, the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe met in Helsinki to discuss issues relating to security in Europe and other topics of interest, such as cooperation in the fields of economy, science, technology, environment, education, and tourism.⁴⁸ The participating states also agreed on their

mutual respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the freedom of thought, conscience, and religion or belief.⁴⁹ They agreed to promote and encourage the exercise of civil, political, economic, social, cultural, and other rights and freedoms, and thereby recognized their universal significance.⁵⁰ The USSR and the Eastern bloc countries were also signatories of the Act, which consisted of an agreement between the Western and Eastern countries that obliged all of the signatories, including the USSR, to respect the human rights of their citizens.

Throughout the fifty years of Soviet occupation, Estonia maintained its national identity; people were reluctant to bury their historical memory. Nationalism in Estonia was connected to interest in folklore, culture, and local history.⁵¹ The country had memories of its independence, and the legacy of its pre-Soviet civic culture and democracy.⁵² As Jakob Hurt stated, “If we should not become great by our strength or our numbers, then we must become great by our spirit, our culture. A nation that is culturally strong and wealthy cannot be stripped of its national identity.”⁵³ This principle sustained Estonians during decades of Soviet rule. During the Soviet occupation, Estonians continued to hold Song Festivals every four years, a tradition that Estonians have cherished since 1869.⁵⁴

In 1985, Mikhail Gorbachev, the new leader of the USSR, announced the need for reforms through the policies of *Perestroika* (restructuring) and *Glasnost* (openness). The reform movement evoked an enthusiastic response in Estonia where, as a result of *Glasnost*, the country was able to publicly rediscover its history.⁵⁵ *Glasnost* also created an opening for the rebirth of grassroots organizations. In 1986, the Estonian Heritage Society was founded. Its aim was to advocate the necessity of protecting Estonia’s cultural treasures and make public the history of Estonia. In the spring of 1987, the Greens movement joined the Heritage Society.⁵⁶ In Estonia, environmental organizations and issues played an important role in setting up what became its popular front. The issue that activated the Estonian masses was the threat of phosphate mining in northeastern Estonia, which could have resulted in the pollution of 40 percent of the Estonian water supply. The project would have required a major influx of immigrant labor to Estonia, which was perceived as yet another demographic threat to the native population.⁵⁷ Throughout the period of Soviet occupation, Estonia faced immigration from all over the Soviet Union. By 1980, ethnic Estonians made up only 64.5 percent of Estonia’s population.⁵⁸ The “Russification” of the Baltic states was Moscow’s goal. Estonia was a bridge between the USSR and the West. In addition, the Baltic region was more advanced economically and had a relatively high standard of living

in comparison to any other region in the Soviet Union and was, therefore, more attractive to Soviet immigrants.

It quickly became apparent to Moscow that the Baltic people wanted national self-determination. From 1988–1990, the grass-roots social movements taking shape in Estonia militated for greater economic, political, and cultural autonomy. The Estonian popular front emerged in April 1988; its goal was to ensure the effective implementation of Moscow's program for restructuring as well as to achieve sovereignty in all areas of life within the context of the Soviet federation.

In the autumn of 1988, the Soviet leadership appointed reform-minded local leaders to positions in the Baltic states. Up until then, Estonia had few native senior administrators. In 1970, for instance, Estonians formed 52 percent of the membership of the Estonian Communist Party, but an appreciable number of these Estonians had grown up in Russia. Even after thirty years in Estonia, many of them still needed to be "re-Estonianized" linguistically as well as culturally.⁵⁹ By late 1988, the authorities in all three republics started to implement changes: national languages were officially made state languages, interwar independence-era national flags and national anthems were revived, and the concept of republic-based citizenship was introduced.⁶⁰ On 16 November 1988, the Estonian Supreme Soviet issued a declaration on Estonian sovereignty. The document did not declare Estonia's secession from the USSR, but it claimed special status for the country.⁶¹

From 1989 onwards, Baltic nationalists saw cooperation as a vital component of their efforts to break free from Soviet rule. The Baltic Council of Popular Fronts was formed in July 1989, and thereafter it met on a regular basis to coordinate activities.⁶² On 23 August 1989, in an unprecedented show of solidarity between the peoples of the Baltic states, the popular fronts of the three countries organized up to two million people to form a human chain stretching from Estonia to Lithuania to show their condemnation of the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact.

By the summer of 1989, the leadership of the three republics had adopted laws concerning economic autonomy.⁶³ The dramatic collapse of the Soviet Bloc in Eastern Europe in late 1989 and early 1990 further stimulated Baltic independence efforts. By the end of 1989, the Communist Parties in the Baltic republics found themselves in the paradoxical situation of endorsing independence for their countries. By late 1989, Estonia's incorporation into the Soviet Union in 1940 was officially declared illegal, and local democratic elections were planned for early 1990. In May 1990, the elected Estonian Supreme Soviet—popular front candidates won the majority in the elections—declared the republic to be "in a transition phase toward independence." During the Russian

August putsch in 1991, Estonia's Supreme Soviet seized the opportunity and proclaimed Estonia's independence.

Throughout the fifty-year Soviet occupation period, Estonians possessed strong nationalist sentiments and wanted to break free from Soviet rule. They used both partisan warfare and peaceful means to combat the Moscow regime. Estonians believed they could re-establish their independent statehood, even in the wake of the failed effort of 1944. During the Soviet occupation, many Estonians were organized in dissident and nationalist movements. In the late 1970s, they started to cooperate with similar groups in the other Baltic states. With the launch of Gorbachev's reform policies (*Glasnost* and *Perestroika*) in the middle of the 1980s, Estonians started to support the option of becoming an autonomous member state of the USSR. At that time, independent statehood did not seem attainable; however, it became an overt aim of Estonian leaders by the end of 1989.

After regaining independence on 20 August 1991, Estonia needed to take security measures to protect its newly acquired independence. Russia was perceived as the main security threat.⁶⁴ This meant that Estonia needed to build national defense forces from scratch, without having proper facilities or personnel available. During the period of Soviet annexation, Estonia had neither an independent security policy nor its own defense forces, as it was part of the Soviet Union. The Soviet armed forces had several military bases on Estonian soil, including a nuclear base in the vicinity of the Estonian capital. Young Estonian men were obliged to serve as conscripts in these new Estonian forces, yet at the same time there were also Estonian officers in the Soviet armed forces.⁶⁵

Newly independent Estonia faced new security dilemmas, and had to chart a course for its security policy. In the introductory part of this work, I pointed out that, at the beginning of the 1990s, there were three main security policy options available for Estonia. One of the alternatives was to remain a neutral power.

The Neutrality Option after Estonia Regained Independence

The idea of neutrality met with considerable sympathy in Estonia, especially right before the nation regained independence, because in the interwar period the country had been neutral.⁶⁶ Estonian political scientist Rein Taagepera thought that, in foreign policy, a newly independent Estonia would most likely maintain a neutral stance as long as Sweden and Finland did. If Russian military bases remained in Estonia, the country's neutrality would inevitably be imperfect. However, balancing the Russian military presence by making military commitments in the Western direction could only complicate matters and

delay eventual Russian disengagement from Estonia. Taagepera believed that if a blatantly nationalist and expansionist dictatorship was established in Russia, then Estonia might seek security guarantees through Western alliances.⁶⁷

The fact that a country is neutral does not necessarily mean that it is demilitarized (witness the example of Switzerland).⁶⁸ There were, however, doubts about whether Estonia and the other Baltic states needed armed forces after all. These doubts were due to the fact that their territory seemed to be almost impossible to protect. It is often claimed that the geopolitical and military situation of the three Baltic states is such that military means cannot play any important role in their security policy—resistance would be futile should a Russian attack occur.⁶⁹ Michael Mosser claims that the overwhelming dilemma of small states is their inability to protect themselves either militarily or economically against intrusion by larger and stronger powers.⁷⁰ The military dimension would play a minor role in Estonia's security strategy, in large part due to the limited scope of the country's resources.⁷¹ Thus it is believed that Estonia cannot defend itself against external threats by its own means.

Estonia did not, however, choose the path of neutrality, even though its northern neighbors Finland and Sweden are still neutral countries.⁷² The country decided to build its own army. At the beginning of the 1990s, there were still Russian troops stationed in Estonia, and they remained in the country until the end of August 1994, three years after Estonia regained its independence. The exact number of troops stationed in Estonia at the beginning of the 1990s was debatable; actual figures remained secret, even from the Estonian government. However, it has been estimated that the number of troops was from about 40,000 to 60,000.⁷³ Neutrality is very far from constituting a security guarantee for small states, especially in a case where a small state is in possession of a strategic geopolitical position in which a stronger state is interested.⁷⁴ Furthermore, neutrality is particularly difficult to achieve if there is still an occupying power left in the country.

It has been argued that small states' foreign policy behavior is dependent on a country's particular historical context, on the external, international environment, and on the geopolitical situation.⁷⁵ Estonia had been a neutral state in the interwar period, and even though it had signed non-aggression pacts with the Soviet Union as well as Germany, it still suffered Soviet and German occupation and annexation. In the summer of 1991, during the unofficial USSR-Estonian talks concerning the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Estonian soil, the USSR claimed that full withdrawal would not be possible before the year 2005.⁷⁶ Estonian politicians and security policy experts had no reason to believe that remaining a neutral power would guarantee the nation's sover-

eignty. It was rather believed that a neutral Estonia could be easily manipulated by Russia, and would remain within Russia's sphere of influence.⁷⁷

It is the external environment that largely dictates to a small state its chances of success as a neutral power.⁷⁸ In the 1990s, the only perceptible danger to Estonia was believed to be coming from Russia.⁷⁹ Estonian politicians and security policy experts perceived Russia to be the only tangible source of external threat. The Estonian approach to the question of the presence of Russian troops included making maximum use of widespread international support for the speedy withdrawal of the troops from Estonian soil.⁸⁰

Russia was reluctant to withdraw its troops from Estonia; it even tried to find a new function for them. British Foreign Secretary Douglas Hurd and Russian Foreign Minister Andrei Kozyrev wrote a joint article that appeared in *Izvestia* on 14 December 1993, supporting a Russian peacekeeping role in the former Soviet Union.⁸¹ At that time, Soviet troops still had not left Estonia, and the Estonian political elite saw this proposal as an attempt to deliver the former occupied nations back to the Kremlin's sphere of influence, so that Moscow could carry out its policies in the "near abroad."⁸² It was feared that if Russian forces remained in Estonia, the West would start to question Estonia's independent status and credibility,⁸³ and that it would not be possible for Estonia to make independent security policy choices.⁸⁴ Russia withdrew its troops because of the U.S. administration's determination and will to assist Russia in accelerating the withdrawal of its troops.

Russian strategists and politicians (namely Nikolai Travkin) believe that contemporary Russia's primary mission is to restore its regional power. Since 1993, the main goal of Russian diplomats has not been to obtain support for Russian integration to the West, but rather to seek recognition by Western states of Russia's prerogative to participate in the provision of order and stability in the former Soviet Union member states.⁸⁵ Russia was constantly concerned with the protection of the rights of Russian-speaking minorities in Estonia and Latvia. At the beginning of the 1990s, the relationship between Russia and Estonia was defined by Estonian treatment of the Russian minority and the Russian withdrawal of troops, and the two issues were often interlinked.⁸⁶ As reform-minded Russian security analysts put it, the slowness of the withdrawal of Russian troops from these territories exacerbated anti-Russian sentiments, thereby aggravating the situation of the Russian-speaking population. This in turn led Russians to demand that troops remain indefinitely in these territories to ensure the protection of Russians on Estonian soil.⁸⁷

Alexei G. Arbatov argues that further delay of the withdrawal of the Russian forces would not have improved the situation of the Russian-speaking population in Estonia. On the contrary, the more rapidly the forces withdrew,

the quicker the relations between Russia and the former Soviet republics would improve.

Michael Mastanduno also indicates that, since 1993, Russia has pursued a more assertive foreign policy, most evident in its coercive and interventionist behavior in the “near abroad” and in its desire to influence events in territorially proximate regions.⁸⁸ The decline in Russian prestige and influence was very dramatic, and it took place over such a brief period of time that one would expect Russia to seek, in the wake of the collapse, to restore some elements of its former great-power status and exercise influence as a regional power.⁸⁹

It seems as though the Russian Federation’s policy towards Estonia at the beginning of the 1990s consisted of leaving its forces on Estonian territory indefinitely. This would have made it impossible for Estonia to pursue an independent security policy, as it would have been easy for Russia to execute indirect (if not direct) control over the formulation of Estonian policies. This explains why Estonia did not pursue a neutral security policy. Neutrality was also rejected as an alternative because Estonia had been a neutral country in the interwar period and, since that option had not worked at that time, there was no reason to believe it would work fifty years later. If neutrality failed, Estonia would not have been able to protect its sovereignty by itself.

Estonian leaders did not trust Russia. In the winter of 1991, the Soviet Union, unwilling to accept the Baltic states’ pursuit of independence, used violence in the hope of “taming” the Baltic republics. Russian special forces killed civilians in outbreaks of violence in Vilnius and Riga. These events had occurred before Estonia regained independence, and before the ultimate collapse of the Soviet Union. However, coupled with the fact that Estonia had been annexed by the USSR, and the memory of Soviet violence during the years of occupation, this constituted another reason for Estonian leaders to be cautious of Russia, the legitimate successor of the USSR.

As the Soviet Union dissolved, the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) was established in December 1991 by Russian President Boris Yeltsin and the presidents of Ukraine and Belarus. Led by Kazakhstan, most of the former Soviet republics immediately joined the organization. The CIS was also meant to provide for a unified military-strategic space. After the establishment of the CIS, the Russian military’s preferred position was that the CIS was simply the Soviet Union by another name.⁹⁰ The Baltic states’ aim was to be emancipated from their Soviet past, and an affiliation with the CIS was seen as being contradictory to this goal.⁹¹ For these very reasons, the Baltic states refused to take part in the CIS. Any formal affiliation with the CIS was completely rejected by the mainstream Estonian political forces due to the fear that

the CIS would be a vehicle for a revived Russian imperium.⁹² Estonia had just escaped from one Russian-led union, and was cautious of being pulled into another.

Conclusion

This chapter demonstrated that in its interwar independence period Estonia did not participate in significant security cooperation with other states, and was a strictly neutral country. Nevertheless, neutrality did not help Estonia preserve its independent statehood. In 1940, the country was annexed by the Soviet Union. Throughout the period of Soviet occupation, the desire for freedom and independence was an enduring phenomenon in Estonia.

After regaining independence in August 1991, Estonia faced the challenge of formulating its security policy. One of the alternatives was to remain a neutral country. Despite the country's history of neutrality, at the beginning of the 1990s Estonian politicians and security policy experts did not favor this option. Estonian leaders did not trust Russia, and perceived its huge neighbor to the east as representing Estonia's main security threat. Since neutrality had failed in 1939–1940, there was no reason to believe that it would succeed fifty years later.

Aside from neutrality, Estonia had two other security policy alternatives in the 1990s. It had the choice to cooperate regionally, or to strive for integration into Western security structures. The next chapter deals with the alternative of regional cooperation, and looks in particular at the possibilities of Estonian cooperation with Finland and the two other Baltic states.

CHAPTER 2

ESTONIA'S REGIONAL MILITARY COOPERATION

Introduction

The second security policy option available to Estonia in the 1990s was to participate in a robust framework of regional security cooperation with Finland and the Baltic states. Estonia's cooperation with Finland must be regarded separately from cooperation among the Baltic states. These are two very different issues, due to the fact that Estonia's cooperation with Finland was unilateral and focused primarily on Finnish defense-related assistance to Estonia, such as help in the educational domain and in equipment donation, whereas cooperation with the Baltic states was based on the countries' similar security policy goals to integrate with Western security institutions and on direct military cooperation.

Even though regional cooperation was rejected as the fundamental driver of Estonia's security policy, its appeal can still be explained by small state theory, as Estonia sought to cooperate with its immediate geographic area. The first section of this chapter explains Estonia's security cooperation with Finland, since Estonia and Finland share close relations in security matters. In the 1990s, however, most of the cooperation was in the form of Finnish assistance and donations to Estonian armed forces. The second section gives an overview of Baltic military cooperation. The three Baltic countries identified similar security policy objectives—namely, to integrate into the Western security system—and decided to cooperate in achieving this objective. Both sections will give reasons why security cooperation with Finland and the Baltic states was not sufficient to serve the security interests of Estonia.

Cooperation with Finland

According to Vahur Made, Estonia and Finland are not competitors in matters of security: the increase in one country's sense of security also increases the other's sense of security.¹ This compatibility can be explained by history, geography, and culture. Estonia and Finland share the same (coastal) border,

as well as the same ethnic origin—the population of both countries is considered to be ethnically Finno-Ugric. Furthermore, the countries' national languages belong to the same linguistic group and are very similar. To some extent, the two countries also share the same history, as both countries were part of the Russian empire up until 1917–18.² Moreover, both countries fought their wars of independence against Russia and helped each other in their wars of independence.

