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Blinken, Antony J.

From: Vershbow, Alexander R.
To: Davies, Glyn T.; @TRIP - NSC Staff at Tripsite
Cc: /R, Record at A1; @EUROPE - European Affairs; @RUSSIA - Russia/Ukraine; @PLANNING - Strat Plan & Comm; @EXECSEC - Executive Secretary
Subject: UPDATE: French Plan for Paris on 27th
Date: Saturday, May 10, 1997 11:09AM

For Sandy Berger

Jean-David Levitte called this morning to lay out French thinking for Paris in greater detail. They are only consulting with the U.S. at this point, but will need early feedback since discussions with NATO and other allies get underway early next week and things will begin to get set in concrete.

The French view the proceedings as a single event -- not quite the two-part sequence indicated below. The leaders would all be seated at a semicircular table. Chirac as host would be in the middle with Solana to his left and Yeltsin to his right. Allies would be seated in the usual English alphabetical order, beginning with Belgium to Solana's left. This works out well, since the President, as the last of the 16, would be to Yeltsin's right. The result, in other words:

CLINTON YELTSIN CHIRAC SOLANA
DEMAIRE DEHAENE
AZNAR CHRETIEN RASMUSSEN etc.

Chirac would open at 10:00 a.m. with 8-10 minute remarks, then Yeltsin would speak, then Solana. All 18 leaders would then sign the NATO-Russia Document, and then individual allies would each speak for 5 minutes each. The President could, per tradition, be the first to speak (this would be around 11:00, i.e. 5:00 a.m. EDT). Allies would be encouraged to restrict their remarks to 5 minutes, but POTUS could go a bit longer. The whole event would be televised (no closed session), ending around 12:20.

Speakers would NOT speak from their seats, but come up to a lectern in the vicinity of Chirac's seat at the center of the table (the French believe this is more congenial TV-wise than speaking seated, but want to be sure we have no problem -- particularly with POTUS still on crutches).

As per the message below, there would then be a family photo (outdoors if weather is OK) followed by drinks and lunch. Levitte projected conclusion at 3:00, after which bilateral could take place. He said it was not likely Chirac would do a press conference, since the whole summit will have been open to the press, but suggested we could do one if we wished down the street at the Ambassador's residence. That, presumably, would also be the easiest venue logistically for the Clinton-Yeltsin bilateral, unless the Russians insist on hosting. Levitte said he assumed the Clinton-Chirac bilat would be very brief (I inferred that this was because Chirac will need to make time for many of the other leaders as well).

Finally, Levitte passed on some thoughts on war crimes (see separate E-mail) and said he hopes to meet with you when he is in town May 22 for the next Sherpa meeting. (That meeting starts at 7:30 p.m., so he could see you at 6:00 pm, just after arrival from the airport.)
12:30 Heads of government sign Charter and speak in turn (total of 15 sets of remarks)

12:30 Family Photo

12:45 - Lunch hosted by Chirac at Elysee
2:30 (Separate lunch at Quai d'Orsay for FMs)

2:45 Individual press conferences

p.m. Clinton/Chirac bilat (alternatively in morning).
    Clinton/Yeltsin bilat ("")

Other points:

- This is on the December, '95 Paris Dayton signing model
- Logistically easy because most events at Elysee
- White House Advance cannot be accommodated before Thursday, May 15 due to State dinner for Japanese crown princess, prep for Chirac's departure for China and NATO advance team arrival all earlier in week

Problems with above:

- We had hoped to find a formula permitting the President to speak at same time as Yeltsin, Chirac, Solana. Two hours and 15 speeches is deadly
- Need to get WH pre-advance in earlier in week as advance team arrives on Sunday, May 18, leaving no time for WHouse to digest results of pre-advance before advance shows up

Suggest you:

- Probe to see if alternative schedule possible giving POTUS higher profile and avoiding 15-speech scenario
- Lay down marker advance team needs to do business in Paris earlier in week
Sandy:

Mark Bellamy called from Paris to give you a heads-up that Levitte will probably try to reach you today to go over French plans for the NATO-Russia signing on 27th (presuming it takes place). French notion is:

10am Opening ceremony at Elysee - speeches by Chirac, Yeltsin, Solana

10:30 - Signing ceremony @ Elysee

12:30 Heads of government sign Charter and speak in turn (total of 15 sets of remarks)

12:30 Family Photo

12:45 - Lunch hosted by Chirac at Elysee

2:30 (Separate lunch at Quai d’Orsay for FMs)

2:45 Individual press conferences

p.m.. Clinton/Chirac bilat (alternatively in morning)

Clinton/yeltsin bilat ( )

Other points:

- This is on the December, '95 Paris Dayton signing model
- Logistically easy because most events at Elysee
- White House Advance cannot be accommodated before Thursday, May 15 due to State dinner for Japanese crown princess, prep for Chirac’s departure for China and NATO advance team arrival all earlier in week

Problems with above:

- We had hoped to find a formula permitting the President to speak at same time as Yeltsin, Chirac, Solana. Two hours and 15 speeches is deadly

- Need to get WH pre-advance in earlier in week as advance team arrives on Sunday, May 18, leaving no time for WHouse to digest results of pre-advance before advance shows up

Suggest you:

- Probe to see if alternative schedule possible giving POTUS higher profile and avoiding 15-speech scenario

- Lay down marker advance team needs to do business in Paris earlier in week
Jean-David Levitte called this morning to lay out French thinking for Paris in greater detail. They are only consulting with the U.S. at this point, but will need early feedback since discussions with NATO and other allies get underway early next week and things will begin to get set in concrete.

The French view the proceedings as a single event -- not quite the two-part sequence indicated below. The leaders would all be seated at a semicircular table. Chirac as host would be in the middle with Solana to his left and Yeltsin to his right. Allies would be seated in the usual English alphabetical order, beginning with Belgium to Solana's left. This works out well, since the President, as the last of the 16, would be to Yeltsin's right. The result, in other words:

```
CLINTON YELTSIN CHIRAC SOLANA
BLAIR DEHAENE

DEMIREL CHRETIEN AZNAR,etc

AZNAR etc

DEMIREL CHRETIEN AZNAR,etc

AZNAR,etc

RASMUSSEN etc
```

Chirac would open at 10:00 a.m. with 8-10 minute remarks, then Yeltsin would speak, then Solana. All 18 leaders would next sign the NATO-Russia Document, and then individual allies would each speak for 5 minutes each. The President could, per tradition, be the first to speak (this would be around 11:00, i.e. 5:00 a.m. EDT). Allies would be encouraged to restrict their remarks to 5 minutes, but POTUS could go a bit longer. The whole event would be televised (no closed session), ending around 12:20.

Speakers would NOT speak from their seats, but come up to a lectern in the vicinity of Chirac's seat at the center of the table (the French believe this is more congenial TV-wise than speaking seated, but want to be sure we have no problem -- particularly with POTUS still on crutches).