The secret protocol of the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact assigned Estonia and Finland (as well as Latvia and Lithuania) to the Soviet sphere of influence. Moscow pressured all of these countries to sign “mutual assistance treaties” that would enable the Red Army to occupy strategic bases in the countries. Estonia and the other Baltic states acceded to Soviet demands, and were eventually annexed by the USSR, whereas Finland resolutely rebuffed similar Soviet demands, decided to confront its Eastern neighbor, and went to war to preserve its independence.

Estonian political scientist Rein Taagepera believes that Estonians submitted to the Soviet Union's demands in 1939 because of their past. For centuries, Estonian peasants had been ruled by foreign rulers; they had been serfs to their foreign lords. Even though Finnish peasants were also ruled by foreign rulers, they had always enjoyed a relatively higher level of autonomy, and were more independent and opinionated. According to Taagepera, history had a different impact on the political behavior of Estonians and Finns; while the former yielded to the Soviet rule, the latter fought the USSR. As a consequence, Estonians were annexed by the Soviet Union, while the Finns preserved their independent statehood.³ Taagepera's argument theorizes that Estonians have a more servile mentality than the Finns. If this theory were valid, then it would be difficult to explain why Estonians fought a war of independence against Soviet Russia in 1918. This constitutes a weakness in Taagepera's psychological explanation of the differences between the two countries.

Estonia and Finland have never once had an armed conflict. On the contrary, close contacts between the two countries are believed to be essential on both shores of the Gulf of Finland. During the 1939 war between Finland and the Soviet Union (the Winter War), Estonia's official position was to remain neutral, although hundreds of Estonian volunteers participated in the conflict on the Finnish side.⁴ Soviet Socialist Estonia and Finland did not cooperate too closely, since Finland's foreign policy was guided by the necessity to maintain a good and trusting relationship with the Soviet Union.

During the Soviet era, northern Estonians were able to watch Finnish television and listen to Finnish radio⁵; by 1964, thousands of Estonian tourists were able to enjoy the short ferry trip from Estonia to Finland, and even more

Finns were able to visit Estonia. This close cultural affinity to Finland, along with the ties that were cultivated during the Soviet era, has helped Estonia to attract significant Finnish investment since 1991.⁶ At the end of the 1980s, Finland was cautious in supporting Estonia's pursuit of independence, again because it wanted to preserve good relations with Moscow. Once Estonia re-established its independence, Finland started to actively support Estonia in solidifying this status. Since the 1990s, after Estonia regained its independence, Estonia and Finland have cooperated in many fields. In 1993, Finland became the major trading partner for Estonia, both in terms of import and export of goods.⁷

Estonian-Finnish security cooperation started in 1992, as Estonia had sought support from Finland regarding security and defense issues immediately after regaining its independence. The cooperation mainly took the form of Finland providing training assistance, because proper officer education was not yet available in Estonia.⁸ According to Finnish legislation, it was not possible to send salaried personnel abroad for training purposes; nevertheless, Finnish defense forces began the education of Estonian officers and non-commissioned officers (NCOs) in Finland.⁹ The reason the Finns provided training assistance to Estonia is due to the fact that Estonia is often viewed as the southern flank of Finnish defense.¹⁰ At the beginning of 1996, Estonia made a new request to Finland concerning the development of possible cooperation in defense issues. By that time, Finnish legislation allowed for expert advisers to function in Estonia, and the training of Estonian personnel in Finland was also continued. In 1996, Finland commenced the "Estonian Project," whereby Finland aided Estonia in building its defense capability. The "Estonian Project" was a project of assistance; it was foreseen to run until the end of 2003. The project was established to support the development of Estonian national defense; however, its aim was never to replace the Estonian defense system with the Finnish one. The purpose was to guide Estonians by helping them find the most suitable procedures and principles for Estonia by using Finland as an example.¹¹ A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between Estonia and Finland dealing with security cooperation was signed on 29 January 1998, and revised on 26 May 2003. Finland assisted the Estonian defense forces by giving expert advice in the fields of operational planning, mobilization systems, communications systems, logistics, staff planning, environmental protection, etc. Finland also donated some military equipment to Estonia and aided Estonia in the area of military training and education. All of this cooperation took place under the rubric of the "Estonian Project."

In the period from 1996 to 2003, approximately 1,200 Estonians (military officers, NCOs, and civilian public servants occupied in the defense sector)

participated in the training offered by Finland. Since 1992, about 450 Estonian cadets and officers have attended Finnish military education institutions. Four special high-level courses were offered to strategic-level officers of the Estonian armed forces; a total of twenty-one officers attended these courses, including the current Chief of Defense of Estonia. More Estonian officers have obtained officer basic education in Finnish military educational institutions than in any other country's military educational establishments. The total amount is as high as 60 percent.¹²

The "Estonian Project" was funded by the Finnish Ministry of Foreign Affairs (the total cost of the project over the years was 2.5 million EUR), and was managed by Finnish reserve officers. After the termination of the project at the end of 2003, Estonia and Finland funded their bilateral cooperation through the budgets of their defense staffs; Estonia is financing its share, and on the Finnish side the coordinators are no longer reserve officers but active-duty officers. The fact that the two countries share responsibility for funding the cooperation—and that the Finnish Defense Staff (as opposed to reserve officers) is now directly involved in the effort—shows that the cooperation that is now taking place is no longer a one-way assistance program but rather an instance of mutual collaboration.

After several years of assistance, the Estonian armed forces were able to function on their own, and the "Estonian Project" was terminated as planned at the end of 2003. Currently, according to the bilateral MOU signed between Estonia and Finland in May 2003, the aim of the countries' "regular" security cooperation is to collaborate in military training and education of military and civilian personnel, as well as in legal aspects, armed forces organization, and the structure and equipment of military units. The MOU also stipulates that cooperation should be maintained in personnel management, environmental issues, military medical services, and, furthermore, in participation in military exercises, procurement of weapons, equipment and other materiel, military geography, and military history. The goal is also to have intensive bilateral unit-to-unit cooperation.¹³ For instance, due to the fact that Estonia lacks suitable air defense training facilities, Finland is offering the possibility for Estonian soldiers and officers to practice on its training grounds. Finland has also offered the use of its training grounds for the Estonian artillery unit.¹⁴ Bilateral inter-ministerial politico-military talks take place on an annual basis, and each year a detailed cooperation plan is signed, laying out the activities for the following year.¹⁵

Estonia simulated Finland's security policy in many aspects. Due to the lack of experience of Estonian defense planners in the first years of independence, the Estonian political and military leadership opted to build a defense

organization similar to that of Finland and other Nordic countries.¹⁶ For instance, Estonia adopted the total defense concept as the cornerstone of its security strategy.

The total defense concept is based on two main components—military and civil defense—which are supported by three subcomponents: economic, civil, and psychological readiness. Military defense is the backbone of total defense, and consists of a country's armed forces. The aim of military defense is to deter aggression and maintain operational readiness in order to defend a country against an armed attack. Civil defense embraces the society as a whole; it consists of a diverse range of activities, such as health and emergency services, supply of power, and other actions taken by a society to strengthen its capacity to deal with states of heightened alert and war. The purpose of economic defense is to build a strong economy that will not break down in times of crisis or war. It includes maintaining stockpiles of resources to support the economy during crises and assure the population's survival. Psychological readiness entails the population's preparedness to defend their country's sovereignty—being loyal and committed to the country and having pride in it. The objective of civil readiness is to preserve national unity, maintain the operation of society in times of crisis or war, and guarantee the optimal usage of resources for the successful conduct of national defense.¹⁷ Countries following the total defense concept tend to base their armies largely on conscription.

At the beginning of the 1990s, Estonian military officers and the majority of Estonian politicians believed that adopting the total defense concept would be a suitable option for Estonia.¹⁸ The Nordic countries propagated the concept of total defense by arranging seminars for political and military leaders from the Baltic states.¹⁹ At the onset of the 1990s, the security dilemmas Estonia faced were not of a technical, but rather of an existential nature. The total defense concept was chosen since Estonia did not have any other country or organization to rely on in times of need.²⁰ An increasing number of Estonian military officers had obtained their education in Finnish military educational institutions (the first graduates of Finnish military educational establishments started service in 1994). At that time, there was a lack of educated officers; therefore, the first graduates were promoted rapidly, and they started carrying out their duties, including working on conceptual documents concerning Estonian security and defense that are normally off-limits for officers until they have served for several years.²¹ Due to the fact that these military officers had a Finnish educational background, they favored the Finnish defense system, including the total defense concept.

The choice of using the Finnish model of defense organization did not pose any major problems until 1993, when Estonia started to look seriously at the

option of becoming a NATO member. It was then considered very important to develop Estonian defense forces in accordance with NATO standards. However, there was a shortage of information on what was actually needed for successful integration into NATO and what the NATO standards actually were.²²

During the course of Estonian-Finnish military cooperation in the 1990s, the intensity in the level of cooperation varied. These fluctuations were caused primarily by the Estonian authorities' inability to find a solution that satisfied the requirements arising from the imperative of self-defense as well as from the desire to eventually join NATO. There were senior Estonian military officers who doubted the Finnish model of defense organization. For instance, General Alexander Einsehn, the first Chief of the Estonian Defense Forces,²³ distrusted the total defense concept and the Finnish course of officer education, seeing them as incompatible with Estonia's long-term goal to join NATO.²⁴ He succeeded in opening channels for Western military know-how to enter Estonia, even before the launch of NATO's Partnership for Peace (PfP) program.²⁵ General Einsehn did not, however, propose an alternative security vision for Estonia. After his resignation in 1995, the Estonian defense forces returned to their earlier "total defense"-based thinking. Total defense was stipulated as the basis of national defense and military strategy, and was officially approved in February 2001.²⁶

The new military strategy adopted by the Estonian government in January 2005 emphasizes the importance of collective defense, which is currently the main security concept for NATO.²⁷ According to Finnish security analyst Max Jakobson, there is no contradiction in Estonia securing its own territory (through total defense) and cooperating with NATO (via collective defense). According to him, securing its national territory should be the priority for every NATO member state; collective defense within NATO only reinforces the security of member states.²⁸

It can be argued, however, that the total defense concept is to a large extent a legacy of the Cold War. In terms of defense planning, it implies preparation for a full-scale, all-out war, encompassing total mobilization of national resources, large armies of conscripts, large reserves, large National Guard organizations, territorial defense operations, and ultimately guerrilla warfare. Meanwhile, in the modern world, the likelihood of such a war is very low.²⁹ The modern world faces new asymmetric security threats, such as the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, terrorism, drug trafficking, and illegal immigration.

Estonian politicians and security policy experts started to question the total defense concept because of a changed threat scenario³⁰ and the country's

status as a member of PfP.³¹ NATO was focusing on collective defense; hence large expenditures on total defense did not seem to be justified, as these resources were needed elsewhere. Estonia had decided to participate in international peace operations in order to show its partners its capability to contribute to international peace and security. At the beginning of the 1990s, there were only Finnish security advisers present in Estonia; by the time Estonian politicians started to question the total defense concept, advisers from the U.S. and the U.K. resided in Estonia as well. The suggestions and advice from these advisers could also explain the shift in Estonian politicians' support regarding total defense.³²

Security cooperation with Finland was very important to Estonia in the 1990s, and it played a crucial role in helping to create the Estonian defense forces. However, Estonia had already identified integration into Western security structures as its main security policy goal, and therefore it did not see cooperation with Finland (or reliance solely on its own new defense forces) as feasible security guarantees. In any case, most of the cooperation between the two countries took the form of Finland providing assistance to Estonia. As Estonia's security policy aim was integration into Western security structures, including NATO, its defense forces strived to achieve NATO standards for interoperability. NATO favors collective defense. The Alliance's 1999 Defense Capabilities Initiative emphasizes notions such as deployability (rapid deployment), sustainability of operations, and interoperability, mirroring NATO's lessons learned from the Bosnian conflict.³³ NATO ceased to see the justification for huge mass armies, and set the same standards of deployability, sustainability, and interoperability for PfP member countries as well. The total defense approach is incompatible with these NATO standards; few countries would have enough resources to follow both the total defense and collective defense concepts.³⁴ Furthermore, only collective defense can assure Estonia's security. The country by itself cannot offer a credible deterrent or defend its territory.³⁵

Estonians were striving for collective defense and North Atlantic Treaty Article V protection, which stipulates that an armed attack against one or more NATO member states in Europe or North America shall be considered as an attack against all NATO member countries. If such an armed attack occurs, each of the member states will assist the country/countries attacked by taking whatever action is deemed necessary, including the use of armed forces to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area. Cooperation with Finland would not have provided Estonia with similar benefits. Cooperation with Finland was seen as a phase in the integration process to Western security

institutions; it was not an alternative, as it would not have been a sufficient security guarantee for Estonia.³⁶

Close security cooperation with Finland would have been impossible due to the chosen course of Finnish security policy—the fact that Finland is a neutral country. Estonia received military assistance and know-how from Finland, and cooperated with it in a multilateral environment, through the North Atlantic Cooperation Council (NACC), PfP, and the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC).³⁷ Due to Finland's neutrality, however, it would not have been possible for Estonia to form a military alliance with Finland for the provision of security. At the beginning of the twenty-first century, Finland is starting to question its neutral status. The 2004 Finnish Security and Defense Policy Report places profound emphasis on international military cooperation; the document also states that, in order to ensure international military cooperation, the Finnish defense forces' standards of operational and equipment interoperability will be developed according to NATO standards and norms.³⁸

Finland is cautiously considering possible NATO membership in the future. Now that Finnish politicians are debating the issue of NATO membership, Estonia is in turn determined to assist Finland if needed. Five months after gaining NATO membership, in September 2004 Estonia acquired the role of being a contact NATO member state for Finland. This is not a totally new concept. The previous contact NATO member state for Finland was Italy; during Estonia's NATO accession period, Denmark and Norway served as contact NATO member states for Estonia. Estonia's duties as a contact NATO member state entail regular diplomatic intercourse, briefing the Finns on NATO activities, and furthering the debate in Finland on possible future NATO membership.³⁹

Cooperation with the Baltic States

Before the collapse of the Soviet Union, the three Baltic states cooperated closely in the effort to break free from Soviet rule. In 1990, the Council of the Baltic States was created. Cooperation between the three countries continued once they had regained their independence. In 1993, inter-governmental cooperation of the Baltic states was restored, based on the 1934 Treaty of Good Understanding and Cooperation between Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, according to which foreign ministers of the Baltic states held conferences to discuss foreign policy matters.⁴⁰ The three Baltic republics enjoy close economic ties—both Latvia and Lithuania are among the top ten most important trading partners for Estonia.⁴¹

Russia's heavy-handed approach to Baltic issues in the early 1990s,⁴² together with its deepening domestic political crisis, helped to stimulate the

move towards Baltic cooperation in foreign and security policy.⁴³ Even though there remain cultural differences between the otherwise geographically close three Baltic states, other states tend to treat the Baltic republics as a single unit.⁴⁴ In spite of the differences between the states, their incorporation into the Soviet Union united them, as did the post-Soviet transformation process that each of the states has undergone, and the similar security problems that each of the new republics faced after regaining independence.⁴⁵ For instance, there was a continued presence of Russian troops in all of the Baltic countries, and they wanted to escape Russia's sphere of influence as quickly as possible. All of the Baltic states had tense relations with Russia, though at the same time they depended on Russian energy and raw materials.⁴⁶

Another issue of concern in the early 1990s that was shared by all of the three republics was the formation of their respective security policies. All of the countries identified a similar goal: to integrate into Western security institutions in order to achieve internal and external security. Internal security (soft security) was believed obtainable through membership in the European Union. The EU is Europe's most important soft-security actor, with its enormous economic and political resources, whereas external security (hard security) could be achieved through NATO membership.⁴⁷ None of the three Baltic republics had its own defense forces after breaking away from the USSR; all of them had to start building their forces from scratch. Russia's proximity (and the fact that the Baltic states did not perceive Russia as a friendly state, but as a security threat) further worked as a unifying factor in Baltic security cooperation.

As we have seen in the previous chapter, Baltic cooperation in security matters in the 1920s and 1930s turned out to be a failure, and contributed to the loss of the states' independence. After regaining their independence, the Baltic states were determined to launch cooperative efforts among themselves that would encompass the military domain. Western countries considered increased Baltic cooperation to be a good prospect for the region's strength and stability, and it was also one of the conditions of NATO and EU membership.⁴⁸

The Baltic defense ministers' meeting of 1992 could be considered as the starting point of Baltic military cooperation. The ministers met to discuss the need for the withdrawal of Russian troops from the territories of the Baltic states. It was decided to continue regular meetings on the ministerial level as well as on the level of the Baltic chiefs of defense. The specifics of these meetings would be part of annual cooperation plans between the ministries of defense of the three countries. The ministers also noted that, considering the small size and limited defense capabilities of the armed forces of the three states, it would be wise to conduct joint military training exercises.⁴⁹

The 27 February 1995 multilateral cooperation agreement between the Baltic ministries of defense laid the legal foundation for the Baltic states' military cooperation in the fields of defense and military relations. The agreement envisaged the Baltic states working together to contribute to security and stability in the Baltic region and adjacent countries. It also suggested that the Baltic states cooperate with the United Nations as well as with NATO, the WEU, and their member states; that the Baltic states participate in international agreements on stability and security; and that they integrate with NATO and the WEU, and participate in the PfP program. The republics agreed to exchange operative information with each other as well as share their experiences on the structural organization and manning of the armed forces and ministries. They also agreed to cooperate in training and educating their military officers and public servants working in the military field.⁵⁰

The aim of this cooperation was also to standardize armaments, weapons, equipment, and other logistics. In 1994, a year before the agreement was drawn up, the Baltic states had established a joint infantry battalion (the Baltic Battalion, or BALTBAT) to participate in international peace support operations. The agreement outlined the further development of the Baltic Battalion. It also stipulated that the Baltic states must launch other joint military cooperation projects, such as the creation of a joint airspace control system and a special communication system.⁵¹ The Baltic military cooperation projects grew out of the PfP program. The fact that they operate in the English language and according to NATO standards further added to the NATO interoperability of the Baltic states.

The currently operating Baltic cooperation projects are the Baltic Naval Squadron (BALTRON); the Baltic Air Surveillance Network (BALTNET); and the Baltic Defense College (BALTDFCOL). The Baltic Command, Control, and Information System (BALTCCIS) is currently being set up. BALTBAT was terminated in the autumn of 2003, because the project had fulfilled its initial mission to prove the will and ability of the Baltic republics to work together as well as with other multilateral forces. However, the cooperation of the land forces of the three Baltic states has a different objective; currently, the Baltic states are developing a joint doctrine for their land forces. According to the project description signed by the chiefs of defense of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania in April 2004, the aim of the land forces' cooperation is to implement common NATO-compatible land forces standards by common staff training at the brigade/battalion level among the land forces of the Baltic states in order to facilitate their integration into NATO structures and ensure their readiness to participate in the full spectrum of military operations.⁵²

The Baltic Naval Squadron, a naval force with mine countermeasures capabilities, was formed in April 1998. The aim of the BALTRON project was to promote cooperation, mutual understanding, and interoperability between the Baltic navies and to provide the Baltic states with a maritime force capable of participation in NATO-led peace support operations.⁵³ After the Baltic states' NATO accession on 29 March 2004, BALTRON has served as the platform for training the crews of the ships participating in the project and for conducting joint exercises and ship maintenance. Commencing in the spring of 2005, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania will take part in NATO MCMFORNORTH on a rotational basis⁵⁴—that is, one country's ship at a time. Prior to a ship's service under the command of MCMFORNORTH, it has to have served in BALTRON for at least six months.⁵⁵

The BALTNET project began in April 1998; it was designed to increase the regional air-surveillance capability and improve the efficiency of international cooperation between the civil and military aviation authorities of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. It includes acquisition, coordination, distribution, and display of air surveillance data (Recognized Air Picture) within the three states. The implementation of the project was also aimed at promoting the Baltic states' integration into NATO by achieving NATO interoperability and optimizing the use of resources. With the Baltic states' accession to NATO, BALTNET became part of the NATO air surveillance system, NATINEADS.⁵⁶ This enabled the exchange of mutual Recognized Air Picture data between the Baltic states and the rest of NATO.⁵⁷

The Baltic Defense College was also founded in 1998. It is a joint military educational institution designed to help create a common background for the Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian officer corps. In addition to Baltic officers, many other officers attend the courses; the teaching staff is also composed of Baltic as well as non-Baltic nationals. BALTDEFCOL also organizes courses for Baltic public servants working in the security and foreign relations sector. In autumn 2004, the three Baltic states contacted NATO Allied Command Transformation (ACT) to apply for NATO Center of Excellence status for the BALTDEFCOL Higher Command Studies Course.⁵⁸

The BALTCCIS project, which is still in its preparatory phase, has been led by the German armed forces. Its aim is to provide the armed forces of the Baltic states with the framework for a command, control, and information (C3) System. This plays an important role in the development of modern staff area C3 functionality. Its aim is to provide the armed forces of the Baltic states with the framework for C3 as a nucleus for future military automated data-processing usage throughout the Baltic armed forces. The project will become fully operational in 2005, and will have full NATO C3 compatibility.⁵⁹

All these projects enjoyed wide international support, and more nations were involved in them than just the three Baltic states. The Nordic countries, the U.S., the United Kingdom, Belgium, Germany, France, Poland, Switzerland, and the Netherlands took part in the projects. Baltic military cooperation acted as a litmus test for Western security institutions. It demonstrated the Baltic states' ability to cooperate, not only amongst themselves, but with different partners in various fields of military affairs.⁶⁰

There is yet another actor—the forum of Baltic Security Assistance (BALTSEA)—that played an important role in assisting the Baltic states to develop their security institutions. BALTSEA was established in Oslo in April 1997 based on an agreement among the seventeen BALTSEA members.⁶¹ Since 1997, BALTSEA has played an exceptional role in coordinating the foreign assistance provided by the fourteen supporting states to the Baltic states. BALTSEA was not only an international assistance program; it also promoted security and defense cooperation between member countries. This forum helped the Baltic states with their NATO integration and security and defense policy objectives. BALTSEA also helped develop the joint Baltic military cooperation projects. The main objective of the forum was to streamline—through regular meetings—the efforts of the countries involved in this cooperation and to optimize the use of resources in the Baltic region.⁶² The BALTSEA forum still operates, and provides the member states the possibility to continue their cooperation in an already functioning framework.

Baltic military cooperation was initiated because of the Baltic states' small size, individual weakness, and militarily vulnerability. The creation of Baltic military cooperation projects in the 1990s demonstrated the will of the Baltic states to cooperate in security matters, but also served the purpose of enhancing the countries' national readiness and defense capabilities.⁶³ The main goal of this cooperation was to prepare the Baltic states for NATO accession. Baltic security cooperation was never an alternative to accession to NATO (or the EU), as it was well understood that three weak states do not add up to one strong state.⁶⁴

Baltic military cooperation was seen as a process—not as a goal—by the Baltic states. The target of this cooperation was to achieve the countries' common security policy goal: membership in Western security institutions. Baltic military cooperation projects served as a step toward obtaining this objective. Even though the security policy objective for the Baltic states was NATO accession, Baltic defense cooperation was not foreseen as ending after the republics' integration with NATO. All of the common projects, with one exception (the BALTBAT project) operate even now. After the Baltic countries' NATO accession, the projects have continued to operate inside NATO.

BALTNET forms a part of NATINEADS, while BALTRON will be assigned to serve in MCMFORNORTH. The Baltic Defense College continues to educate officers according to NATO standards, and the Baltic states have applied for a NATO Center of Excellence certification for one of the College's courses.

Despite their outward show of unity and the tendency of other states to treat them as a single unit, tensions exist between the Baltic countries. Lithuania, the largest and militarily most powerful of the Baltic states, has sought a leadership role in Baltic military cooperation, and has very often not been willing to compromise with Latvia and Estonia. For instance, the BALTBAT project was terminated because of Lithuanian unwillingness to proceed with it; Estonia and Latvia would have continued the project. However, the Baltic states realize that in order to make their voice heard, it is useful for them as small countries to cooperate within the framework of NATO, or to form coalitions with other smaller and larger countries on a case-by-case basis.

Conclusion

Even though Estonia cooperated with both Finland and the Baltic countries on security matters in the 1990s, it did not consider regional security cooperation as a viable security guarantee. In the 1990s, cooperation with Finland was mostly one-sided, and took the form of Finnish assistance and donations to the Estonian armed forces. Furthermore, as a neutral state, Finland could not have engaged in too close a form of military cooperation, such as an alliance with Estonia. Cooperation with Latvia and Lithuania was unlike cooperation with Finland. All of the Baltic countries had identified integration into Western security structures as their main security policy objective, and were determined to collaborate to facilitate the integration process. Baltic military cooperation projects served as a tool to reach the Baltic states' common security policy goals.

Regional cooperation was not sufficient to serve the security interests of Estonia as the country strived for North Atlantic Treaty Article V protection. The main reason for this objective was acquiring a security guarantee against Russia. Russia was still perceived as the main (or the only) external security threat facing Estonia in the first half of the 1990s. Therefore, Estonian politicians and security policy experts thought it was best to integrate into Western security structures—the quicker the better—to prevent the events of 1939–40 from happening again.

The following chapter analyzes the last round of North Atlantic Treaty Organization enlargement in March 2004 and the reasoning behind it. It explains

why the United States supported the eastward expansion of NATO and the Baltic states' integration into Western security structures.

CHAPTER 3

THE UNITED STATES AND THE BALTIC REPUBLICS

Introduction

One cannot examine Estonia's option to join Western security institutions without analyzing the United States' desire to see the North Atlantic Treaty Organization expand eastward. This chapter explains the last round of NATO enlargement in March 2004 and the reasoning behind it. More precisely, it explains why the United States supported the expansion of NATO eastward and the Baltic states' integration into Western security structures.

In comparison with major powers, small states have a rather limited capability pool. Their inability to mobilize significant resources for military preparedness and economic growth may give them strong incentives to entrust their security to promises of allied support. Minor powers may seek alliances in order to increase their security on the basis of major power guarantees to protect their territories and population against military aggression. Major powers may be interested in alliances with minor powers in order to expand their military and foreign policy influence or to deny such influence to other states.¹ It should be noted that the last round of NATO enlargement did not take place only because the Baltic states were interested in joining the Alliance; the U.S. was interested in expanding the Alliance as well. In fact, there were mutual interests—on the side of both the U.S. and the aspirants—in enlarging NATO towards the east.²

As was discussed in the previous chapter, the primary security policy objective of the Baltic states was integration into Western security institutions, including NATO accession. Mette Skak has argued that the aim of Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian security policy in the 1990s was emancipation from their Soviet past.³ The goal of the Baltic countries was to leave their Soviet past behind and start over with Western security institutions by their side. The three countries saw full membership in NATO as the best guarantee against dangers from the East. Russia was perceived as the main threat; therefore,

speedy integration with the West was considered to be the best security guarantee.

Douglas Stuart has argued that former president Bill Clinton's campaign for the eastward extension of the North Atlantic Alliance (and his policy of engagement and enlargement altogether) was an important part of a larger effort to steer the American foreign policy debate away from isolationism.⁴ The policy of engagement and enlargement stated that the United States must exercise global leadership, but depending on the challenges and the U.S. interests at stake, America should act either unilaterally, in alliance and partnership, or multilaterally. One of the most important targets of the policy of engagement and enlargement was the expansion of the community of democratic nations by strengthening democratic processes in key emerging democratic states, including the newly independent states of the former Soviet Union.⁵ According to this policy, the U.S. was to direct its efforts toward assisting states that figured in U.S. strategic interests. The new democracies in Central and Eastern Europe were mentioned as examples of states where the U.S. has interests because of their proximity to the democratic powers of Western Europe, their importance to U.S. security, and their potential markets.⁶ The U.S. was interested in the region of Central and Eastern Europe because they wanted these countries to remain democratic and not fall under Russian influence. If Russia had militarily attacked these newly independent states, a U.S. counterattack would have followed.⁷

As a superpower, the United States has always wanted to have control and influence over Europe. In the 1990s, the European Union was trying to set up an independent foreign and security policy—a development that threatened U.S. hegemony. According to James John Tritten, the U.S. government loudly and clearly delivered the message that it preferred that NATO remain the premier organization for the defense of Europe.⁸

It follows that there were many reasons for the United States to promote the expansion of NATO. The U.S. was maximizing its own strength in the unipolar world. It aspired to maintain influence over European foreign and defense policies, and needed new allies to accomplish these goals. There were also domestic political reasons involved, such as intensive lobbying by Baltic-Americans. Finally, we cannot overlook the special relationship that the U.S. and the Baltic states enjoy.

This chapter is divided into three sections. The first section gives a brief overview of the last round of NATO enlargement in March 2004; the second section explains the U.S. desire to maximize its power in the international arena; and the third section explains the domestic political reasons for the United States' support of the last round of NATO enlargement.

The Latest Round of NATO Enlargement in March 2004

The last round of NATO enlargement took place on 29 March 2004, with the accession of seven new member states from Eastern and Central Europe to NATO membership: Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Slovakia, Slovenia, and Romania. The preparations for this round of enlargement had started years before, with the creation of the North Atlantic Cooperation Council (NACC) in 1991 and the launch of the Partnership for Peace (PfP) program in 1994.⁹ As early as 1999, when the Czech Republic, Hungary, and Poland became part of NATO, it was known that NATO enlargement would not be limited to the Visegrad countries.

In 1994, when NATO launched its Partnership for Peace program, Estonia was one of the first countries to join.¹⁰ The aim of the PfP was to bring non-member states into closer cooperation with NATO. It served as NATO's invitation for military cooperation with the NACC member states and with other interested states in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. Its ambition was not to draw new lines of confrontation, but to allow Alliance support for the transformation of non-member military establishments interested in future joint military operations for peaceful purposes, especially in peacekeeping and humanitarian missions.¹¹ The PfP framework was seen as an important step in preparing states for the possibility of full Alliance membership in the future.¹² It was a self-paced and self-selecting program, meaning that it was up to PfP countries to determine the scope of their participation. States whose ultimate goal was NATO membership—as was the case with the Baltic states—would begin with the PfP. In return, this program would allow them to shape their military doctrines and practices to NATO standards according to their own timetables and resources. Russian politicians, however, believed (or wanted to believe) that the launch of the PfP program would postpone any future rounds of NATO enlargement.¹³ It was clear from the start that the PfP would not satisfy the security policy goals of Estonia or the other Baltic states. These countries were looking for North Atlantic Treaty's Article V security guarantees, and PfP was simply a framework for cooperation—not an alliance for providing collective defense.

The three Baltic states were invited to join NATO at the Prague Summit of 2002, despite Russia's objections. It should be noted that the Baltic states were already members of NACC (later EAPC) and the PfP program. Russia was concerned by the further plans of the U.S. administration, which involved a new round of NATO expansion.¹⁴ If it had been up to Russia, or if the West had given in to Russia's wishes not to enlarge NATO to include member states from the former Soviet Union, the latest round of NATO enlargement would

not have taken place at all (or, if it had, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania would have not been on the list of invitees).

Russian politicians as well as security analysts mostly opposed NATO enlargement. Russia saw the Baltic states' desire to join NATO as destabilizing; it was believed that East European states accession to NATO would deliver a mortal blow to European security.¹⁵ NATO enlargement to Russia's Western border (with the Baltic states) was perceived as a political affront and a threat to Russian security. Although Russia did not approve of the enlargement, the country no longer considered NATO as an enemy.¹⁶ However, the country's attitude *vis-à-vis* NATO enlargement remains uncertain. Official rhetoric aside, it could be said that Russia was not sure whether NATO was a partner or a potential adversary.¹⁷ The West was aware of Russia's distrust and concerns about the enlargement process.¹⁸ However, even though it was argued that accepting the Baltic states into NATO would damage the good relations between Russia and the West, NATO still proceeded with enlargement.

The U.S. administration championed the enlargement process, and together with the Nordic NATO member countries (Denmark and Norway), it was the principal supporter of the Baltic states' accession to the Alliance. The U.S. looked to the Nordic states for advice and ideas on how to craft U.S. strategy towards the Baltic states. This is because the Nordic countries knew the region better than the United States, and understood the importance of greater U.S. involvement.¹⁹ Denmark and Norway had also been in a position similar to that the Baltic states found themselves in the 1990s after the end of World War II. Both countries had been occupied by Nazi Germany between 1940–45, and opted to join NATO when it was founded in 1949 because both Denmark and Norway believed that the alliance could offer them security guarantees that they could not obtain through any other security arrangement.²⁰

International Reasons for the U.S. to Support the Last Round of NATO Enlargement

Maximizing Strength and Making New Allies

The United States' interest in NATO expansion arose from its status in world politics—we find ourselves in the post-Cold War era living in a unipolar world.²¹ According to the neorealist approach, in a unipolar world states will try to increase their own strength when faced with unbalanced power.²² As the sole remaining superpower, the U.S. would therefore try to establish a world order that reflects American values.²³ There is no doubt that the U.S. perceives itself as the global hegemon that intends to secure its position in the world.²⁴ This is why it is interested in spreading American values to the rest of the

world. The most important “American value,” in this context, is democracy. The spread of democracy, at least within the discourse of U.S. foreign policy, is what the U.S. was striving for when it supported the last round of NATO enlargement. The U.S. wanted to extend the zone of peace and stability; it also wanted a unified Europe in order to achieve security and stability in the old continent as a whole.²⁵ Josef Joffe has argued that, if NATO expansion had ended with the accession of the Visegrad countries, it would have been a signal to Russia to absorb the rest of the potential members in Europe (including the Baltic states) into its sphere of power.²⁶

The campaign of NATO enlargement was actually started by Germany; the idea was then taken over by the politicians in the United States, who gradually became the biggest proponents of the alliance’s expansion.²⁷ President Bill Clinton’s foreign policy of engagement and enlargement, touched on in the introductory part of the chapter, is a good example of the support given by the U.S. to the process of NATO’s eastward expansion.