As per the message below, there would then be a family photo (outdoors if weather is OK) followed by drinks and lunch. Levitte projected conclusion at 3:00, after which bilaterals could take place. He said it was not likely Chirac would do a press conference, since the whole summit will have been open to the press, but suggested we could do one if we wished (in the French believe this is more congenial TV-wise than speaking seated, but want to be sure we have no problem -- particularly with POTUS still on crutches).

Finally, Levitte passed on some thoughts on war crimes (see separate E-mail) and said he hopes to meet with you when he is in town May 22 for the next Sherpa meeting. (That meeting starts at 7:30 p.m., so he could see you at 6:00 pm, just after arrival from the airport.)
12:30 Heads of government sign Charter and speak in turn (total of 15 sets of remarks)

12:30 Family Photo

12:45 - Lunch hosted by Chirac at Elysee
2:30 (Separate lunch at Quai d'Orsay for FMs)

2:45 Individual press conferences

p.m.. Clinton/Chirac bilat (alternatively in morning)
       Clinton/yeltsin bilat ( )

Other points:

o This is on the December, '95 Paris Dayton signing model

o Logistically easy because most events at Elysee

o White House Advance cannot be accommodated before Thursday, May 15 due to State dinner for Japanese crown princess, prep for Chirac's departure for China and NATO advance team arrival all earlier in week

Problems with above:

-- We had hoped to find a formula permitting the President to speak at same time as Yeltsin, Chirac, Solana. Two hours and 15 speeches is deadly

-- Need to get WH pre-advance in earlier in week as advance team arrives on Sunday, May 18, leaving no time for WHouse to digest results of pre-advance before advance shows up

Suggest you:

-- Probe to see if alternative schedule possible giving POTUS higher profile and avoiding 15-speech scenario

-- Lay down marker advance team needs to do business in Paris earlier in week
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UNCLASSIFIED CLASSIFICATION
Friday, May 16, 1997

NATO-RUSSIA ACCORD: 'A NEW EUROPEAN ORDER' OR 'TROUBLE AHEAD'? 

The majority of observers abroad applauded the "historic" May 14 agreement outlining new, formal ties between NATO and Russia for opening the Alliance's door to former USSR satellites and "guaranteeing Europe's stability." Others, however, raised their voices in concern about the wisdom of moving ahead with enlargement against Russia's wishes. Editorials supporting a larger NATO praised President Clinton and his administration's "tough" handling of the tortuous process of persuading Russia to sign off on enlargement. London's independent Financial Times held, "The biggest winner is Washington, which...gambled that it could satisfy Eastern Europe's desire for inclusion into the West without overly alienating the Russians." Analysts agreed that the "compromise" deal carefully spared Russia further humiliation and salved her pride by offering other incentives, such as a seat at the Group of Seven's table, while insuring that NATO did not give ground on its vital interests. German national ARD-TV pragmatically concluded, "More could not be won--by either side." Others believed with Paris's left-of-center Le Monde that the deal officially concluded the Cold War era by giving Moscow "what it wanted most: to have a voice...in matters of European security" and by creating a "framework" for "a new, pan-European security system." A substantial segment of Moscow's press sided with these conclusions, with some going so far as to declare that Russia had scored a "diplomatic success" and that Russian Foreign Minister Primakov "defended Russia's security interests." Centrist Nezavisimaya Gazeta judged that "this document lays a real foundation for an effective...military-political partnership between Russia and NATO." Central European writers whose countries are widely expected to be invited into the Alliance could not conceal their delight. Budapest's top-circulation Nepszabadsag held, "The real winners are of course the prospective new members of the Alliance, including Hungary."

Critics of the accord focused instead on the damage to be wrought by what they claimed would be a newly divided Europe. Journalists pointed out that few--in Moscow and elsewhere--are fooled by the rhetoric: Russia's might has dwindled so that it cannot stop NATO's march towards its borders. The accord simply allowed Russia to "save face," insisted Moscow's reformist Segodnya. Ljubljana's left-of-center Vecer said the agreement confirmed "that there is just one superpower left...and that Russia has been...defeated in a battle in which it could not expect a victory." The conviction that resentment of Moscow's position might create a dangerous new rift in Europe moved Milan's provocative, classical liberal Il Foglio to insist that the West should guard against creating a "feeling of encirclement" in Russia that might give anti-democratic forces the upper hand. Center-left Gazeta Wyborcza in Warsaw worried that the admissions process would get derailed by one of the parliaments of the 16 NATO members. Centrist Sueddeutsche Zeitung of Munich highlighted three issues that might spell trouble for NATO: how much influence Russia will have over NATO's decisions, the uncertain future of countries left out of the first round of acceptances and the possibility that a larger NATO "will not necessarily" be better. Riga's centrist Neatkarja Rita Avize feared that "our problems are just beginning," with Russia doing its utmost to keep the Baltics out of NATO.

This survey is based on 81 reports from 22 countries, May 9-16.

EDITOR: Mildred Sola Neely
RUSSIA: "Moscow Only Allowed To Save Face"

Georgy Bovt judged in reformist Segodnya (5/16): "Basically, NATO will not at all feel constrained by a consensus in the proposed Russia-NATO council. It is simple and cynical: Moscow was only allowed to save face, but when the Russian president tried to interpret the accord wider than NATO did, his 'mistake' was delicately pointed out to him.... Anyway, this accord completed a certain stage in Russia-NATO relations. Throughout that stage, Russian diplomacy was on the defensive, trying to minimize the effects of NATO enlargement and win concessions. Acting that way, Moscow was doomed to either failure or a very limited success. It turned out to be the latter."

"U.S. Not To Take Moscow's Vote Seriously"

Dmitry Gornostayev surmised on page one of centrist Nezavisimaya Gazeta (5/16): "Moscow's vote (in the proposed joint council) is not going to be taken seriously, at least not by the Americans. They are willing to talk about cooperation in peacekeeping, human rights and, possibly, operations to rescue missing alpine climbers; but they won't hear of it when it comes to Russia's national security interests."

"Basis For Effective Partnership"

Sergei Rogov stated in centrist Nezavisimaya Gazeta (5/16): "This document lays a real foundation for an effective, not declarative, military-political partnership between Russia and NATO. That the West, after five odd years of dilly-dallying, has agreed to seal this partnership is a great success of Russian diplomacy. That level of relations with the former Cold-War enemy enables Russia to avoid the humiliation of a losing side having to put up with restrictions imposed by the winner."

"We Got Most Of What We Hoped To Get"

Ilya Bulavinov, accompanying Defense Minister Igor Rodionov on a tour of the United States, cited in reformist, business-oriented Kommersant Daily (5/16) a Russian military expert as commenting on the Russia-NATO founding act: "We have gotten most of what we hoped to get. Neither side has yielded an inch of its ground on the four last points of contention. Russian generals are satisfied. Of course, we could have acted smug, pretending not to notice NATO enlargement. But that wouldn't have made sense. Security has to be ensured via cooperation. Now Russia has more leverage to influence the European security system."