Even though the U.S. remains the world’s only military superpower, and is the inescapable leader of NATO (if it chooses to be), it is now both politically and economically less able and willing to act alone. Jan Lodol has argued that many national goals can be achieved only by organizing a strong coalition devoted to advancing the common interest.²⁸ In today’s world of new asymmetric threats, the U.S. is better served by coalitions that are strong enough to control the emerging new threats of terrorism and proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. The ongoing Operation Iraqi Freedom could, to some extent, serve as an example of how the powerful U.S. might work together with some of its allies, especially those who are unwilling or incapable to challenge U.S. policies. None of the members of the coalition, except the United Kingdom, is militarily strong. Most of the coalition members regard their support for the U.S.-led effort as a bargain for their own security interests—if those countries support the U.S. now, they expect the U.S. to support them in their time of need.

The United States’ choice of partners and allies is of critical importance.²⁹ The same notion figured prominently in President Clinton’s engagement and enlargement policy; durable relationships with allies and other friendly nations were seen as an important element of U.S. security preparedness.³⁰ By making new allies, the U.S. in effect widens the framework of countries where it (or NATO) could set up military bases when needed.³¹ As a matter of fact, as early as 1991 the U.S. security strategy emphasized the importance of alliances and solidarity with allies.³²

The US has special relationships with several of the new NATO member states.³³ For instance, several of these states are participating in the U.S.-led

Operation Iraqi Freedom. New NATO member states were liberated from Soviet control by the successful end of the Cold War. For those countries, the goal of eliminating Saddam Hussein—a despotic dictator—from power seemed more compelling than for many Western European countries, which for decades had enjoyed peace, democracy, and financial well-being.³⁴ In autumn 2004, sixteen of the total twenty-eight nations participating in the coalition were NATO member states (including the U.S. itself). Of those sixteen countries, nine were new NATO members: Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, and Slovakia.³⁵ Although by the beginning of 2005, Hungary had already withdrawn its forces from Iraq (and Poland and some other coalition member states have announced the withdrawal of their forces during the course of 2005), it could be argued that, for the United States, supporting Central and Eastern European states' accession to NATO has already paid off.

Now that there is stability in Eastern Europe, the U.S. has more means (time, interests, and resources) to spread democracy in other parts of the world. The Baltic states are not at the top of the list of priorities for the U.S. any longer, because the countries have reached a level of stability with their accession to membership in the EU and NATO. That does not, however, mean that the U.S. has lost interest in the region. Currently, the U.S. has different concerns, and is spreading democracy in other parts of the world, for instance in Iraq and Afghanistan.

By supporting NATO expansion to the east, the U.S. also wanted to remedy the injustices experienced by the Central and Eastern European states (including the Baltic states) during their decades under Soviet domination. According to Kenneth Waltz, a renowned structural realist, the U.S. believes it is acting for the sake of peace, justice, and stability in the whole world.³⁶ The U.S. believed that countries that happened to end up on the wrong side of the Iron Curtain after World War II should not be punished for that misfortune, but should instead be gradually welcomed into the Western security institutions with all corresponding rights and privileges.³⁷

Acquiring Dominance and Control

There remain other reasons why the U.S. supported the latest round of NATO enlargement. These reasons are not as noble as the reason of righting the wrongs of history; rather, they have to do with notions of dominance and control.

In the twentieth century, the United States showed an interest in dominating European foreign and security policies. Even though the primary security concern for many European countries is not how to distance themselves from the U.S., but how to prevent the US from drifting away, the aim of France is to

impede U.S. dominance.³⁸ Its ambition was to make the European Union the most important actor in Europe, including in matters of foreign and security policy, thus minimizing American influence in the region. Immediately after the end of the Cold War, French leaders began asserting that Europe did not need American leadership to set its own security policy.³⁹ The outcome was the formulation of the EU Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP).⁴⁰

As the U.S. had (and still has) a strategic interest in what occurs in Europe, a more dominant European Union (and the CFSP) was seen to marginalize U.S. influence over the region.⁴¹ In counterbalance, the U.S. argued for the Central and Eastern European countries' membership in NATO in order to enhance NATO's security role at the expense of the EU's arrangements, which would exclude or downplay U.S. participation in European affairs.⁴² NATO was seen as the main instrument for maintaining America's domination over the foreign and military policies of the European states.⁴³

It should be noted that the Baltic states and other new NATO and EU member states are interested in NATO primarily as a guarantor of hard security, and in the EU as a guarantor of soft security, despite the fact that the EU is launching its own security and defense policy (ESDP). Most Eastern European countries are pro-American, and perceive the European Security and Defense Policy's efforts as complementary to those of NATO. At the same time, France opposes the United States' world dominance, and pushes the European Union to act as a counterweight to the United States. The French view NATO and ESDP not as complementary but as adverse initiatives.⁴⁴ However, it is ironic that the Eastern European countries escaped Russian domination only to be used by the United States to thwart efforts for greater European autonomy with respect to the United States.

Domestic Political Reasons for the U.S. to Support the Last Round of NATO Enlargement

The domestic political reasons for the United States to support the 1999 round of NATO enlargement also had a lot to do with U.S. electoral politics, and the electoral advantage that U.S. politicians can gain among U.S. citizens of Eastern European origins. In fact, during the U.S. presidential election campaign of 1996, President Clinton announced the invitations to the Visegrad countries to join the Alliance in cities with large populations of Eastern European immigrants. There was also an intensive Polish, Hungarian, and Czech lobby—along with the U.S. arms industry lobby—to encourage U.S. defense policy decision-makers to favor the idea of enlargement. The U.S. arms industry was interested in finding new markets in Eastern and Central European states.⁴⁵ Two of these three domestic political actors bolstered U.S. support for the next

round of Alliance expansion in 2004, although perhaps not with the same impact.

The domestic political reasoning behind U.S. support for the most recent round of NATO expansion was similar to the domestic political reasoning behind the support for the 1999 enlargement. There was an intensive Baltic-American lobby, and although the U.S. arms industry lobby did not play as prominent a role as it did prior to the enlargement of 1999, it was still a factor. Lobbying has a significant impact on U.S. decision-making processes and on decision-makers. Lobbyists try to influence the Congress and the administration in power as much as they can to tilt decisions in the direction favorable to the interest groups the lobbyists represent.⁴⁶

During and after World War II, many people of Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian origin immigrated to the U.S. The Baltic American community is small but well organized, and worked closely with other groups to build political support for Baltic states' NATO membership.⁴⁷ According to Ron Asmus, the Baltic-American lobby was very efficient. When State Department officials briefed Congress on U.S. Baltic policy, they often found that representatives of the Baltic-American lobby had either just preceded them or were standing outside ready to make the case for the U.S. to provide more security assistance.⁴⁸ The Baltic-American lobby had a considerable impact on U.S. decision-makers in promoting the enlargement of the Alliance.

There was also widespread support for the accession of the Baltic states among many senior U.S. foreign policy experts, such as the former U.S. Secretary of State Madeleine Albright and former Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott.⁴⁹ Nevertheless, in addition to caring about the future of the Baltic states, promising them eventual NATO membership, and feeling sorry for their tumultuous past, these individuals were also interested in transforming and westernizing the societies of the Baltic states.⁵⁰ Once again, the U.S. emphasized the democratization and stabilization of Eastern Europe.

The U.S. arms industry was also lobbying for new NATO enlargement to some extent. Their intention was to further expand the defense market for potential new customers. The Baltic states do not possess excessive resources to spend on defense acquisitions; in fact, they have quite limited means.⁵¹ However, they have already conducted deals with U.S. arms manufacturers. For instance, both Estonia and Latvia purchased three-dimensional radar systems from Lockheed Martin.⁵²

In the mid 1990s, the U.S. and the Clinton Administration did not yet have a concrete Baltic policy, but the issue was considered important.⁵³ The United States supported the Baltic states' accession to NATO, but was not sure of when and how this was to happen. At that time, the U.S. was also wary of the

Russian response to NATO enlarging to the former “near abroad.” The U.S. declared that Russia did not have a veto over NATO enlargement, but was clearly influenced by Russia’s concerns.⁵⁴ U.S. officials sought to make NATO “Russia-friendly” through Russian participation in the PfP program, and by the creation of the NATO-Russia Permanent Joint Council in the spring of 1997.⁵⁵ However, in May 1996, when President Clinton met the presidents of the three Baltic states, he reassured them that, in the long term, the U.S. wanted to see the full integration of the Baltic states into the West, and that there would not be any “secret deals” with Russia over NATO’s enlargement to the East.⁵⁶

Another reason why the U.S. was in favor of the Baltic states’ accession to the Alliance is that the US has always had a special relationship with the Baltic states. The U.S. was the most influential of the few states that never recognized Moscow’s annexation of the Baltic states in 1940, and that regarded their statehood as uninterrupted since the establishment of their independence. The Baltic states maintained their consulates in the U.S., even during their fifty-year Soviet occupation period.

Estonia, along with the other Baltic states, chose to cooperate with the world’s only remaining superpower because it had more trust in the U.S. than in many of the Western European states. Americans gave the Baltic states perspective with respect to the withdrawal of Russian armed forces as well as regarding NATO enlargement.⁵⁷ The U.S. non-recognition of the Soviet annexation, as well as the Clinton Administration’s determination to assist in speeding up the withdrawal of Soviet troops from the Baltic states, explain the trust these small nations had in the U.S.⁵⁸ Trust in the U.S. was also the result of political pragmatism—it was well known that the Russians would listen to the U.S. and (though unwillingly) accept its decisions.⁵⁹ Furthermore, the Baltic states had a close relationship with Denmark, and Denmark, in turn, had a close relationship with the United States. Implicitly, the Baltic states’ warm relations with Denmark brought them together with the U.S. as well.⁶⁰

The Baltic states’ moderate distrust in Western European states can be explained by their unwillingness in the early 1990s to see Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania as part of the Western security structure. For instance, in the 1990s, France was conducting a systematic campaign against NATO’s strategic reforms and against expanding the Alliance’s political role by consistently blocking any attempts by NATO to move toward any new or expanded role.⁶¹ Additionally, many analysts in both the U.S. and Europe believe that France considers Russia an ally in weakening the U.S. position in Europe. They also claim that France has shown more respect than other Western states to Russia’s demands, even to the demand that NATO should never enlarge to the

states of the former Soviet Union.⁶² The Baltic states at the same time desperately wanted to move away from Russia's sphere of influence. The only way to succeed was to have a powerful state—the United States—as an ally.

On 16 January 1998, the United States and the Baltic states signed the U.S.-Baltic Charter. As former U.S. president Bill Clinton wrote in his memoirs, the charter was designed to formalize the U.S.-Baltic security relationship and reassure the Baltic states that the ultimate goal of all NATO nations, including the United States, was the full integration of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania into NATO and other multilateral institutions.⁶³ The charter also stated that the U.S. had a profound interest in the independence, territorial integrity, sovereignty, and security of the three Baltic states, and that Europe would not be fully secure unless Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania were secure. The charter also asserted that no non-NATO state would have a veto over Alliance decisions, reassuring the Baltic republics that Russia would not be able to veto NATO enlargement.⁶⁴ The fact that the U.S. was willing to make the commitment to sign such a document speaks for itself. Good relations with the Baltic states were of importance to the United States, as were notions of strengthening the democratic process in the Baltic states and fostering their accession into NATO.

Conclusion

The U.S. supported the latest round of NATO enlargement for various reasons, on both the international and the domestic levels. The last round of NATO enlargement did not only take place due to U.S. support; it was a mutual initiative, as the Baltic states and other newly acceded countries had proclaimed integration into NATO as one of their most important security policy objectives.

In supporting NATO enlargement, the U.S. was maximizing its own strength in the unipolar world. It was (and still is) also interested in continuing to have a say in European foreign and security policy, especially at a time when the European Union was launching joint foreign and defense policies and becoming more united than ever. At the same time, France was trying to blunt American influence over European affairs. The U.S. needed new allies to accomplish its policy of spreading democratic values across the world. Now that the eastern part of Europe has been stabilized, and the Bush Administration has launched a long-term plan to reduce the size of its forces stationed in Europe, the U.S. can concentrate on other parts of the world—for instance, on carrying out regime change and introducing democracy in Afghanistan and Iraq.

There were also several domestic political reasons why the U.S. supported the most recent round of Alliance enlargement. Baltic-Americans and (to a lesser extent) the U.S. arms industry were lobbying to get the Baltic states incorporated into Western security frameworks. In addition, the United States was interested in maintaining good relations with the Baltic states.

The Baltic republics can be viewed as quite pro-U.S. in their policies and actions. For instance, all of the Baltic states are participating in Operation Iraqi Freedom. It can be argued, however, that this is not due to their ultimate support for the Bush Administration, but rather is derived from the Baltic states' own security interests. If the Baltic states support the U.S. now when the U.S. needs them, they can expect U.S. military support when they need it.

The next and final chapter of this paper concludes that integration into Western security structures was the best security policy option for Estonia and discusses the advantages and disadvantages of Estonia's integration.

CHAPTER 4

ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF ESTONIA'S INTEGRATION WITH WESTERN SECURITY INSTITUTIONS

Introduction

Membership in Western security institutions, along with successful bilateral and multilateral relations with other countries, makes it possible to defend Estonia's security policy interests. This relationship is essential to preserving Estonia's independence and sovereignty, territorial integrity, constitutional order, and public safety.¹ The enlargement of both NATO and the EU has extended the zone of peace and stability in Europe, and hence has reduced the threat of large-scale military conflicts. Therefore, after acquiring membership in the EU and NATO, Estonia is as safe from traditional threats (such as state-on-state war) as possible in today's security environment.² However, Estonia's integration into NATO and the EU was not exclusively advantageous. In the case of the EU accession, it was feared that Estonia would lose some portion of its sovereignty when acceding into the European Union.³ Membership in the European Union does not weaken Estonia's sovereignty, however. This is because Estonia is now able to defend its national sovereignty better than at any other time in its history. For small states such as Estonia, membership in international organizations gives them a forum to make their voices and policies heard in world politics.⁴

By acquiring membership in the EU and NATO, Estonia was acting according to one of the common foreign policy patterns of small states. According to the theory of small states' behavior in foreign policy, small states often tend to employ diplomatic and economic foreign policy instruments as opposed to military instruments, and join multinational institutions whenever possible. As emphasized throughout this work, Estonia wanted to join NATO to acquire hard security guarantees, and the EU to acquire soft security guarantees.⁵

This chapter introduces the EU and NATO foreign and security policies and explores the advantages and disadvantages that accompany Estonia's integration into the EU and NATO. The chapter is divided into four sections. The

first section explains the EU Common Foreign and Security Policy; the second section describes NATO security policy; the third section gives an overview of the new instabilities in transatlantic relations; and the fourth section evaluates Estonia's choice to integrate into Western security institutions in the light of the new instabilities in transatlantic relations and analyzes the possible consequences.

The European Union's Foreign Policy

All twenty-five EU member states take part in the European Union's Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP). The principle of a common foreign and security policy was formalized in the 1993 Maastricht Treaty on European Union. The objective of the European Union's common foreign policy was to enable the EU to make its voice heard on the international stage and express its position on armed conflicts, human rights, and any other subject linked to the fundamental principles and common values that form the basis of the European Union. The provisions of the CFSP were revised by the 1999 Amsterdam Treaty, which spells out the CFSP's five fundamental objectives:

1. Safeguard the common values, fundamental interests, independence and integrity of the EU in conformity with the principles of the United Nations Charter;
2. Strengthen the security of the EU in all ways;
3. Preserve peace and strengthen international security, in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter, as well as the principles of the 1975 CSCE Helsinki Final Act and the objectives of the Paris Charter, including those on external borders;
4. Promote international cooperation;
5. Develop and consolidate democracy and the rule of law, and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms.⁶

These objectives are to be pursued by defining principles and general guidelines for the common foreign and security policy, by deciding on common strategies, adopting joint actions and common positions, and by strengthening systematic cooperation between the EU member states in the conduct of policy.⁷

The Amsterdam Treaty also calls for the creation of a common European security and defense policy (ESDP) within the overall framework of CFSP. This policy could lead to a common defense, subject to a decision adopted by the EU member states in accordance with their respective constitutional requirements. ESDP deals with crisis management, including humanitarian and rescue missions, peacekeeping, and combat-force use in crisis management

(including peacemaking). The policy of the EU with respect to ESDP is not to prejudice the specific character of the security and defense policies of those EU member states that are also members of NATO.⁸

In December 2003, EU leaders adopted a European Security Strategy, which emphasizes the importance of the fight against terror; pursuit of policies against proliferation of weapons of mass destruction; and the importance of dealing with regional conflicts and organized crime and putting failed states back on their feet.⁹ The European Security Strategy sees transatlantic relationships as one of the core elements of the international system. According to the strategy, the EU's intention should be an effective and balanced partnership with the United States.¹⁰

The European Security Strategy also sets guidelines and objectives for building security in the EU's neighborhood, stating that it is in the interests of the EU that countries bordering the EU are well governed. Therefore, the EU's task is to promote a ring of stable countries to the east and south of the Union.¹¹ Sharing the benefits of the EU's 2004 enlargement with neighboring countries in strengthening stability, security, and well being for all concerned is the target of European Union's "Neighborhood Policy."¹² The policy is designed to prevent the emergence of sizeable gaps in terms of quality of life between the enlarged EU and its neighbors, and to offer them the chance to participate in various EU activities through frameworks of greater political, security, economic, and cultural cooperation. The European Neighborhood Policy is distinct from the issue of potential membership. It offers neighboring countries a privileged relationship with the EU, which will build on a mutual commitment to common values principally within the fields of the rule of law, good governance, respect for human rights (including minority rights), the promotion of friendly relations, and the principles of market economy and sustainable development.¹³

NATO's Security Policy

According to the North Atlantic Treaty, the fundamental role of NATO is to safeguard the freedom and security of its member countries by political and military means. Based on common values of democracy, human rights, and the rule of law, the Alliance not only ensures the defense of its members but also contributes to peace and stability in the Euro-Atlantic region. The Alliance, therefore, performs the following fundamental security tasks:

- Provides the foundation for a stable Euro-Atlantic security environment, based on the growth of democratic institutions and commitment to the peaceful resolution of disputes;

- Serves as an essential transatlantic forum for consultations on any issues that affect the vital interests of NATO members and coordinates their efforts in fields of common concern;¹⁴
- Deters and defends against any threat of aggression against any NATO member state.¹⁵

NATO's Strategic Concept, which outlines the Alliance's security tasks and guides the Alliance in the pursuit of its agenda, emphasizes the importance of collective defense and reinforcement of the transatlantic link. The document also states that the European NATO member states should assume greater responsibility within the Alliance.¹⁶

NATO also strives for increased partnership, cooperation, and dialogue with other non-NATO member countries who share the Alliance's common values of democracy, individual liberty, and the rule of law. Partnership and cooperation initiatives include, among others, the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, which is a framework for political negotiations, and the Partnership for Peace program, which is the operational arm of the partnership framework aimed at defense cooperation. Russia and Ukraine have special consultation bodies with NATO—the NATO-Russia Council and the NATO-Ukraine Council—to conduct political dialogue on current security issues and develop practical cooperation in areas of common interest. With Russia, constructive political consultations have been held on issues such as the situations in Afghanistan, Serbia and Montenegro, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, and the "Greater Middle East" initiative. With Ukraine, key areas of consultation and cooperation include peace-support operations, defense reform, economic aspects of defense, military-to-military cooperation, armaments, civil emergency planning, and science and environment.¹⁷

Other NATO cooperation initiatives with non-NATO member countries include the Mediterranean Dialogue and the Istanbul Cooperation Initiative (preceding the Greater Middle East initiative), which are two complementary initiatives. During the Istanbul Summit in June 2004, NATO leaders (with Estonian representatives among them) decided to elevate the alliance's Mediterranean Dialogue to a genuine partnership, and to launch the Istanbul Cooperation Initiative with selected countries in the broader region of the Middle East.¹⁸

NATO's Mediterranean Dialogue partners are Algeria, Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Mauritania, Morocco, and Tunisia. The Mediterranean Dialogue has successfully contributed to confidence building and cooperation between NATO and its Mediterranean partners. The enhanced Mediterranean Dialogue will contribute to regional security and stability by promoting greater practical cooperation, enhancing the dialogue's political dimension, assisting in defense

reform, building cooperation in the field of border security, achieving interoperability, and contributing to the fight against terrorism, while complementing other international efforts.

The Istanbul Cooperation Initiative promotes practical bilateral cooperation with NATO and interested countries in the broader Middle East region. This initiative aims at enhancing security and stability through a new transatlantic engagement, offering tailored advice on defense reform, defense budgeting, defense planning, and civil-military relations, promoting military-to-military cooperation to contribute to interoperability, fighting terrorism through information sharing and maritime cooperation, combating the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their delivery systems, and illegal trafficking in weapons.¹⁹

New Instabilities in Transatlantic Relations

In terms of security, there exists a huge capability gap between the United States' military capabilities and the combined military capabilities of all other NATO member states. One of the reasons for the U.S. to support the last round of NATO enlargement was the U.S. desire for a stronger unified Europe in order to achieve security and stability in the continent as a whole.²⁰ The United States, nevertheless, did not want Europe so unified that Europe, acting together, could outweigh the U.S. A united Europe is seen as a potential threat to American interests, and the U.S. has hopes of blocking its emergence.²¹

For the past several years, the conventional wisdom has been that the United States and Europe have grown apart—that the end of the Cold War and the events of 9/11 have produced a strategic divergence that is impossible to overcome. The relations between the U.S. and the EU have been especially frosty since the beginning of the Iraq war. The divide between Europe and the United States emerged because each side took actions the other strongly opposed, or declined to join in actions the other strongly favored. Moreover, these disputes have become self-perpetuating: U.S. policies spark hostility among Europeans, and vice versa. That hostility in turn convinces leaders on both sides that they have no choice but to go it alone.²² However, since President Bush's re-election in November 2004, there has been a clear desire on both sides to overcome tensions caused by the war in Iraq. In his inaugural address, President Bush said that the world requires that America and Europe remain close partners.²³ Tensions also thawed after U.S. Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice's trip to Europe at the beginning of February 2005. In her speech in Paris on 8 February 2005, Rice called on Europe to work with the U.S., emphasizing notions such as transatlantic partnerships and shared values, and even backing the idea of strong unified Europe.²⁴

Transatlantic relations are unlikely to get warmer, however, even though currently there is good will on both sides to ameliorate the relationship. This is because there are other new potential sources of disagreement between the United States and European countries. For instance, Iran's uranium enrichment program is a potential new source of conflict. Britain, France, and Germany prefer diplomacy and economic incentives to entice Iran away from building nuclear weapons. Although the U.S. has not clearly stated it would use military action, it is sending mixed signals on the issue. Furthermore, there are other issues where the European Union and the United States have differences of opinion regarding appropriate action. For example, the EU has indicated that in the near future it will lift its arms embargo on China. This step would infuriate the United States, as the U.S. is deeply concerned about the acceleration of China's arms build-up. In addition, Europeans are broadly in favor of trying those suspected of war crimes and genocide in Darfur, Sudan in the International Criminal Court.²⁵ The U.S. is against the idea, fearing that it will be used to bring cases against U.S. citizens.²⁶

On 16 February 2005, fifty-five foreign policy and national security experts from both sides of the Atlantic published a document (*A Compact between the United States and Europe*) that offers specific policy recommendations for U.S. and European leaders on how to deal with most of the present key strategic challenges. This document demonstrates that transatlantic differences do exist, and that agreement is no longer an easy task; however, it also shows that agreement on a comprehensive transatlantic strategy is possible, even on the most difficult issues. Experts who signed the document believe that the transatlantic partnership must endure, not because of what it has achieved in the past, but because the United States and Europe's common future depends on it.²⁷

According to the authors of the document, words alone will not restore a productive transatlantic partnership. Europeans cannot simply ask the U.S. to recognize the error of their ways and reverse their policies of the past years. Likewise, the U.S. cannot simply attest to the validity of their methods and invite Europeans to come on board. Each side will have to take steps that address the legitimate concerns of the other. Regarding new strategic challenges, the document suggests the following policy recommendations:

- *Iran.* The U.S. and the EU should insist that Iran permanently and verifiably end its fuel cycle program. The United States should declare its support for the EU's nuclear dialogue with Iran. The EU countries should declare their readiness to impose meaningful penalties on Iran if it refuses to end its nuclear fuel recycling programs, or withdraws from the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

- *China.* The EU should declare that, if it lifts its arms embargo against China, it will replace it with a reinforced code of conduct on arms sales. The EU will invite the United States, Japan, and other states to provide a specific list of weapons and technologies that they feel would negatively affect security and stability in the region. The U.S. should reiterate its opposition to a lifting of the arms embargo, but refrain from taking action so long as these measures are not violated. The EU should expect China to ratify the UN convention on civil and political rights.
- *International Criminal Court.* The U.S. should reaffirm its concerns about the jurisdiction of the International Criminal Court, but should reiterate that it will not impose punitive measures on nations that support it. The United States shall not oppose a resolution by the UN Security Council referring the situation in Darfur, Sudan, to the International Criminal Court.

According to Quentin Peel, a leading international affairs columnist with the *Financial Times*, it will take strong glue to fix the transatlantic alliance. The 2005 Munich conference on security policy, which annually brings together political and military heavyweights from defense establishments on both sides of the Atlantic, showed signs of doubt that NATO can survive and flourish in the new world order after 9/11. Gerhard Schröder, the German Chancellor, declared in a speech read by his defense minister that NATO is no longer the primary venue for transatlantic partners to discuss and coordinate strategies. The message of Munich is that the old relationships centered on NATO no longer suit the new reality. Quentin Peel suggests that both sides must adapt. If the U.S. wants NATO to thrive, it must accept a bigger role for the organization: the Alliance must be more than simply a military toolbox. For their part, the Europeans must work out how a common EU security policy can be developed without undermining NATO. Peel predicts that if neither side is ready to adapt, the old Alliance's days are numbered.²⁸

The next section will discuss the disadvantages and advantages of Estonia's integration into NATO and the EU, taking into account the new instabilities in transatlantic relationships.

Advantages and Disadvantages for Estonia in Integrating into Western Security Institutions

Estonia's accession to membership in the European Union and NATO fulfilled the country's long-term security policy objectives. Currently, Estonia faces a situation where it has attained its security policy goals and has not yet set new security policy objectives. The Estonian Ministry of Foreign Affairs should

already have addressed the issue of setting the country's new foreign and security policy goals before acceding to Western security institutions.²⁹ At the same time, the Estonian Ministry of Foreign Affairs has mistakenly believed that Estonia's foreign and security policy would be formulated for it by the EU and NATO after Estonia's accession to membership. In reality, each member state formulates its own policies; NATO and the EU may merely provide support in the formulation process. It is important for each member state to take the responsibility to participate in the formulation process of the organizations' common policies. Estonia should, therefore, aim towards being a noticeable and active partner in both institutions.³⁰ However, in order to participate actively and be able to make its voice heard, Estonia first has to set its new security and foreign policy priorities.³¹

Disadvantages of Integration

Estonian membership in the EU and NATO does not only entail advantages; there are also disadvantages as well. NATO membership and the collective defense nature of the organization offer Estonia hard security guarantees. If Estonia were to be attacked militarily, the provisions of North Atlantic Treaty Article V would be launched. Therefore, any references to the irrelevance of NATO belittle the advantages that Estonia and other small states gain from the organization.

In terms of NATO and the EU's common security and defense policy, Estonia believes that NATO and the ESDP must supplement each other and, therefore, that there should not be any duplication in the development of NATO and ESDP military capabilities. For Estonia, a strong transatlantic relationship is the most essential guarantee of Europe's security and stability, and one of the most important priorities in the European Union's Common Foreign and Security Policy. Estonia regards the durability of cooperative relations between the European Union and the United States as essential.³²

Some analysts claim that the international relations of Estonia (as well as Latvia and Lithuania) are presently shaped by a divided loyalty between Europe and the U.S. (as the main representative of NATO),³³ and that Estonian security doctrine short-sightedly relies on the U.S. contribution to Estonian security.³⁴ The National Security Concept of Estonia indeed stresses the importance of transatlantic relations and Estonia's partnership with the United States.³⁵ However, it is in Estonia's interests that schisms should not emerge between NATO and the EU, due to the fact that they could reduce NATO's deterrent value.³⁶

The theory of complex interdependence suggests that interdependence generates vulnerability. One could argue that, by being a member of NATO and a partner of the US, Estonia could be more vulnerable to asymmetric threats

such as international terrorism. This would be a disadvantage deriving from membership in Western security institutions. Close cooperation with the U.S. could also make Estonia vulnerable *vis-à-vis* the relationship between the U.S. and European countries. Estonia's loyalty to the U.S. could create a difference of opinion or even conflict with France and Germany, especially in the light of new instabilities in transatlantic relationships, even though official documents from NATO and the EU, and recent speeches by U.S. and European leaders, point out the importance of fruitful transatlantic relations. For instance, the war on Iraq divided Europe as never before. In February 2003, French President Chirac stated that "Eastern Europeans missed an opportunity to shut up." This statement was a response to Eastern Europeans' pro-U.S. stance, understood in France to constitute a lack of commitment to Europe.³⁷ It should also be noted that Russia actively tried to incite conflicts between the Baltic states and Western European countries by stressing that the Baltic states' pro-Americanism is without doubt contra-European.³⁸

Russia has the ability to manipulate Estonia. Estonia and Russia have had a very complex relationship. This exists primarily because of the countries' history, and especially the fifty-year Soviet occupation of Estonia. After Estonia regained independence, Russia began putting pressure on Estonia by showing the world its concern regarding the treatment of Russian-speaking minorities in Estonia.³⁹ At the same time, Russia has never tried to assist in improving the quality of life of Russians living in the "near abroad."⁴⁰ The quarrel over the citizenship and status of Russian speaking minorities re-emerges constantly, even though it should already be settled. The departure of the OSCE mission from Estonia and Latvia in late 2001 indicated that the OSCE does not see problems in the treatment of Russian-speaking minorities in these countries.⁴¹ Neither does the EU. Nevertheless, Russia tries to influence Estonia and Latvia through the EU by mere accusations of problematic treatment of Russian-speaking minorities in these countries.

These accusations could become a challenge if Estonia does not continue to act constructively in counterbalancing Moscow's allegations. It is of crucial importance to constantly inform other European Union member states of Estonia's views on the issue of the treatment of minorities. Estonian political leaders think there is no mistreatment of Russian-speaking minorities. The aim would be for the other EU states to know both sides of the story, and not make their judgment based only on the accusations they hear from Russia.⁴²

Russia could also use other means of manipulation. Even though Estonia produces most of its own energy (through hydroelectric power and oil shale), the country produces no natural gas or coal, and depends entirely on imports from Russia.⁴³ Russia has the opportunity to use natural gas and petroleum to

put pressure on many NATO and EU member states (not only the Baltic states) in order to tilt foreign policy issues in favor of Russia. Analyst Paul Goble thinks it is likely that in the future Moscow will utilize this tool.⁴⁴

Advantages of Integration

After joining NATO, Estonia is not forced to rely upon its own national efforts in dealing with basic security challenges. As a full Alliance member, Estonia has to maintain the credibility earned during the accession process and complete the restructuring of its defense forces to meet NATO requirements.⁴⁵ It is also important to continue bilateral and multilateral cooperation with neighboring allies, as well as to share NATO accession experiences with possible future members.⁴⁶ This would include continuous participation in the Partnership for Peace program, continuous development of Baltic security cooperation, and participation in arms control efforts.⁴⁷ Estonia as a NATO member state is now also a participant in NATO security policies. Participation in initiatives such as the Mediterranean Dialogue and the Istanbul Cooperation Initiative offers an opportunity for Estonia's security policy to have a much wider scope as compared to the policies the country had prior to NATO accession.

Through membership in the EU, Estonia has acquired soft security guarantees, such as economic stability and EU investments. When acceding to EU membership, Estonia had to follow policies set by the EU member states. Now, as one of the member countries, Estonia has the opportunity to participate in the formulation of these policies. Accession has brought to the forefront many issues that are constantly on the European Union's agenda, but which have not been priorities for Estonia until now.⁴⁸ In the framework of the EU, these include such topics as Middle Eastern conflict and cooperation with Northern African countries. Estonia does not have enough human or financial resources to open new embassies or to arrange numerous visits to faraway regions. However, the European Union's cooperation framework gives Estonia the possibility of establishing closer ties with African, Asian, and South American countries.

Estonia actively participates in the European Union's Neighborhood Policy. Closer economic and political cooperation with the European Union's neighboring states is seen as essential from the perspective of the security and welfare of Europe as a whole. Due to its geographical location, Estonia's attention is mainly focused on cooperation with the European Union's eastern neighbors—such as Byelorussia, Georgia, Ukraine, and Moldova—but the country also supports the development of the Union's relations with its southern neighbors.⁴⁹ Despite Estonia's limited financial resources, development cooperation is becoming an essential part of Estonia's foreign policy. For

instance, Estonia is actively contributing to Ukraine's development as a democratic state. This takes place, primarily, through development cooperation projects, and by participating in the formulation of the European Neighborhood Policy directed towards Ukraine. Estonia also closely collaborates with Georgia. In 2004, for instance, Georgian officials were given courses in the areas of information society development, environment, EU integration, as well as taxation and financial policy. The Estonian and Georgian ministries of defense are also working together intensively.⁵⁰ Estonia contributes to development cooperation not so much with financial resources, but mostly by passing along specialized knowledge in various fields.

EU membership has also been favorable to Estonia with respect to Russia in some aspects. Before Estonia's EU membership, Moscow implemented double tariffs on goods imported from Estonia. After Estonia's accession to membership in the EU, Russia has been economically forced to treat Estonia just as it treats any other EU member country.⁵¹ Despite differences of opinion on many issues between Estonia and Russia, Estonia could assist the enlarged EU in promoting improved relations with Russia.⁵² Estonia could act as a mediator between Russia and the EU, both because of geographical proximity to Russia and because Estonians understand Russians better than do Western or Central Europeans.⁵³

Conclusion

Being a member of Western security institutions entails both advantages and disadvantages. Membership in the European Union and NATO is both a privilege and an obligation, requiring that Estonia be more knowledgeable and more comprehensive in its thinking. If Estonia wants to avoid marginalization, it has to be active and participate to the fullest in the formulation of EU and NATO policies.