"Yeltsin, Clinton Get Different Draft Accords?"

Andrei Kabannikov remarked in reformist, youth-orient Komsomolskaya Pravda (5/16): "To listen to the Russian and American presidents, they were given different drafts of the Russia-NATO accords."

"Sides Met Their Objectives In This Compromise"

Vadim Markushin of centrist, army Krasnaya Zvezda (5/16) said: "The sides really met their objectives by reaching a compromise. Each set out to meet the other somewhere down the road, covering a part of the way which, of course, differed from that gone by the other. Did the Russian negotiators do their best when NATO, virtually, was in a position to refuse to talk to Moscow? It seems they did. As for the real historical value of the accord, we should go by time, not the harangues of presidents and ministers."
"For Internal Consumption Only"

Georgy Bovt wrote in reformist Segodnya (5/15): "The scowling Primakov realizes that today's NATO, in principle, is no threat to today's Russia with the kind of administration she has today. The noisy anti-NATO rhetoric is for internal consumption, very limited, since ordinary Russians, for the most part, don't seem scared by NATO enlargement, and some of them, adopting the rules of the game, realize that, after all, things will turn out differently from what politicians say."

"Diplomatic Success"

Centrist Nezavisimaya Gazeta front-paged (5/15) this comment by Yulia Petrovskaya and Dmitry Gornostayev: "While a detailed analysis is still ahead, that which happened easily qualifies for a diplomatic success. Not only did they avoid getting the talks deadlocked-- this danger persisting throughout the consultations--but they compromised on all aspects of the future accord, so it will certainly be signed by Boris Yeltsin and the heads of state and government of NATO member-countries in Paris on May 27.... The Russian Foreign Ministry and Primakov proved up to a rather difficult task by having met the deadline and defended Russia's security interests. Commenting on the results of the talks, Primakov described the accord as testimony to the triumph of common sense and a great victory for Russia and the entire world community."

"Russia Achieved Her Main Goal"

Veronika Kutsyllo said on page one of reformist, business-oriented Kommersant Daily (5/15): "Who ceded to whom is unclear yet. And that may remain so forever, as both sides will probably want to keep it that way. One indisputable compromise is the name of the document. As predicted, a 'charter' and 'agreement' have yielded to an 'act.' Russia has achieved her main goal--after the long and truly excruciating negotiations, nobody will reproach her for a very easy surrender. Also, with yesterday's round over, Russia doesn't look like a 'hardheaded bear' unfit for civilized talks."

"Third World War Nears End?"

Ivan Boltovsky, commented in neo-communist Pravda (5/15) on a round-table conference in Moscow last Tuesday which discussed the restoration of this country's national security system: "According to the former KGB chief Vladimir Kryuchkov, NATO advance and the Kremlin's surrender lead humanity to a third world war. Indeed, the Russian bear, his hands up, is backing down, confronted by NATO. Still, Kryuchkov doesn't seem quite right about NATO enlargement threatening a war. Isn't that war about to be over? The valiant Cheka men keep wrecking their brains over why, with the state security agency cruelly savaged, the government won't stir a finger to restore it for the good of the Fatherland. The answer is simple: a national sellout."

"NATO Enlargement: Russia Will Be Alone Again"

Alexei Malashenko of the Moscow Carnegie Center mused in centrist Nezavisimaya Gazeta (5/7): "By the rules of yore, Russia has never been part of Western Europe. As she conquered alternately Paris and Berlin, crossed the Alps, and gobbled up Finland, Russia always remained an alien force. European powers used her in fighting against each other, but invariably cut her out of the spoils at the last minute. They feared (or respected?) her, looking with dismay upon her traditions, lifestyle, resistance to reform, and religion. Today the border between NATO and Russia is, in fact, a border between two different Christian confessions. NATO's new advance to our borders, as it were, legitimizes that perpetual reality. Eastern Europe is looking for protection from Russia's bedlam, Lukashenko, Anpilov and other communist ghosts. Western Europe is willing to provide it, just in case. NATO enlargement is in order, for sociocultural and strictly pragmatic reasons. And so that Russia will stay alone again."
GERMANY: "Problems"

Josef Joffe fretted in an editorial in centrist Sueddeutsche Zeitung of Munich (5/16), "It would be of exquisite absurdity if, for instance, Poland felt threatened by Russia and appealed to NATO's Council--and Moscow...in the NATO-Russia Council then decided how the Alliance has to act against Russia. This is one core problem. A second one refers to the security of those who do not join the Alliance in the first wave of applicants..... If NATO, as has been promised again and again, wants to offer the young democracies support, it must establish closer ties with the Baltics, Ukrainians and Southeastern Europeans and convince the Russians of this move in the same determined manner that it used in the case of the first wave of applicants. The third and worst paradox of this success is that NATO becomes bigger, but it will not necessarily become better.

"Nineteen-plus members--in between the Russians and outside the proteges--this is no recipe for cohesion and strength. If the Alliance wants to create a new right to exist with this enlargement, than it should not degenerate into a mini-UN or a second OSCE."

"Success: Securing Moscow's Nod Without Permanent Strain"

Centrist Neue Osnabruecker Zeitung (5/15) said, "The decisive diplomatic success is that Moscow's approval was achieved without a permanent strain on East-West relations. A new security architecture will stabilize peace in Europe even more. The new leitmotif is now partnership instead of the looming ice age.... Europe's geo-strategic map will increasingly change--in favor of an alliance which turned from a defensive alliance into a community of states that shares the same values."

"Trouble Ahead In Moscow"

Centrist Mitteldeutsche Zeitung of Halle (5/15) maintained: "The situation in Moscow will not calm down now. As soon as the parliamentarians realize that Yeltsin, after the meeting with Clinton in Helsinki, bragged too much and that the painfully accomplished agreement does not correspond to Yeltsin's promises, the trouble will really start. This paper would by no means pass the parliament."

"Add More Members Now?"

Guenter Nonnenmacher wondered on the front-page of right-of-center Frankfurter Allgemeine (5/15), "Will there really be only 'one accession wave?' Would it not be better to accept even more states in this 'first wave,' because we can expect Russia...to try to prevent further enlargements?"

"Russia's Successful Strategy"

In the view of Jochen Siemens in an editorial in left-of-center Frankfurter Rundschau (5/15), "Russia's negotiating strategy was successful. The government in Moscow continues to reject the enlargement to the East...but receives, nevertheless, compensations. This is not bad for a development which Moscow was unable to prevent anyway and which creates new costs and problems for the West."