It is in Estonia's interests that the EU and NATO preserve their significance and power in the future. Any claims regarding the irrelevance of NATO belittle the advantages that Estonia gains from NATO membership. Instabilities in transatlantic relationships should be overcome. The stronger that the EU and NATO are, the easier it will be for Estonia to achieve its national interests through these institutions. Therefore, Estonia's foreign and security policy should be aimed at supporting initiatives that make the EU and NATO frameworks stronger. This, in turn, means that Estonia should participate actively in both NATO and the EU, including in the framework of CFSP. In order to efficiently participate in the formulation of policies, Estonia must be better informed regarding world politics.

CONCLUSION

This paper has concerned itself with Estonia's security policy choices since the country regained its independence after the collapse of the Soviet Union. There were roughly three main policy options open to Estonia at this point: remaining a neutral country; cooperating regionally with Finland and the other two Baltic states in security matters; or striving for integration with Western security institutions. Estonian politicians chose the last option. The purpose of the work has been to demonstrate that this was the best alternative of the three available options.

The thesis has a quite eclectic theoretical base. For the most part, small state theory (the aspect of the theory dealing with small states' conduct in foreign policy) has been the primary theoretical basis. I have used this theory because it best describes the behavior of small states in international relations. Estonia is a small state in terms of geographical size, population, and degree of influence in international politics. The concept of complex interdependence is used as a complement to small state theory in explaining interstate cooperation, vulnerability in interdependence, and Estonia's security policy choices. Even though competing theories such as realism and structural realism deal mainly with maximization of power and do not emphasize interstate cooperation in the international arena and are not, therefore, applicable to explain Estonia's choices in security policy, they explain the behavior of the United States in supporting NATO's eastward expansion.

The paper demonstrates that neither neutrality nor regional cooperation was a viable security policy option for Estonia after regaining independence in August 1991. In its interwar independence period, Estonia had been a strictly neutral country. Nevertheless, neutrality failed in 1940 when Estonia was forcibly incorporated into the Soviet Union. As Russia was still perceived as an enemy at the beginning of the 1990s, there was no reason to believe that neutrality would succeed fifty years later. Rather, Estonian politicians and security policy experts believed that a neutral Estonia could be easily manipulated by Russia and would, therefore, remain in Russia's sphere of influence.

Regional cooperation with Finland and the Baltic states was also not sufficient to serve the security interests of Estonia. Estonia had already identified integration into Western security structures as its main security policy goal, and the country strived for the protection offered by Article V of the North

Atlantic Treaty. Cooperation with Finland was seen as a phase in the process of integrating into Western security institutions; it was not seen as an alternative, as it would not have constituted a sufficient security guarantee for Estonia. The creation of Baltic military cooperation projects in the 1990s demonstrated the will of the Baltic states to work together in security matters, but also served the purpose of enhancing the countries' national readiness and defense capabilities. The main objective of this cooperation was to prepare the Baltic states for NATO accession. Baltic security cooperation was never an alternative to accession to NATO or the EU, but it did serve as a tool to reach the Baltic states' common security policy ambition to integrate with Western security institutions.

One cannot speak of Estonia's wish to join Western security institutions without mentioning the U.S. desire to see the North Atlantic Treaty Organization expand toward the east. This thesis demonstrates that the last round of NATO enlargement did not take place only because of the Baltic states' and other aspirants' will to join the Alliance, but also because the U.S. was interested in NATO expansion. Enlargement, therefore, was an initiative of mutual interest. The U.S. supported the most recent round of NATO enlargement for various reasons, both international and domestic. By supporting NATO enlargement, the U.S. was maximizing its own strength in the unipolar world. It was also interested in continuing to have a say in European foreign and security policy, especially at a time when the European Union was launching joint foreign and defense policies and becoming more united than ever. The U.S. needed new allies to accomplish its policy of spreading democratic values around the world. There were also several domestic political reasons why the United States supported the 2004 round of NATO enlargement. Baltic-Americans and, to a lesser extent, the U.S. arms industry were lobbying to get the Baltic states incorporated into Western security structures. In addition, the U.S. was interested in maintaining good relations with the Baltic states.

The paper explains that integration into Western security policy institutions was the best security alternative for Estonia because the country gained both soft (internal) and hard (external) security guarantees when acceding to membership in these institutions. Furthermore, Estonia now has the opportunity to take part in the formulation of EU and NATO policies. Participation in initiatives such as the European Union's Neighborhood Policy or NATO's Mediterranean Dialogue and the Istanbul Cooperation Initiative offer an opportunity for Estonia's security policy to have more influence when compared to the policies the country had prior to its membership in the EU and NATO.

Nevertheless, Estonia's membership in Western security institutions entails both advantages and disadvantages, especially considering the new instabilities

in the transatlantic relationship. Membership in the European Union and NATO is both a privilege and an obligation for Estonia, requiring that the country be more knowledgeable and more comprehensive in its thinking, taking a view that befits its status as a player in broad security frameworks.

NOTES

Introduction

- ¹ Estonia is a parliamentary republic. The head of state is the president of the Republic of Estonia. The legislative branch consists of a unicameral parliament (*Riigikogu*); the executive branch is constituted by the Council of Ministers. The prime minister is the head of government. Estonian foreign policy is formulated by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (*Statutes of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs* § 7, 20 May 2004), and executed by the executive branch (*Constitution of the Republic of Estonia* § 87, 28 June 1992). Defense policy is formulated by the Ministry of Defense (*Statutes of the Ministry of Defense* § 6, 1 June 2004). Together with the other relevant ministries, such as the Ministry of Internal Affairs and the Ministry of Economic Affairs and Communications, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Defense set Estonian security policy (*Statutes of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs* § 8; *Statutes of the Ministry of Defense* § 8, 2004).
- ² The WEU was merged with the structures of the EU in 2001.
- ³ Geoffrey Stern, *The Structure of International Society: an Introduction to the Study of International Relations*, 2nd ed. (London: Pinter, 2000), 12.
- ⁴ Jay M. Shafritz, Phil Williams, and Ronald S. Calinger, *The Dictionary of 20th Century World Politics* (New York: Henry Holt, 1993), 476.
- ⁵ Charles W. Kegley, Jr. and Eugene R. Wittkopf, *World Politics. Trend and Transformation*, 5th ed. (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995), 30.
- ⁶ David Vital, *The Inequality of States: A Study of the Small Power in International Relations* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1967), 5.
- ⁷ Vital, *Inequality of States*, 148–50. A distinction should be made between neutrality and neutralism. Neutrality is a legal concept, which involves established rights and duties. A state is presumed neutral if it remains impartial in case of war and does not declare support for any of the belligerents by word or deed. Belligerents must, in return, not violate the territorial integrity of neutral states (Graham Evans and Jeffrey Newnham, *The Dictionary of World Politics: a Reference Guide to Concepts, Ideas, and Institutions* [New York: Simon & Schuster, 1990], 271). Neutralism or non-alignment indicates a state's intention to remain uninvolved in any conflict that may occur and to act with impartiality towards any belligerents. Neutralism manifests itself in a rejection of commitment to the foreign policies of other states or alliances (Shafritz, et. al., *Dictionary of 20th Century World Politics*, 476).

- ⁸ Shafritz, et al, *Dictionary of 20th Century World Politics*, 614.
- ⁹ Robert O. Keohane, "Lilliputians' Dilemmas: Small States in International Politics," *International Organization* 23:2 (Spring 1969): 296.
- ¹⁰ Jeanne A.K. Hey, "Introducing Small State Foreign Policy," in *Small States in World Politics. Explaining Foreign Policy Behavior*, ed. Jeanne Hey (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2003), 5.
- ¹¹ Ibid.
- ¹² Efraim Karsh, *Neutrality and Small States* (London: Routledge, 1988), 193.
- ¹³ Evans and Newnham, *Dictionary of World Politics*, 270.
- ¹⁴ Robert O. Keohane and Joseph S. Nye, *Power and Interdependence: World Politics in Transition* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1977), 27, 35–36.
- ¹⁵ Robert Jervis, "Understanding the Bush Doctrine," *Political Science Quarterly* 118:3 (2003): 385.
- ¹⁶ Hans J. Morgenthau, *Politics among Nations. The Struggle for Power and Peace* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1968), 282.
- ¹⁷ Charles O. Lerche, Jr., *Principles of International Politics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1956), 327. In an alliance each ally sacrifices some of its sovereignty, because it is no longer acting on its own but has to consider the interests of its allies as well.
- ¹⁸ States acquire soft security through economic and political means.
- ¹⁹ NATO's Strategic Concept suggests that the defense policies of NATO member states are denationalized without the Allies losing their sovereignty (NATO Strategic Concept, Section 43, 1999).
- ²⁰ Heinz Gärtner, "Small States and Alliances," in *Small States and Alliances*, ed. Heinz Gärtner and Erich Reiter (Heidelberg: Physica Verlag, 2001), 2.
- ²¹ Erich Reiter, "Introductory Comments on the Objective of the Small States and Alliances Workshop," in *Small States and Alliances*, 13–14.
- ²² David Leyton Brown, "Canadian Defence Policy in the 1990s: the North American Dimension," *Canadian Defence Quarterly* 21:1 (1991): 20.
- ²³ Amos A. Jordan, William J. Taylor, Jr., and Lawrence J. Korb, *American National Security: Policy and Process*, 3rd ed. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989), 51.
- ²⁴ James J. Tritten, *Our New National Security Strategy: America Promises to Come Back* (Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers, 1992), 71, 80.
- ²⁵ Andrus Park, "Russia and Estonian Security Dilemmas," *Europe-Asia Studies* 47:1 (1995): 33.
- ²⁶ Kari Möttölä, "Finland, the European Union and NATO – Implications for Security and Defence," in *Small States and Alliances*, 124.

- ²⁷ States acquire hard security through military means. Andres Kasekamp, Toomas Riim, and Viljar Veebel, *Eesti koht ja valikud Euroopa ühises julgeoleku- ja kaitsepoliitikas* (Tallinn: Eesti Välispoliitika Instituut, 2003), 13.
- ²⁸ Hain Rebas, “Can the Baltic States be Defended: an Essay on Macro-History and Semantics,” *Baltic Defence Review* 1 (1999), available at www.bdcol.ee/bdcol/pdf_files/bdreview/05bdr199.pdf.
- ²⁹ Walter J. Clemens, Jr., *The Baltic Transformed. Complexity Theory and European Security* (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 2001), 217.
- ³⁰ Arthur A. Berger, *Media Research Techniques* (Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, 1991), 57–59.
- ³¹ Madeleine Grawitz, *Méthodes des sciences sociales*, 6th ed. (Paris: Dalloz, 1984), 620.
- ³² Hannes Walter, *Rahva Hääl* (9 November 1993).

Chapter 1

- ¹ Efraim Karsh, *Neutrality and Small States* (London: Routledge, 1988), 81.
- ² Up to 1917, Estonia was part of the Russian empire; from February–November 1918 it was occupied by Germany, from 1940–1941 and 1944–1991 by the Soviet Union, and from 1941–1944 by Nazi Germany.
- ³ *De jure* recognition was accorded in 1921.
- ⁴ Toivo U. Raun, *Estonia and the Estonians*, 2nd ed. (Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press, 1991), 99.
- ⁵ In the War of Independence, Estonians fought Bolsheviks as well as White Russian armies.
- ⁶ The Soviet Union (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, or USSR) was formed in 1922.
- ⁷ During the War of Independence Estonians fought both Soviet Russian and German forces.
- ⁸ Raun, *Estonia and the Estonians*, 105–8. The British contributed a fleet of twelve ships to deliver machine guns, rifles, and ammunition to the Estonian national forces. The fleet also prevented Soviet naval attack on the capital Tallinn, or on the northern coast. The Finnish government arranged loans and provided weapons. The Finnish authorities also permitted the recruitment of volunteer soldiers to aid Estonians (Raun, *Estonia and the Estonians*, 108).
- ⁹ David M. Crowe, *The Baltic States and the Great Powers: Foreign Relations, 1938–1940* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1993), 7.
- ¹⁰ John Hiden and Patrick Salmon, *The Baltic Nations and Europe: Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania in the Twentieth Century* (London: Longman, 1994), 73.

- ¹¹ Raun, *Estonia and the Estonians*, 123.
- ¹² Crowe, *Baltic States and the Great Powers*, 1, 4.
- ¹³ Walter J. Clemens, Jr., *The Baltic Transformed. Complexity Theory and European Security* (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 2001), 6.
- ¹⁴ Kaido Jaanson, "Balti-Skandinaavia liidust," *Akadeemia* 9 (1990): 1898. Finland and Poland were considered Baltic states in the 1920s–1930s. Since then, Finland has been classified as a Scandinavian state, although, if linguistic self-determination is used, it is closer to Estonia; see Nicholas Hope, "Interwar Statehood: Symbol and Reality," in *The Baltic States: The National Self-Determination of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania*, ed. Graham Smith (Basingstoke: MacMillan, 1994), 42.
- ¹⁵ Hiden and Salmon, *Baltic Nations and Europe*, 44.
- ¹⁶ Crowe, *Baltic States and the Great Powers*, 7.
- ¹⁷ Raun, *Estonia and the Estonians*, 125.
- ¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 124.
- ¹⁹ Rein Taagepera, *Estonia – Return to Independence* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1993), 49.
- ²⁰ Kevin O'Connor, *The History of the Baltic States* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2003), 105.
- ²¹ Hiden and Salmon, *Baltic Nations and Europe*, 64.
- ²² O'Connor, *History of the Baltic States*, 108–9.
- ²³ Raun, *Estonia and the Estonians*, 139. The pact was called the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact in honor of its signatories, People's Commissar of Foreign Affairs Viatcheslav Molotov and German Defense Minister Joachim von Ribbentrop.
- ²⁴ O'Connor, *History of the Baltic States*, 109–10.
- ²⁵ Raun, *Estonia and the Estonians*, 139.
- ²⁶ David Kirby, "Incorporation: the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact," in *The Baltic States: the National Self-Determination of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania*, 73.
- ²⁷ Mart Laar, *War in the Woods: Estonia's Struggle for Survival 1944-1956* (Washington, D.C.: The Compass Press, 1992), 7.
- ²⁸ Crowe, *Baltic States and the Great Powers*, 176.
- ²⁹ Approximately 10,000 of these 61,000 people were deported to Siberia.
- ³⁰ Aleksandras Shtromas, "The Baltic States as Soviet Republics: Tensions and Contradictions," in *The Baltic States: the National Self-Determination of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania*, 86–87.
- ³¹ Raun, *Estonia and the Estonians*, 174.
- ³² After the Soviet occupation, the authorities disbanded *Kaitseliit*.
- ³³ Laar, *War in the Woods*, 9.

- ³⁴ See Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Estonia Web page (*Estonia and Lithuania*), at www.vm.ee/eng/kat_176/1193.html (28 May 2004).
- ³⁵ Aigi Rahi-Tamm, “Inimkaotused,” Okupatsioonide repressiivpoliitika uurimise riiklik komisjon (in *Valge Raamat – Eesti rahva kaotustest okupatsioonide läbi 1940-1991*, ed. Ülo Ennuste, Erast Parmasto, Enn Tarvel, Peep Varju, 2004), 18.
- ³⁶ An extremely large number of Estonians were involved in guerrilla activities. One estimate suggests that in 1945 there were between 10,000 to 15,000 active guerrilla fighters in Estonia (Shtromas, “Baltic States as Soviet Republics,” 92).
- ³⁷ Shtromas, “Baltic States as Soviet Republics,” 93.
- ³⁸ Laar, *War in the Woods*, 26.
- ³⁹ *Ibid.*, 101.
- ⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 39–40, 222.
- ⁴¹ O’Connor, *History of the Baltic States*, 139.
- ⁴² Crowe, *Baltic States and the Great Powers*, 176.
- ⁴³ *Ibid.*, 178.
- ⁴⁴ The “Prague Spring” was a period of political liberalization in Czechoslovakia. The USSR interpreted the attempts to create “socialism with a human face” as a threat to their hegemony over Eastern Europe, and together with its Warsaw Pact allies invaded Czechoslovakia to suppress resistance with military means.
- ⁴⁵ Romuald J. Misiunas and Rein Taagepera, *The Baltic States, Years of Dependence* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), 241–44.
- ⁴⁶ O’Connor, *History of the Baltic States*, 144.
- ⁴⁷ Shtromas, “Baltic States as Soviet Republics,” 105–6.
- ⁴⁸ See Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, *Final Act*, 1 August 1975. The CSCE is now known as the OSCE (Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe).
- ⁴⁹ The participating states were: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, the German Democratic Republic, the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, the Holy See, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, San Marino, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, the USSR, the United Kingdom, the United States, and Yugoslavia.
- ⁵⁰ CSCE *Final Act*, Article 7.
- ⁵¹ O’Connor, *History of the Baltic States*, 139.
- ⁵² Graham Smith, “The Resurgence of Nationalism,” in *The Baltic States: the National Self-Determination of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania*, 121.
- ⁵³ Jakob Hurt was an intellectual who had been active in Estonia’s nationalist awakening in the nineteenth century.