"More Could Not Be Won--By Either Side"

Gerd Pelletier said in a commentary on national ARD-TV's late evening newscast "Tagesthemen" (5/14): "At first glance, this looks like NATO having scored some points. This is no charter, no internationally binding treaty which the Russians wanted, it is simply a document...with 20 pages in which, for instance, each side gives assurances to the other side
that neither of the two wants to attack the other one... Regarding the tough military facts, NATO promises not to deploy nuclear weapons and no Western forces on the territory of the countries that border to Russia. This makes clear that, in case of a crisis, the security and assistance pact is also true for Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic, i.e. there will be no second-class members. And what is the use of all this for Russia? A feeling of relative security, greater cohesion with the West? The use probably refers to the preferences that are not listed in this document... Improved economic assistance, a seat at the table of the G-7, and so on--just the result of a poker game that was played with patience. More could not be won--by either side."

BRITAIN: "A New European Order"

The independent weekly Economist called the accord (5/16): "Russia's second surrender. Seven years ago the then Soviet Union admitted that it could no longer dominate Eastern Europe. This week Russia admitted that several countries once in its sphere of influence could join what had been for half a century a hostile coalition, the West's NATO Alliance.... One reason why NATO achieved its objectives was that it presented a united front. The 16 members gave Mr. Solana a clear mandate and have not sought to deal behind his back."

"Personal Triumph For Solana"

According to the conservative Times (5/15): "The deal with Russia marks a personal triumph for Secretary General Solana."

"Hardest Job Is Yet To Come"

An editorial in the conservative Times (5/15) remarked, "The deal setting out a special relationship between NATO and Russia...has the potential to lessen the strategic risk accompanying NATO enlargement to Central Europe. This, however, is at some cost to NATO's cohesiveness as a military alliance. This cost must be borne as the price of an ill-judged decision. The alternative, a fearful Russia determined to reverse what it perceives as humiliation by the West, could inflict still graver damage to the continent's security...."

"The hardest job is yet to come. Poland, the Czech Republic and Hungary must be told at the Madrid summit in July that so far from membership freeing them from thinking about Russia, they must be especially active in building bridges to Moscow. Mr. Yeltsin needs more than a piece of paper to convince Russians that NATO has not stabbed them in the back. Confidence-building will be the work of a generation. It must now be made to succeed; for at the end of that period, historians may cite yesterday as the date when the West unintentionally began to dismantle the North Atlantic Alliance."

"Tricky NATO Gamble Pays Off For Clinton"

The independent Financial Times had this commentary by diplomatic editor Bruce Clark (5/15): "If victory always finds a hundred fathers, then yesterday's agreement between NATO and Russia must count as a triumph of the first order.... But the biggest winner is Washington, which, more than two years ago, gambled that it could satisfy Eastern Europe's desire for inclusion into the West without overly alienating the Russians...

"For the United States, the central and cooperative role Russian reformers played in securing the deal vindicates President Clinton's decision, proclaimed at a NATO summit in January 1994, that the Western bloc must reach out to Central Europe and Russia simultaneously."

"Vindication Of Tough Stance By U.S., NATO Allies"

The Independent Financial Times observed (5/15): "There was good news from Moscow
yesterday, at last... It means that Mr. Yeltsin and his successors will have a voice, but not a veto, on the future of Europe's security arrangements. That is just as it should be, and a vindication for the tough stance adopted throughout by the United States and its NATO allies.

FRANCE: "Guaranteed Stability For Europe"

Yves Pitette held in Catholic La Croix (5/16): "Seen from Moscow, it is a victory... Tomorrow, Russia will emerge from its present disarray and may go back to playing the role of superpower. This is why it was important to use this 'window of opportunity' to ensure the security of Central European democracies.... This stability could only be guaranteed by NATO. The fact that Moscow is playing along makes things easier.... The NATO-Russia agreement guarantees Europe's stability. It is sufficiently precise and official to help Yeltsin on the domestic front. NATO gets its green light to go ahead with its expansion. Apparently, everyone is satisfied."

"New Framework For East-West Relations"

In the view of Pierre Bocev in right-of-center Le Figaro (5/16): "The signatures on the NATO-Russia agreement will launch a new effort to establish a new framework of relations between East and West.... It is up to NATO now to prove it can go beyond its traditional role of defense unit and to become an element of political stability in tomorrow's world.... It is up to Russia to prove it is able to generate trust and to turn the page on Lenin's postulate that there can only be one winner and one loser, never two winners."

"The End Of The Cold War"

Under the headline above, Daniel Vernet observed in left-of-center Le Monde (5/16): "Russia has obtained what it wanted most: to have a voice--and a decisive one at that--in matters of European security.... Much will depend on what the Russians will do with the joint institutions offered to them.... They can either share in Europe's stability...or play at upsetting the apple cart and hamper Western initiatives.... The choice will depend on how things evolve inside Russia.... Cooperation or disruption? Probably both."

"A Historic Agreement Between NATO And Russia"

In its editorial, right-of-center Les Echos said under the headline above (5/15): "Before NATO's impending enlargement, Russia has been able to save face.... Washington may be satisfied with having pushed the Alliance's borders by 1,000 kilometers to the East, and Moscow can be satisfied that a new iron curtain will not be raised in Europe. But the question remains regarding NATO's function, a question raised since the end of the Cold War.... NATO has a few years to define its new mission, a mission in which a stabilized Russia might find its place."

"Yeltsin's Personal Success Story"

Irina de Chikoff pointed out in right-of-center Le Figaro (5/15): "The 'founding act' is halfway between the treaty demanded by Moscow, and the charter proposed by NATO.... In the end, having understood that Russia would not be able to stop NATO's enlargement, (Yeltsin) decided to speed things up. His aim has been to transform what he called 'the West's greatest error' into a personal success story.... As compensation, he also wanted Russia's integration into every international institution, beginning with the G-7. He seems to have won his wager on both counts."
ITALY: "NATO Expands Eastwards, But Still Has Chills"

An editorial in provocative, classical liberal Il Foglio (5/16): "The NATO-Russia Founding Act is undoubtedly a success for Western diplomacy and particularly U.S. diplomacy. The disputes which have immediately begun over the interpretation of the treaty, especially regarding the veto right on new memberships which Moscow believes it should exert and which Washington denies, show, however, that the agreement is not so strong.... While it is too early to think of Moscow's integration into the Western security system, we nonetheless need to prevent the feeling of encirclement from pushing the Russians towards the creation of an antagonistic bloc with China.... The democratic strengthening of Russia, in fact, is no less important than that of Eastern European nations.... We need to be very careful about the increased power of NATO, so as to prevent the interpretation of expansion as a project hostile to others: In addition to the Russians, Islamic nations also represent a critical point. The key NATO country in the Middle East, Turkey, is going through a convulsive phase.... Restoring the southern flank of the Alliance as an element of stability is an objective as important and complicated as that of expansion eastwards. Ethnic and religious tensions in the area do not seem to be decreasing, and a silent withdrawal of NATO northwards would only make them worse."

"Important Step Toward New European Equilibrium"

A commentary by Giorgio Torchia in Rome's conservative Il Tempo said (5/15): "The agreement...represents an important step along the road of a new equilibrium in Europe. The Atlantic Alliance is changing its role, looks and goals, even though its military structure remains essentially the traditional one.... NATO is becoming an instrument to control conflicts, a military arm of the UN and an anchor for Eastern European equilibrium."

"The Risks Of The New NATO"

Moscow correspondent Enrico Franceschini's analysis in left-leaning, influential La Repubblica read (5/15): "Is yesterday's agreement indeed a victory for all?... The Russia-NATO pact leaves several key questions unresolved. What will happen to those countries, especially former Soviet republics in the Baltics, which will not be part of the first group of nations joining NATO? Who is going to pay the approximately $40 billion needed to adjust NATO to its new, expanded dimension? And, most of all, how will Russia's parliament and public opinion react?... NATO expansion marks a turning point in East-West relations: It does not have its roots in Russia's agreement, but in its extreme weakness. In other words, it is the evidence that the West has won the Cold War and that it can do what it wants in Europe.... Was it really so urgent, and so indispensable, to underscore that for the Russians?"

AZERBAIJAN: "Say It Softly: Russia Has Lost East And Central Europe"

Under the pseudonym *Nurani,* Tofiqa Qasimova said in independent Ayna/Zerkalo (5/3): "Arguments of the European NATO member states against accepting Russia into the bloc entail bankruptcy of another Russian political initiative--an attempt to play on the budding American-European controversies.... Russia has lost East and Central Europe; it only prefers not to speak out loud about it. But, obviously, the path is already paved for Yeltsin's retreat. Or rather, a 'scapegoat' is being prepared in the person of Yevgeny Maksimovich Primakov. He will be blamed for a too tough tone in the relations with the West, and this will be an attempt to put all the responsibility for another geopolitical failure not on the 'democrats' but on 'national-patriots.' However, Russia is obviously not going to give up without a battle."

BELGIUM: "Sacrificial Lambs?"

In conservative Catholic La Libre Belgique (5/16), Philippe Paquet commented: "By instituting a Permanent Joint Council gathering the NATO member countries and Russia, which will give the latter a say in the functioning of the Alliance, the Founding Act definitively acknowledges the
principle that enlargement is achieved with the Kremlin's consent. This position, which sacrifices the strategic benefit that the West could draw from its victory in the Cold War to the political and economic interest of safeguarding the painful democratic transition in Moscow obviously sounds the knell of some applications for membership in the immediate future, to begin with those of the Baltic states.

"Paradoxically, it is the most insecure countries that risk finding themselves excluded from the new security system in the wake of the Madrid Summit. Of course, the idea of a Balto-Atlantic Charter is making progress and many people in Vilnius, Riga or Tallinn, see in it a temporarily satisfactory arrangement if it is combined with an active and increased involvement of the Baltic countries in the Partnership for Peace. That will, nevertheless, not alleviate the impression that once again, the Baltic countries are being sacrificed in the name of a necessary understanding among European powers."

"One Of The Major Developments Of Post-Cold War"

Pierre Lefevre wrote in independent Le Soir (5/15), "This is not Russia's admission to NATO, but it is nevertheless one of the major developments of the post-Cold War, announcing more stability for the European continent.... This 'founding act'...turns the old one-on-one between NATO and Russia into an instrument of cooperation, and the former enemies into new allies.... Significantly, the agreement concluded yesterday is not only the fruit of the traditional Russian-American tête-à-tête. Western Europe played its role in it, indicating its desire to become the third pillar of a new tripolar equilibrium.... NATO's enlargement, combined with the Russian-Atlantic agreement, should, in fact play, the stabilizing role in post-Communist Europe that NATO itself played in Western Europe after World War II."

"Yeltsin Loses Game Without Losing Face"

Under the headline above in independent Le Soir (5/15), Pol Mathil observed: "Boris Yeltsin is probably happy. He has extricated himself from an embarrassing situation which he created himself by excessively blowing on the NATO issue. And he has, in Mr. Primakov, a designated scapegoat.... Does that mean that the curtain can be lowered? No. In fact, the Kremlin has not surrendered.... The enlargement treaty must be ratified by the parliaments of the 16 member countries.... The Russians discreetly remind the Western partners that an American--or Englishman, Frenchman, etc.--should not pledge to defend a country which he cannot even locate on the map. Would-be members of NATO should consequently finance geography lessons in the West. It would be a very good investment for them."

BULGARIA: "Hope Both Parties To Wedding Contract Keep Pledges"

Bulgarian Socialist Party Duma (5/15) observed, "It seems that the wedding contract between NATO and Russia is ready.... However, despite the consensus which has been reached, Moscow still believes that lots of issues remain in the zone of uncertainty. The anti-Yeltsin opposition will exploit them to accuse...Yeltsin of committing national treason. Even those who are not Yeltsin's opponents kept warning the Kremlin until the last minute that it should not conclude a deal from which it would benefit little or even nothing.... Yet, the pledge has been made. It would be good for both Europe and the world if the two parties keep to the contract."

CANADA: "An Important Accord With Russia"

The leading Toronto Globe and Mail opined (5/16), "Wild claims are being made on both sides of the Atlantic for this week's accord between Russia and the North American Treaty Organization.... Nevertheless, the accord is one of the most important since the end of the Cold War, containing at least the seed of a historic accommodation between Russia and the West.... Mr. Yeltsin has been nothing if not a vision of flexibility.... Mr. Yeltsin has recognized the concessions made by NATO on the status of the new members.... Mr. Clinton's
exaggerations were more of the rhetorical sort.... Russia still resents the expansion of NATO which it views as a threat to its national security and continues to formally oppose.... Even so, Mr. Clinton is right to see the historic potential in the accord.... The accord is another attempt to recognize Russia's importance and acknowledge its status. The goal of post-Cold War Western diplomacy should be to build a new, pan-European security system that spans the old East-East divide. The accord brings that goal considerably closer."

HUNGARY: "Central Europe Certainly The Winner"

According to highly conservative Uj Magyarorszag (5/16), "Central Europe is certainly the winner in the agreement between NATO and Russia.... The agreement to be signed in Paris at the end of May opens the path to NATO enlargement.... The signing ceremony in Paris, rather than being the end of a long process, is the beginning of a new era."

"The Victory Of Common Sense"

Top-circulation Nepszabadsag (5/15) held, "The developments must be seen as a breakthrough; the victory of common-sense.... Russia is not in the position of choosing confrontation with the West...and it cannot force its will on the United States or Europe, either.... Yeltsin, of course will be crucified by his opposition, but this is another issue. It clearly seems that the document is closer to the original proposals of Brussels than those of Moscow. However, it would be a mistake to indicate that Russia suffered a defeat by giving its consent to the document. Primakov gave nothing for free and under the present circumstances he reached the utmost possible.... The real winners are, of course, the prospective new members of the Alliance, including Hungary which stated from the very first minute that Russia's interests must be taken into account and at the same time feared in secret that the West would be too generous with the Kremlin. To be left out from NATO would have been a disaster but receiving second-class membership would not have been satisfactory, either."