- ⁵⁴ Laar, *War in the Woods*, 223.
- ⁵⁵ During most of the Soviet occupation, history was presented in the service of the state and the Communist Party, which controlled the state.
- ⁵⁶ Laar, *War in the Woods*, 227.
- ⁵⁷ Raun, *Estonia and the Estonians*, 223.
- ⁵⁸ Misiunas and Taagepera, *The Baltic States*, 353.
- ⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 207.
- ⁶⁰ Smith, “Resurgence of Nationalism,” 130–32. During the Soviet period, the Russian language was the second official language of the Baltic states (and of all other member states of the USSR). Republic based citizenship did not exist – people living in the USSR were citizens of the Soviet Union (passports contained information about nationality, however).
- ⁶¹ Misiunas and Taagepera, *The Baltic States*, 321.
- ⁶² O’Connor, *History of the Baltic States*, 155.
- ⁶³ Smith, “Resurgence of Nationalism,” 133.
- ⁶⁴ In August 1991, the Soviet Union still existed. The final collapse of the USSR took place on 31 December 1991.
- ⁶⁵ At the beginning of the 1990s, there were approximately 200 Estonians who had been through the Soviet Union’s course of officer education (Anto Kergand, “Officer Basic Training in Foreign Countries and Its Influence on the Development of the Estonian Defence Forces in 1922-1999,” research paper completed at the Finnish National Defense College (2001), 5).
- ⁶⁶ Andrus Park, “Russia and Estonian Security Dilemmas,” *Europe-Asia Studies* 47:1 (1995): 32.
- ⁶⁷ Taagepera, *Estonia – Return to Independence*, 228.
- ⁶⁸ Clemens, Jr., *The Baltic Transformed*, 214.
- ⁶⁹ Robert Dalsjö, “Baltic Self-defence Capabilities—Achievable and Necessary or Futile Symbolism?” *Baltic Defence Review* 1 (1999); available at www.bdcol.ee/bdcol/pdf_files/bdreview/04bdr199.pdf.
- ⁷⁰ Michael W. Mosser, “Engineering Influence: The Subtle Power of Small States in the CSCE/OSCE,” in *Small States and Alliances*, ed. Erich Reiter and Heinz Gärtner (Heidelberg: Physica Verlag, 2001), 64.
- ⁷¹ Park, “Russia and Estonian Security Dilemmas,” 39.
- ⁷² Both Sweden and Finland take part in NATO’s Partnership for Peace program and prepare active participation in European Security and Defense Policy (ESDP). Both countries are also members of the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council. During the course of the 1990s, the Swedish government ceased to use the term “policy of neutrality,” which has gradually been replaced by the expression “non-participation in military alliances” (Gunnar Lassinantti, “Small States and Alliances: A Swedish

- Perspective,” in *Small States and Alliances*, 103). According to the Finnish Security and Defense Policy Report of 2004, the country is placing profound emphasis on international military cooperation, thus considering possible NATO membership in the future.
- ⁷³ Park, “Russia and Estonian Security Dilemmas,” 36; Taagepera, *Estonia – Return to Independence*, 228. The number was 150,000, if family members are included.
- ⁷⁴ David Vital, *The Inequality of States: a Study of the Small Power in International Relations* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1967), 148–50.
- ⁷⁵ Sasha Baillie, “A Theory of Small State Influence in European Decision Making,” *Journal of International Relations and Development* 1A (1998); Vital, *Inequality of States*, 122; Karsh, *Neutrality and Small States*, 81.
- ⁷⁶ Interview with Lieutenant Colonel Enn Tupp (23 December 2004); former (deputy) head of Defense Committee of Estonian Supreme Soviet; former Minister of Defense; currently Estonian defense attaché to Denmark and Norway.
- ⁷⁷ Interview with Mr. Margus Kolga (6 January 2005); former Deputy Secretary General for Defense Policy of Estonian Ministry of Defense; currently an analyst at the Baltic Defense College.
- ⁷⁸ Karsh, *Neutrality and Small States*, 80.
- ⁷⁹ Clemens, Jr., *The Baltic Transformed*, 179.
- ⁸⁰ Park, “Russia and Estonian Security Dilemmas,” 27.
- ⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 32.
- ⁸² The former Soviet Union member states are called the “near abroad.”
- ⁸³ Interview with Ambassador Jüri Luik (7 January 2005); former Member of Parliament, Minister of Foreign Affairs, twice Minister of Defense; currently Estonian Ambassador to the U.S., Canada, and Mexico.
- ⁸⁴ Interview with Margus Kolga.
- ⁸⁵ Eiki Berg, *Geopoliitika* (Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastus, 1998), 90.
- ⁸⁶ O’Connor, *History of the Baltic States*, 187.
- ⁸⁷ Alexei G. Arbatov, “Russia’s Foreign Policy Alternatives,” *International Security* 18:2 (Autumn 1993): 27–28.
- ⁸⁸ Michael Mastanduno, “Preserving the Unipolar Moment: Realist Theories and U.S. Grand Strategy after the Cold War,” *International Security* 21:4 (Spring 1997): 64.
- ⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 64–65.
- ⁹⁰ James J. Tritten, *Our New National Security Strategy: America Promises to Come Back* (Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers, 1992), 71, 80.
- ⁹¹ Interview with Jüri Luik.
- ⁹² Park, “Russia and Estonian Security Dilemmas,” 33.

Chapter 2

- ¹ Vahur Made, “Soome ja Eesti – ideaalsed sugulased,” *Postimees* (6 December 1997), available at <http://arhiiv2.postimees.ee:8080/leht/97/12/06/arvamus.htm#esimene>.
- ² Finland proclaimed its independence from Russia on 6 December 1917.
- ³ Seppo Zettenberg, *Ühe puu eri harud Eesti ja Soome – eilsest tänasesse* (Helsinki: Taloustieto OY, 2004), 20.
- ⁴ *Ibid.*, 47. At the same time, Russian bombers took off from their air bases on Estonian soil when going to bomb Finland (Zettenberg, 65).
- ⁵ The information on world politics gained from Finnish sources was often very different and more truthful than the information broadcast by Soviet media.
- ⁶ Kevin O’Connor, *The History of the Baltic States* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2003), 191.
- ⁷ Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Estonia Web page (*Eesti-Soome majandussuhted*), available at www.vm.ee/est/kat_461/4172.html (14 November 2003). In 2003, major Estonian export articles to Finland were machinery and equipment, textile and textile products, and wood and wood products. Major import articles in 2003 were machinery and equipment, metal and metal products, and textile and textile products (Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Estonia Web page [*Estonia and Finland*], available at www.vm.ee/eng/kat_176/1097.html [25 August 2004]).
- ⁸ Anto Kergand, “Officer Basic Training in Foreign Countries and Its Influence on the Development of the Estonian Defence Forces in 1922-1999,” research paper completed at the Finnish National Defense College (2001), 8.
- ⁹ Jouko Kivimäki and Seppo Haario, *Viro-projekti 1996-2003, Raportti Suomen puolustusvoimien johtaman projektin toiminnasta Viron maanpuolustuksen kehittämiseksi* (Helsinki: Pääesikunta kansainvälinen osasto, 2004), 23.
- ¹⁰ Kergand, “Officer Basic Training in Foreign Countries,” 11.
- ¹¹ Kivimäki and Haario, *Viro-projekti 1996-2003*, 29.
- ¹² Kergand, “Officer Basic Training in Foreign Countries,” 36.
- ¹³ Memorandum of Understanding between the Ministry of Defense of the Republic of Estonia and the Ministry of Defense of the Republic of Finland on Cooperation in the Field of Defense Matters, Section 3 (26 May 2003).
- ¹⁴ Puolustusvoimat, *Viron kenttätykistö koulutusammunnoissa Niinisalossa*, Tiedotteet, 12.3 (1999). Official press release from the Finnish Defense Forces.
- ¹⁵ Ministry of Defense of Estonia Web page (*kahepoolne kaitsealane koostöö*), at www.mod.gov.ee/?op=body&id=251 (27 October 2004).
- ¹⁶ Seppo Haario, “Suomen puolustusvoimien Viron-projekti”, *Sinibaretti* (11 February 2001).

- ¹⁷ Ants Laaneots, *Totaalkaitse riigikaitseüsteemina*, Academic Centre for Baltic and Russian Studies' Web page; at www.ut.ee/ABVKeskus/eesti/totaalkaitse.html#_ftn6 (Autumn 2000).
- ¹⁸ Kivimäki and Haario, *Viro-projekti 1996-2003*, 207.
- ¹⁹ Interview with Lieutenant Colonel Enn Tupp (23 December 2004); former (deputy) head of Defense Committee of Estonian Supreme Soviet; former Minister of Defense; currently Estonian defense attaché to Denmark and Norway.
- ²⁰ Interview with Ambassador Jüri Luik (7 January 2005); former Member of Parliament, Minister of Foreign Affairs, twice Minister of Defense; currently Estonian Ambassador to the U.S., Canada, and Mexico.
- ²¹ Kergand, "Officer Basic Training in Foreign Countries," 43.
- ²² Erik Männik, "Development of the Estonian Defence: Finnish Assistance," *Baltic Defence Review* 7 (2002): 39.
- ²³ General Einseln was Chief of the Estonian Defense Forces from 4 May 1993 to 22 December 1995.
- ²⁴ Some feared that Estonia's close cooperation with Finland as a non-NATO state could shut NATO's doors to Estonia (Kivimäki and Haario, *Viro-projekti 1996-2003*, 207).
- ²⁵ Männik, "Development of the Estonian Defence," 37–39. An Estonian Peacekeeping Company was established; its training is based on that of the Royal Marines (Männik, 39).
- ²⁶ *Eesti sõjalise kaitse strateegia* (Estonian National Military Strategy), 28 February 2001.
- ²⁷ *Sõjalise kaitse strateegiline kava* (Military Strategy), 18 January 2005.
- ²⁸ Vallo Toomet, Urmet Kook, and Kaarel Tarand, "Max Jakobson: Vene ohtu täna veel pole," *Riigi Kaitse* (9 December 2003).
- ²⁹ Kestutis Paulauskas, "Security Dimension of Northern Europe after the Double Enlargement," *Baltic Defence Review* 11 (2004): 109.
- ³⁰ Interview with Mr. Indrek Kannik (28 December 2004); former Minister of Defense, also former Secretary General of Estonian Ministry of Defense.
- ³¹ Interview with Mr. Margus Kolga (6 January 2005); former Deputy Secretary General for Defense Policy of Estonian Ministry of Defense; currently an analyst at the Baltic Defense College; and interview with Jüri Luik.
- ³² Interview with Jüri Luik.
- ³³ Interview with Margus Kolga.
- ³⁴ Interview with Ambassador Sulev Kannike (25 January 2005), former Ambassador to NATO and the WEU, currently Deputy Secretary General for Defense Policy of Ministry of Defense of Estonia.

- ³⁵ Interview with Brigadier-General Märt Tiru (7 January 2005), former Chief of Defense of Estonia, currently Estonian defense attaché to the U.S. and Canada.
- ³⁶ Interview with Indrek Kannik.
- ³⁷ The Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council was set up in 1997 to replace the North Atlantic Cooperation Council established in 1991.
- ³⁸ Finnish Security and Defense Policy Report, Chapter 5 (2004).
- ³⁹ Interview with Indrek Kannik.
- ⁴⁰ Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Estonia Web page (*Eesti, Läti ja Leedu koostöö*), at www.vm.ee/est/kat_50/437.html (13 May 2004).
- ⁴¹ In 2003, the main Estonian export articles to Latvia were chemical products, metal and metal products, and mineral products; the main import articles were wood and wood products, food products, and paper and paper products. The main Estonian export articles to Lithuania in 2003 were food products, animal products, and machinery and equipment; the main import articles in 2003 were mineral products, food products, and plastic and rubber products (Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Estonia Web page (*Estonia and Latvia*), at www.vm.ee/eng/kat_176/1206.html (21 June 2004); and (*Estonia and Lithuania*), at www.vm.ee/eng/kat_176/1193.html (28 May 2004).
- ⁴² In 1991, the uprisings in the Baltic capitals ended with civilian casualties in Vilnius and in Riga.
- ⁴³ John Hiden and Patrick Salmon, *The Baltic Nations and Europe: Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania in the Twentieth Century* (London: Longman, 1994), 193.
- ⁴⁴ Ea Jansen, "Rahvuslusest ja rahvusriikide sünni eeldustest Baltimail," *Akadeemia* 11 (1994): 2243.
- ⁴⁵ Jennifer A. Moll, "The Transatlantic Security Rift and Its Implications for Baltic Security," *Baltic Defence Review* 11 (2004): 74.
- ⁴⁶ Graham Smith, "The Resurgence of Nationalism," in *The Baltic States: the National Self-Determination of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania*, ed. Graham Smith (Basingstoke: MacMillan, 1994), 134.
- ⁴⁷ Gunnar Lassinantti, "Small States and Alliances: A Swedish Perspective," in *Small States and Alliances*, ed. Erich Reiter and Heinz Gärtner (Heidelberg: Physica Verlag, 2001), 104.
- ⁴⁸ O'Connor, *History of the Baltic States*, 193.
- ⁴⁹ Michael H. Clemmesen, "Security and Defence Cooperation—A Step Towards a Baltic Framework," *NATO's Nations* (special edition on the Baltic states) (1999): 32.
- ⁵⁰ See the Agreement between the Ministry of Defense of the Republic of Estonia, the Ministry of Defense of the Republic of Latvia, and the Ministry of National Defense of the Republic of Lithuania on Cooperation in the Fields of Defense and Military Relations, 27 February 1995.

- ⁵¹ Ibid., Article 1.
- ⁵² Baltic Military Committee, “The Land Forces Cooperation among Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, Project Description,” 22 April 2004.
- ⁵³ Estonian Ministry of Defense, Baltic Defense Cooperation brochure (2002), 12.
- ⁵⁴ Mine Countermeasure Force North (slated to become part of NATO Response Force).
- ⁵⁵ Ministry of Defence of Estonia webpage (*Balti mereväeskaader*), at www.mod.gov.ee/?op=body&id=95 (19 April 2004).
- ⁵⁶ NATO Integrated and Extended Air Defense System.
- ⁵⁷ Ministry of Defence of Estonia webpage (*Balti õhuseiresüsteem*), at www.mod.gov.ee/?op=body&id=96 (24 March 2004).
- ⁵⁸ Michael H. Clemmesen, “The Background and Development of the Baltic Defence College Higher Command Studies Course ‘Leadership of Transformation’,” Lecture delivered for the Higher Command Studies Course, September 2004.
- ⁵⁹ BALTSEA Information Web page (*Baltic Command, Control and Information System*), at www.baltsea.net/baltccis/framework.html (2004).
- ⁶⁰ Jüri Luik, Foreword to Baltic Defense Cooperation brochure (Tallinn: Estonian Ministry of Defense, 2002).
- ⁶¹ BALTSEA member states include the three Baltic states, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Iceland, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, and the United States.
- ⁶² See BALTSEA Information webpage (*BALTSEA introduction*), at www.baltsea.net/sg/sg_intro.asp. Western assistance to the re-establishment of the Baltic defense forces was of a varied nature. It often faced troubles in ensuring that the resources drafted for this purpose were spent rationally and effectively. These experiences led to the recognition that these efforts need to be coordinated between the sponsor countries.
- ⁶³ Interview with Indrek Kannik.
- ⁶⁴ Interview with Jüri Luik.

Chapter 3

- ¹ Volker Krause and David Singer, “Minor Powers, Alliances and Armed Conflict: Some Preliminary Patterns,” in *Small States and Alliances*, ed. Erich Reiter and Heinz Gärtner (Heidelberg: Physica Verlag, 2001), 18.
- ² Western security analysts believed that as long as the process of NATO enlargement went on and aimed at enhancing the security of all European states, it would be important that the Baltic three were neither excluded from the process on geopolitical grounds, nor fell out of the race because of lack of support or lack of own effort (Robert Dalsjö, “Baltic Self-defence Capabilities—Achievable and Neces-

- sary or Futile Symbolism?" *Baltic Defence Review* 1 (1999); available at www.bdcoll.org.uk/bdcol/pdf_files/bdreview/04bdr199.pdf.
- ³ Mette Skak, "Post-Communist Foreign Policies," *Cooperation and Conflict* 27:3 (1992): 282. Skak argues that this is the foreign policy goal of all post-communist Eastern and Central European States.
- ⁴ Douglas T. Stuart, "Symbol and (Very Little) Substance in the U.S. Debate over NATO Enlargement," in *Will NATO Go East*, ed. David G. Haglund (Kingston, Ont.: Queen's University Centre for International Relations, 1996), 124.
- ⁵ William J. Clinton, "Advancing Our Interests through Engagement and Enlargement," in *American Defense Policy*, ed. Peter L. Hays, Brenda J. Vallance, and Alan R. Van Tassel (Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997), 284.
- ⁶ *Ibid.*, 296–97.
- ⁷ James J. Tritten, *Our New National Security Strategy: America Promises to Come Back* (Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers, 1992), 23. This would not have been a nuclear counterattack but an attack with conventional forces. A more recent report issued by the RAND Corporation in 2004 states that, in case of Russian-Baltic conflict (a Russian attempt to employ military coercion to separate the three Baltic states from the rest of NATO), the U.S. and NATO would interfere (Eric V. Larson; Derek Eaton; Paul Elrick; Theodore Karasik; Robert Klein; Sherrill Lingel; Brian Nichiporuk; Robert Uy; and John Zavadil, *Assuring Access in Key Strategic Regions: Toward a Long-term Strategy* [Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2004], 65). This is only logical (and subject to the Article V security guarantee), as Estonia is now a NATO member state.
- ⁸ Tritten, *Our New National Security Strategy*, 60.
- ⁹ The NACC participants did not receive any promise of full or even associate NATO membership, but the creation of NACC showed that NATO was undergoing changes.
- ¹⁰ Estonia joined the PfP program on February 3, 1994; it was the fourth country to do so.
- ¹¹ Catherine McArdle Kelleher, *The Future of European Security. An Interim Assessment* (Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1995), 96.
- ¹² Ronald D. Asmus, *Opening NATO's Door. How the Alliance Remade Itself for a New Era* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002), 51.
- ¹³ *Ibid.*, 54.
- ¹⁴ Carnegie Center Web page (*Press Conference with Moscow Carnegie Center Deputy Director Dmitry Trenin on RF-U.S. Agenda*), at www.carnegie.ru/en/pubs/media/47974.htm (13 June 2001).