"Concessions For Reasonable Compromise"

Influential Magyar Hirlap (5/15) opined, "Both Russia and NATO made concessions; after all, this is the era of reasonable compromises. The West is very grateful to Secretary General Solana, whose diplomatic flexibility contributed to a great deal to the success of the talks."

LATVIA: "Baltics' Problems Are Just Beginning"

Viesturs Buls concluded in centrist Neatkariga Rita Avize (5/16): "So who were the winners and losers after Wednesday's agreement?... Actually, NATO has generously allowed Moscow to back down honorably.... The only real winners in the agreement are the Eastern Europeans--Poles, Czechs, Hungarians. Their membership in the Alliance is now secure. As for the Balts, I think our problems are just beginning. The Kremlin, gritting its teeth, will tolerate NATO expansion's first round, but will do everything it can to ensure that there is no second or third round."

THE NETHERLANDS: "A New NATO"

Under the above headline, influential, liberal De Volkskrant judged (5/16): "The NATO-Russia charter is very well balanced.... The Atlantic Alliance and its former Russian opponents are making a series of actual steps towards a structural political cooperation.... A renewed NATO gets the historic opportunity to encourage peace and security in all of Europe.... There are two problems: The resistance of Russian nationalists...and a further NATO enlargement with countries such as Romania, Bulgaria, and the Baltic States. In principle, such a further enlargement is still possible, but it is unlikely that NATO will soon pursue this--and rightly so, for the new NATO and its partners should run a test period first."
"A Victory For The International Community And Russia"

In an editorial, centrist *Algemeen Dagblad* (5/15), "Even before we know the details of the agreement, we can already conclude that this agreement is truly 'historic.' For it is the foundation for a broad European security structure. A new NATO will help prevent or resolve conflicts between European countries. In the new member states, a new NATO will even have to contribute to the development of a free market economy and to more democratic relations.... Awaiting approval from the NATO member states and President Yeltsin, we can appropriately quote Primakov: a victory for the healthy mind, the international community and Russia."

NORWAY: "Yeltsin's Yes To NATO"

Conservative *Aftenposten* maintained (5/16), "Russia's hesitant yes to NATO in the East is more than anything else a yes to the new political reality in Europe.... It is natural for Norway to support the agreement NATO made with Russia. This agreement will ensure NATO's dominance in shaping the security policy for the entire European continent--even East of the Ural Mountains. Consequently, Norway, despite its rejection of EU membership, will be an insider when decisions about Europe and Norway's security and defense are made."

"Russia: In From The Cold"

Social Democratic *Arbeiderbladet* applauded the agreement between Russia and NATO, adding (5/15), "Independent of the planned NATO expansion eastward, yesterday's breakthrough in Moscow will have great influence on security in Europe.... The agreement gives Russia wide access to several of the decision-making processes that take place within the Alliance. This is a very important contribution to breaking down the distrust which still exists between the former enemies."

"Russia Must Not Isolate Itself"

In Social Democratic *Arbeiderbladet*, Norwegian Institute of Foreign Affairs researcher Geir Flikke wrote (5/15), "NATO expansion is an excellent way to start a diplomatic dialogue which will pull Europe out of the situation it has been in and give some life to its diplomatic relations. This will also bring Russia to a crossroads; if Russia wants to take an active part in Europe, the country must get involved and not isolate itself."

POLAND: "Clashing Interpretations Of Treaty"

Public Television Channel 1's main news "Wiadomosci" (5/15) aired this, "It is clear that the two sides understand the principles of the treaty in different ways. Boris Yeltsin claims that the document gives Russia a right to co-decide about all to which the treaty refers. Bill Clinton denies this, 'We are giving Russia a right to speak but not a right to veto.'"

"Crowning Of Clinton Era In International Politics"

Center-left *Gazeta Wyborcza* (5/15) ran this commentary by Leopold Unger, "The enlargement of NATO is the crowning of (Clinton's) era in international politics, the first and actually undisputed evidence of the victory of the United States and the West in the Cold War. One could even say...that yesterday in Moscow the West convinced Russia that it is high time to begin the process of genuinely closing the chapter in history titled Yalta.... Does that mean that we can start dancing? The Russia and the United States are going from rivalry to the positions of allies? Too early. The treaty on NATO enlargement, not the charter, will have to be ratified by the parliaments of the 16 countries of the Alliance. The whole campaign of the opponents of NATO enlargement, from Moscow, the New York Times, on down to French Socialist Michel Rocard, is directed not at the governments (that would be hopeless), but at the parliaments, i.e., public opinion. The American--the opponents of the expanded NATO say--should not get
involved in the defense of a state that he is unable to find on the map. The candidates for NATO should launch in the United States a (large program) for teaching geography. It will pay off."

"What Is The Price Of This Success?"

Jan Skorzynski commented in centrist Rzeczpospolita (5/15), "Our road to NATO has been shortened.... It is worth asking, however, what is the price of this success. It is difficult to answer this question unless we learn the details of the compromise.... Permanent guarantees of non-deployment of nuclear weapons on our soil, the ban on stationing additional Alliance troops, the ban on upgrading the military infrastructure and on storing NATO arms, the limitation on conventional forces--the endorsement of these demands would lead to second-rate membership. Russia's adequate, good-neighborly gestures which would prove its intentions did not go hand in hand with Moscow's demands. On the contrary, the Russian presence, including the military, near the Polish borders is being strengthened through the plan of a union with Belarus.... Nothing is heard about the reduction of the armed forces in the Kaliningrad enclave.

"It all does not mean that one should not make an agreement with Russia. Poland, as a neighbor of Russia and a future member of the Alliance, is interested in NATO having as good a relationship with its former Cold War opponent as possible. From the Warsaw view, the basic criterion of an assessment of an agreement will be its shape, and not the fact that an agreement has been made. Therefore, the functioning of the NATO-Russia Council, which will convene twice a year under joint leadership, arouses the most concern. Russia is gaining the right of a voice, which is equal to that of the North Atlantic Treaty member states. Won't it weaken the unity and determination of the Alliance? Doesn't it give [Russia] too many opportunities to block the process of NATO enlargement since the Russians, during the key two years, will have a better place in Brussels than the aspirant countries?"

"A Compromise"

Channel 2's main news "Panorama" (5/14) called the document "a compromise between the willingness of acceptance of new members and protection against the nervous Russian reaction."

PORTUGAL: "Russia Saves Face"

Center-left Público (5/15) observed under the headline above, "The outcome (of the accord) does not mean that the polemics over NATO enlargement have ended in Russia. It is expected that, once the contents of the act become known, discussions will become even more heated...."

"According to Russian analysts, the accord was not really a diplomatic victory for Moscow, which continues to oppose NATO enlargement.... But not signing some kind of agreement would be seen primarily by Russian public opinion as an even greater defeat: NATO enlargement would take place anyway, and Russia would not have gotten any concessions, either real or symbolic."

SLOVENIA: "Another Defeat For Moscow"

Left-of center Delo (5/16) stated: "The consent of a deeply offended Russia...is not necessary; NATO would rush to the East without it. But because Yeltsin's honor had to be rescued, an agreement has been signed just to calm official Moscow.... The agreement is yet another defeat for Moscow in its confrontation with the West. Russia has officially become a second-class power; the West is afraid of it only because of its rusty rockets and hungry crowds which would rush into Europe if a new plains were..."
"Russia Defeated In Battle It Could Not Win"

Left-of-center Vecer (5/16) underlined, "The well-known fact has been confirmed that there is just one superpower left on the Earth and that Russia has been...defeated in a battle in which it could not expect a victory."

SWEDEN: "Risks For Sweden, The Baltics"

Liberal Dagens Nyheter (5/15) pointed out in an editorial, "The message from Moscow will mean a go-ahead signal for the process which, by 1999, will make some former Warsaw Pact states NATO members. The Russians will now, ironically enough, have influence in the NATO Council, mainly because of its enlargement which they so strongly oppose. This in order to avoid a new security rift across Europe....

"A new situation is approaching, and we are now running the risk of getting separated from the mainstream. Countries like Sweden and the Baltic states have to count on having a less important role in the system than Moscow, said Swedish security policy expert Gunnar Jervas the other day.... This chance of reaching concord must be taken. But this implies that the Baltic states gain security--and by this, also Sweden."

"NATO-U.S. Strategy Was Right"

Conservative Svenska Dagbladet's editorial (5/15) judged, "This proves that NATO and the U.S. strategy vis-a-vis Russia was right.... The circumstances on how the agreement came about also indicate that those who warned that continued plans for the enlargement would further reactionary powers in Russia were wrong. On the contrary, as has been emphasized by Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, by being hesitant about its intentions, NATO would have encouraged these powers even more. The NATO-Russia agreement means that Moscow will be given an exceptional position among non-NATO countries and a much closer relationship than Sweden, for example."

EAST ASIA AND PACIFIC

JAPAN: "A Step Toward Stabilization Of Europe"

An editorial in top-circulation, moderate Yomiuri said (5/16), "The agreement NATO and Russia reached on Wednesday will define a new cooperative relationship in Europe. The accord opens the way for the expansion of NATO, an issue left unresolved in Europe since the end of the Cold War.... This promises to be an important step toward a more stable Europe.

"By accepting the former communist countries as new members, NATO takes on new significance. With the United States involved deeply in the Western military alliance and Russia maintaining a cooperative relationship, NATO becomes the core of the security structure in Europe, playing an even bigger role than in the days of the Cold War."

"U.S. Scores Big Diplomatic Win"

While liberal Asahi headlined "U.S. Scores Big Diplomatic Win," liberal Tokyo Shimbun's Moscow correspondent Inakuma observed (5/15), "It seems clear that Russia's international prestige will decline further yet. If Yeltsin's economic policies fail to revive Russia, the conservatives are sure to challenge the Russian president's political control."

INDONESIA: "Deal Did Harm Russia"

Leading, Independent Kompas (5/16) remarked in an editorial, "It is easy to agree that the deal
did harm Russia. Hopefully, NATO--including its new members--will consider Russia's feelings and fulfill all commitments for European peace and unity through the new Russia-NATO partnership.*

SOUTH KOREA: "Stroking Yeltsin, NATO Establishes New European Order"

Conservative Chosun Ilbo commented (5/16): "Although the United States and Russia interpret some key issues differently, the West is not going to challenge Yeltsin over these differences. It knows cannot afford to do so, since Yeltsin is the only bulwark against a possible resurgence of ultra-nationalism and communism in the country.... The West had to stroke the Russian bear in order to draw a new security map for Europe."

"Europe Gains Security And Russia Practical Benefits"

Readers of independent Dong-A Ilbo (5/15) saw this comment, "NATO's eastward expansion has finally been achieved. The dramatic agreement between NATO and Russia will bring about the most significant military and political changes Europe has seen since the collapse of the Berlin Wall. The expansion will not only provide Central European countries with a Russian security guarantee, it will establish a strong security mechanism to fill the power vacuum left by the end of the Cold War. With Russia tied to the transatlantic Alliance, the United States can now focus on the Asia-Pacific and its potential adversary, China.... With Russian agreement to the expansion, the United States and Russia, former rivals, are heading into a new partnership of security."

SOUTH ASIA

INDIA: "NATO Sop For Russia"

An editorial under the headline above (5/16) ran in the nationalist Hindustan Times: "For all the hype with which the Western media has hailed the text...the fact remains that there is actually very little to write home about. The proposed charter linking Russia and the Western military Alliance...apparently contains no new concessions for Moscow other than what President Clinton had offered to President Yeltsin in Helsinki.... It was no different in Moscow last Wednesday, when Primakov was obliged to toast a compact which ignores such important issues as the stationing of nuclear weapons and conventional forces on the territories of new NATO members, and the retention of rights by NATO to admit any number of states into its fold. What, in effect, the covenant does is to sardonically offer Moscow a mute swan observer status in the joint NATO-Russian council which is to be set up. It is surprising how the West could be so blind as to overlook the possibility of creating a new and dangerous fault line in Europe: NATO enlargement might engender a Cold War scenario, with the bloc's military forces confronting Russian troops eyeball-to-eyeball, especially in the Kaliningrad region. This--and a host of other strategic military equations--would, in fact, thrust on NATO the unpleasant task of having to draw a new Iron Curtain across the continent."

LATIN AMERICA

ARGENTINA: "A Triumph For Clinton; First Success For Albright"

Oscar Raul Cardoso, international analyst of leading Clarin (5/15), concluded, "Yeltsin believes that by lancing the boil of NATO enlargement, he may be able to devote himself to a renewed campaign of cooperation with the West. For Bill Clinton, the accord represents a personal triumph vis-a-vis his critics, among them domestic opposition and several European sectors. It is also a reaffirmation of his own policy of keeping all his political eggs in Yeltsin's basket. The accord is also the first success for Madeleine Albright, who celebrated yesterday her first 100 days as secretary of state. But the doubts will only start to clear up when the text of the political accord is shown and the political ramifications are examined."
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NATO-RUSSIA ACCORD: 'TRICKY GAMBLE PAYS OFF FOR CLINTON'

A majority of the media abroad hailed yesterday's "historic" agreement between NATO and Russia on a document outlining a new relationship as ushering in a new stabilizing framework for post-Cold War era Europe and for clearing the last major hurdle to the admission of new members to the Alliance. In many countries, top-story treatment of yesterday's accord included praise for President Clinton and his administration's "tough" handling of what critics feared still might lead to a dangerous clash between Moscow and the West. London's independent Financial Times held, "The biggest winner is Washington, which...gambled that it could satisfy Eastern Europe's desire for inclusion into the West without overly alienating the Russians."