- ¹⁵ Alexei B. Arbatov, "Changing the Order that Worked: Prospects and Alternatives for European Security," in *The Future of European Security* (Berkeley: The Regents of the University of California, 1991), 163.
- ¹⁶ Kari Roberts, "Russian Response to NATO Expansion," presentation at Queen's Centre for International Relations Annual Conference 2004, "NATO after Istanbul: Prospects and Implications of Expansion" (30 September–1 October 2004).
- ¹⁷ It should be noted, nevertheless, that the chairman of the Russian Duma's foreign commission told Finnish politicians at the end of October 2004 that Russia continues to perceive NATO as unfriendly (Imbi Paju, "Venemaa hoiatas Soomet NATO-ga liitumise eest," *Postimees* (30 November 2004), at www.postimees.ee/301104/esileht/valisuudised/151386.php). Furthermore, public polls conducted in 2004 indicate that up to 60 percent of Russians who took part in the polls consider NATO to be an aggressive military bloc (Kestutis Paulauskas, "Security Dimension of Northern Europe after the Double Enlargement," *Baltic Defence Review* 11 (2004): 110).
- ¹⁸ Actually, ordinary Russians took no interest in NATO, in its enlargement, or in foreign and security policy altogether. Ordinary Russians were preoccupied with the struggles of everyday life, whereas it was the Russian elite that took the issue of enlargement much more seriously (Andrei Kortunov, "NATO Enlargement and Russia: in Search of an Adequate Response," in *Will NATO Go East*, 71).
- ¹⁹ Asmus, *Opening NATO's Door*, 231.
- ²⁰ Gunnar Lassinantti, "Small States and Alliances: A Swedish Perspective," in *Small States and Alliances*, 101.
- ²¹ See Charles Krauthammer, "The Unipolar Moment Revisited," *The National Interest* (Winter 2002/2003): 5–17.
- ²² Kenneth N. Waltz, "NATO Expansion: A Realist's View," in *Explaining NATO Enlargement*, ed. Robert W. Rauchhaus (London: Frank Cass, 2001), 23.
- ²³ Robert W. Rauchhaus, ed., *Explaining NATO Enlargement*, 11.
- ²⁴ Ernst B. Haas, "Organization Theory: Remedy for Europe's Organizational Cacophony," in *Explaining NATO Enlargement*, 85; Asmus, *Opening NATO's Door*, 290.
- ²⁵ Asmus, *Opening NATO's Door*, 155, 289. The United States, nevertheless, did not want Europe so unified that Europe, acting together, would outbalance the U.S.
- ²⁶ Josef Joffe, "NATO After Victory: New Products, New Markets, and the Microeconomics of Alliance," in *Will NATO Go East*, 63.
- ²⁷ David Haglund, "The Future of Transatlantic Relations," presentation at Queen's Centre for International Relations Annual Conference 2004, "NATO after Istanbul: Prospects and Implications of Expansion" (30 September–1 October 2004).

- ²⁸ Jan Lodal, *The Price of Dominance: the New Weapons of Mass Destruction and Their Challenge to American Leadership* (New York: Council on Foreign Relations Press, 2001), 10.
- ²⁹ Kelleher, "The Future of European Security," 9–10.
- ³⁰ Clinton, "Advancing Our Interests," 285.
- ³¹ Barry Posen, "Command of the Commons: The Military Foundations of U.S. Hegemony," *International Security* (Summer 2003): 17.
- ³² Tritten, *Our New National Security Strategy*, 22.
- ³³ By "new NATO states," I mean the states that have acceded to NATO in the enlargements of 1999 as well as 2004.
- ³⁴ Sloan, "U.S. Hegemony and the Transatlantic Alliance," 30.
- ³⁵ As can be seen from the list above, only one of the newly acceded states – Slovenia – never took part in the coalition.
- ³⁶ Waltz, "NATO Expansion: A Realist's View," 24.
- ³⁷ Steven Weber, "A Modest Proposal for NATO Expansion," in *Explaining NATO Enlargement*, 94.
- ³⁸ Michael Mastanduno, "Preserving the Unipolar Moment: Realist Theories and U.S. Grand Strategy after the Cold War," *International Security* 21:4 (Spring 1997): 58. U.S.-French relations never recovered after General DeGaulle's decision in 1966 to withdraw France from the integrated NATO military command (Jennifer A. Moll, "The Transatlantic Security Rift and Its Implications for Baltic Security," *Baltic Defence Review* 11 (2004): 67).
- ³⁹ Moll, "Transatlantic Security Rift," 70.
- ⁴⁰ The CFSP was established as the second pillar of the European Union in the 1993 Treaty on European Union, signed in Maastricht.
- ⁴¹ William Yerex, "The North Atlantic Cooperation Council: NATO's Ostpolitik for Post-Cold War Europe," in *NATO's Eastern Dilemmas*, ed. David G. Haglund, S. Neil MacFarlane, and Joel J. Sokolsky (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1994), 185.
- ⁴² Beverly Crawford, *The Future of European Security* (Berkeley: The Regents of the University of California, 1992), 39. The Northern Dimension of the EU's policies and the Northern European Initiative put forward by the U.S. State Department were also two competing strategies to gain power in the Baltic Sea region (Konstantin Khudoley and Dmitri Lanko, "Russia, NATO Enlargement and the Baltic States," *Baltic Defence Review* 11 (2004): 121).
- ⁴³ Haas, "Organization Theory: Remedy for Europe's Organizational Cacophony," 86.
- ⁴⁴ Moll, "Transatlantic Security Rift," 71.
- ⁴⁵ Waltz, "NATO Expansion: A Realist's View," 30.

- ⁴⁶ Alan R. Gitelson, Robert L. Dudley, and Melvin J. Dubnick, *Ameerika Ühendriikide valitsemisüsteem* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1996), 173. Translation from the Regional Program Office of the US Embassy to Estonia (contract RPO 2000238).
- ⁴⁷ There are approximately 20,000 people of Estonian, 80,000 people of Latvian, and 800,000 people of Lithuanian origin living in the United States.
- ⁴⁸ Asmus, *Opening NATO's Door*, 159.
- ⁴⁹ Strobe Talbott also served as President Clinton's policy adviser on Russia and the new independent states of the former Soviet Union.
- ⁵⁰ Asmus, *Opening NATO's Door*, 229.
- ⁵¹ For instance, in 2004, Estonia spent about 28.47 million EUR on the procurement of military equipment and systems (the overall defense budget was 147.68 million EUR). In 2005, some 30.57 million EUR is to be spent on the procurement of military equipment and systems (the overall defense budget being 165.33 million EUR).
- ⁵² Ministry of Defense of Estonia, *Pressiteade nr. 31 radarihankekonkursist*, at www.mod.gov.ee/?op=news&id=106&sw=lockheed%20martin (24 April 2001).
- ⁵³ Asmus, *Opening NATO's Door*, 160.
- ⁵⁴ Mastanduno, "Preserving the Unipolar Moment," 71.
- ⁵⁵ The NATO-Russia Permanent Joint Council was replaced by the NATO-Russia Council in May 2002.
- ⁵⁶ Asmus, *Opening NATO's Door*, 149, 162.
- ⁵⁷ Interview with Mr. Margus Kolga (6 January 2005); former Deputy Secretary General for Defense Policy of Estonian Ministry of Defense; currently an analyst at the Baltic Defense College.
- ⁵⁸ Interview with Lieutenant Colonel Enn Tupp (23 December 2004); former (deputy) head of Defense Committee of Estonian Supreme Soviet; former Minister of Defense; currently Estonian defense attaché to Denmark and Norway; and interview with Brigadier-General Märt Tiru (7 January 2005), former Chief of Defense of Estonia, currently Estonian defense attaché to the U.S. and Canada.
- ⁵⁹ Interview with Märt Tiru.
- ⁶⁰ Interview with Enn Tupp.
- ⁶¹ Michel Fortmann and David G. Haglund, "Between Eurovoluntarism and Realism: France and European Security in Transition," in *NATO's Eastern Dilemmas*, 138; Yerex, "North Atlantic Cooperation Council," 185.
- ⁶² Interview with Mr. Indrek Kannik (28 December 2004); former Minister of Defense, also former Secretary General of Estonian Ministry of Defense.
- ⁶³ William J. Clinton, *My Life* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2004), 772.

- ⁶⁴ A Charter of Partnership Among the United States of America and the Republic of Estonia, Republic of Latvia, and Republic of Lithuania, 16 January 1998.

Chapter 4

- ¹ *National Security Concept of the Republic of Estonia*, Section 1.1, 2004.
- ² Merle Krigul, “Muutustest Eesti julgeolekukontseptsioonis pärast 2004. aasta 2. aprilli,” *Diplomaatia* 7 (April 2004): 3.
- ³ Interview with Brigadier-General Märt Tiru (7 January 2005), former Chief of Defense of Estonia, currently Estonian defense attaché to the U.S. and Canada.
- ⁴ Interview with Ambassador Sulev Kannike (25 January 2005), former Ambassador to NATO and the WEU, currently Deputy Secretary General for Defense Policy of Ministry of Defense of Estonia.
- ⁵ States acquire hard security through military means. It corresponds to securing territorial integrity and public safety. Soft security is acquired through political and economic means; the aim is to achieve political and economic stability.
- ⁶ Treaty on European Union, Article 11, 2002.
- ⁷ *Ibid.*, Article 12.
- ⁸ *Ibid.*, Article 17.
- ⁹ European Council, *European Security Strategy* (12 December 2003), 3–6.
- ¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 9, 13.
- ¹¹ *Ibid.*, 7–8.
- ¹² The European Neighborhood Policy’s partners to the east are Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Moldova, and Ukraine; its partners to the south include Algeria, Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Palestinian Authority, Syria, and Tunisia.
- ¹³ European Commission (*European Neighborhood Policy*) http://europa.eu.int/comm/world/enp/policy_en.htm (2004).
- ¹⁴ *The North Atlantic Treaty*, Article IV (4 April 1949).
- ¹⁵ *Ibid.*, Articles V and VI.
- ¹⁶ North Atlantic Treaty Organization, *The Alliance’s Strategic Concept*, Sections 4–5 (April 1999).
- ¹⁷ North Atlantic Treaty Organization Web page (*NATO Russia Relations*), at www.nato.int/issues/nato-russia/index.html (13 January 2005).
- ¹⁸ North Atlantic Treaty Organization webpage (*NATO Elevates Mediterranean Dialogue to a Genuine Partnership, Launches Istanbul Cooperation Initiative*), at www.nato.int/docu/update/2004/06-june/e0629d.htm (9 July 2004).
- ¹⁹ North Atlantic Treaty Organization, *Istanbul Cooperation Initiative*, June 2004.

- ²⁰ Ronald D. Asmus, *Opening NATO's Door. How the Alliance Remade Itself for a New Era* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002), 155, 289.
- ²¹ Tony Judt, "Europe vs. America," *The New York Review of Books* 52:2 (10 February 2005): 40.
- ²² Philip H. Gordon and Charles Grant, "A Concrete Strategy for Mending Fences," *International Herald Tribune* (17 February 2005).
- ²³ George W. Bush, Inaugural Address (20 January 2005); available at www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2005/01/20050120-1.html.
- ²⁴ Condoleezza Rice, "Remarks at the Institut d'Etudes Politiques de Paris - Sciences Po" (8 February 2005); available at www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2005/41973.htm.
- ²⁵ A UN report on the deadly conflict in Sudan found no clear evidence of genocide, but said that "no less serious and heinous" crimes had been perpetrated. It recommended that the Security Council refer the situation to the International Criminal Court.
- ²⁶ "Let's Be Friends," *The Economist*, 11 February 2005; available at www.economist.com/agenda/displayStory.cfm?story_id=3643049.
- ²⁷ Gordon and Grant, "A Concrete Strategy for Mending Fences."
- ²⁸ Quentin Peel, "An Alliance of Conflicting Priorities," *Financial Times* (16 February 2005).
- ²⁹ Interview with Mr. Margus Kolga (6 January 2005); former Deputy Secretary General for Defense Policy of Estonian Ministry of Defense; currently an analyst at the Baltic Defense College.
- ³⁰ Interview with Ambassador Jüri Luik (7 January 2005); former Member of Parliament, Minister of Foreign Affairs, twice Minister of Defense; currently Estonian Ambassador to the U.S., Canada, and Mexico.
- ³¹ Interview with Margus Kolga.
- ³² Kristiina Ojulang, "Main Guidelines of Estonia's Foreign Policy" (address by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Estonia Kristiina Ojulang to Riigikogu on behalf of the Government of Estonia), 7 December 2004.
- ³³ Susanne Nies, "Between Chirac, Bush and Putin: the Baltic States, from Factors to Actors in the New Europe," *Baltic Defence Review* 9 (2003): 88. It is no secret that NATO's security guarantees are, in effect, U.S. guarantees.
- ³⁴ Ahto Lobjakas, "Kuningas Julgeolek on alasti," *Eesti Päevaleht* (18 December 2004), at www.epl.ee/artikkel_280975.html.
- ³⁵ *National Security Concept of the Republic of Estonia*, Sections 1.2, 2.4.1, 2004.
- ³⁶ Interview with Jüri Luik.
- ³⁷ Nies, "Between Chirac, Bush and Putin," 87.
- ³⁸ Baltic Center for Russian Studies, *Analüütiline ettekanne* 3 (27 March 2003), 5.

- ³⁹ Russia is putting similar pressure on Latvia, where the percentage of Russian population is the highest among the three Baltic states. Of the Estonian population, approximately 25 percent are ethnic Russians.
- ⁴⁰ Marko Mihkelson, “Venemaa Eesti-poliitika pankrott,” *Diplomaatia* 6 (March 2004): 13.
- ⁴¹ Nies, “Between Chirac, Bush and Putin,” 91.
- ⁴² Interview with Mr. Indrek Kannik (28 December 2004); former Minister of Defense, also former Secretary General of Estonian Ministry of Defense.
- ⁴³ Walter J. Clemens, Jr., *The Baltic Transformed. Complexity Theory and European Security* (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 2001), 139.
- ⁴⁴ Krister Paris, “Gazprom: Kremli rusikas ja rahamasin hoiab haardes poolt Euroopat,” *Eesti Päevaleht Ärileht* (5 January 2005), at http://arileht.epl.ee/artikkel_939.html. From 1988–1991, the Soviet Union tried to pressure its republics not to break away from the union by reducing the supply of energy (Nies, “Between Chirac, Bush and Putin,” 91). Furthermore, at the beginning of the 1990s, Moscow tried to manipulate the Baltic states by reducing their supply of natural gas (Paris).
- ⁴⁵ The Alliance’s 1999 Defense Capabilities Initiative points out deployability (rapid deployment), sustainability of operations, and interoperability as requirements (Defense Capabilities Initiative, 1999).
- ⁴⁶ For instance, with current Membership Action Plan countries Albania, Croatia, and Macedonia.
- ⁴⁷ *Sõjalise kaitse strateegiline kava* (Military Strategy), 18 January 2005. Estonia is not yet a party of the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe, the target of which is to increase the transparency of military activity through the control of conventional arms, information exchange, and implementation of a thorough monitoring system. Nevertheless, Estonia is following the development of the treaty as well as the fulfillment of treaty commitments, and is ready to start accession negotiations after the treaty (as modified in 1999) becomes effective. Estonia does not have weapons of mass destruction, and has signed major international agreements for preventing their proliferation (National Security Strategy, Section 2.5.3, 2004).
- ⁴⁸ Kyllike Sillaste-Elling, “Eesti välispoliitika väljakutsed ja võimalused,” *Diplomaatia* 16 (January 2005): 3.
- ⁴⁹ Ojuland, “Main Guidelines of Estonia’s Foreign Policy.”
- ⁵⁰ Ibid.
- ⁵¹ Mihkelson, “Venemaa Eesti-poliitika pankrott,” 13.
- ⁵² Pierre Moscovici, “Väikeriikide roll laienenud Euroopa Liidus,” *Diplomaatia* 12 (September 2004): 12.
- ⁵³ Estonia was part of the Soviet Union for decades, and as a consequence understands the Russian “way of thinking.”