There were many who also claimed to be winners in the deal: the Russians, the Central Europeans who hope to enter NATO, and the Western Europeans for helping secure the accord. Many observers agreed that the "compromise" deal carefully spared Russia further humiliation and salved her pride through other incentives, such as economic aid and a seat at the Group of Seven's table while insuring that NATO did not give ground on its vital interests. German national ARD-TV pragmatically concluded, "More could not be won--by either side."

Moscow's papers asserted that Russia had scored a "diplomatic success," with centrist Nezavisimaya Gazeta insisting that Russian Foreign Minister Primakov "defended Russia's security interests." Concern remained high, however, that this was just the first step in a long and still thorny process of balancing enlargement with friendship with Russia. Rome's left-leaning, influential La Repubblica fretted over "the risk that...NATO's expansion will...encourage the rising to power of a nationalist leader in Russia." Center-left Gazeta Wyborcza in Warsaw worried that the admission of new members must be approved by the parliaments of the 16 NATO member countries, and that public opinion might be swayed by "the whole campaign of the opponents of NATO enlargement."

ZAIRE: ANOTHER CANCELED SUMMIT

The on-again, off-again nature of Zaire's peace talks left many foreign observers wondering if a peaceful transition could be negotiated between Zairian President Mobutu and rebel leader Laurent Kabila, thus sparing Kinshasa, or if--in the words of London's conservative Times--"the Zairian capital could become a killing ground as rebel forces close in." With the French press still smarting from their own nation's loss of influence in francophone Africa, Paris's left-of-center Liberation huffed that Mr. Kabila's latest no-show was an indication of "the failure of U.S. diplomacy." Lusaka's independent Chronicle, noting that Mr. Mobutu's rule had "left a shell of what is probably the richest country in this region," hoped that Mr. Kabila would "allow for democratic elections within a year and accept whatever the people of Zaire decide."

South Africa's key role in the negotiations and its ascendancy as a regional power were underscored by Brussels's conservative La Derniere Heure.

BRIEFS

-- Turkish Offensive Against The PKK: No End In Sight
-- Zimbabwe Urges 'Downlisting' Of Elephants
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RUSSIA: "Diplomatic Success"

Centrist Nezavisimaya Gazeta front-paged (5/15) this comment by Yulia Petrovskaya and Dmitry Gornostayev: "While a detailed analysis is still ahead, that which happened easily qualifies for a diplomatic success. Not only did they avoid getting the talks deadlocked—this danger persisting throughout the consultations—but they compromised on all aspects of the future accord, so it will certainly be signed by Boris Yeltsin and the heads of state and government of NATO member-countries in Paris on May 27.... The Russian Foreign Ministry and Primakov proved up to a rather difficult task by having met the deadline and defended Russia's security interests. Commenting on the results of the talks, Primakov described the accord as testimony to the triumph of common sense and a great victory for Russia and the entire world community."

"Russia Achieved Her Main Goal"

Veronika Kutsyllo said on page one of reformist, business-oriented Kommersant Daily (5/15): "Who ceded to whom is unclear yet. And that may remain so forever, as both sides will probably want to keep it that way. One indisputable compromise is the name of the document. As predicted, a 'charter' and 'agreement' have yielded to an 'act.' Russia has achieved her main goal—after the long arid truly excruciating negotiations, nobody will reproach her for a very easy surrender. Also, with yesterday's round over, Russia doesn't look like a 'hardheaded bear' unfit for civilized talks."

"Third World War Nears End?"

Ivan Boltovsky, commented in neo-communist Pravda (5/15) on a round-table conference in Moscow last Tuesday which discussed the restoration of this country's national security system: "According to the former KGB chief Vladimir Kryuchkov, NATO advance and the Kremlin's surrender lead humanity to a third world war. Indeed, the Russian bear, his hands up, is backing down, confronted by NATO. Still, Kryuchkov doesn't seem quite right about NATO enlargement threatening a war. Isn't that war about to be over? The valiant Cheka men keep wrecking their brains over why, with the state security agency cruelly savaged, the government won't stir a finger to restore it for the good of the Fatherland. The answer is simple: a national sellout."

GERMANY: "More Could Not Be Won—By Either Side"

Gerd Pelletier said in a commentary on national ARD-TV's late evening newscast "Tagesthemen" (5/14): "At first glance, this looks like NATO having scored some points. This is no charter, no internationally binding treaty which the Russians wanted, it is simply a document...with 20 pages in which, for instance, each side gives assurances to the other side that neither of the two wants to attack the other.... Regarding the tough military facts, NATO promises not to deploy nuclear weapons and no Western forces on the territory of the countries that border to Russia. This makes clear that, in case of a crisis, the security and assistance pact is also true for Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic, i.e., there will be no second-class members. And what is the use of all this for Russia? A feeling of relative security, greater cohesion with the West? The use probably refers to the preferences that are not listed in this document.... Improved economic assistance, a seat at the table of the G-7, and so on—just the result of a poker game that was played with patience. More could not be won—by either side."
"Truly Historic"

Wolfgang Nette commented on regional radio Norddeutscher Rundfunk of Hamburg (5/14): "We should rarely use the term 'historic,' but in this concrete case it seems to me that a truly historic agreement was achieved.... The military balance remains decisive since it will be based on mutual information and cooperation.... It is certainly true that the devil will be in the details and the envisaged trust capital must be built up carefully."

"Add More Members Now?"

Guenter Nonnenmacher wondered on the front-page of right-of-center Frankfurter Allgemeine (5/15), "Will there really be only 'one accession wave?' Would it not be better to accept even more states in this 'first wave,' because we can expect Russia...to try to prevent further enlargements?"

"Price Unclear"

In the view of Jochen Siemens in an editorial in left-of-center Frankfurter Rundschau (5/15): "The price for this questionable enlargement remains unclear, because the deployment of NATO forces and mainly the number and movability of Russian forces--for instance, in the Caucasus--can be settled only in new talks about the CFE treaty.... Russia's negotiating strategy was successful. The government in Moscow continues to reject enlargement to the East...but receives, nevertheless, compensation. This is not bad for a development which Moscow was unable to prevent anyway and which creates new costs and problems for the West."

BRITAIN: "Personal Triumph For Solana"

According to the conservative Times (5/15): "The deal with Russia marks a personal triumph for Secretary General Solana."

"Hardest Job Is Yet To Come"

An editorial in the conservative Times (5/15) remarked, "The deal setting out a special relationship between NATO and Russia...has the potential to lessen the strategic risk accompanying NATO enlargement to Central Europe. This, however, is at some cost to NATO's cohesiveness as a military alliance. This cost must be borne as the price of an ill-judged decision. The alternative, a fearful Russia determined to reverse what it perceives as humiliation by the West, could inflict still graver damage to the continent's security.... "The hardest job is yet to come. Poland, the Czech Republic and Hungary must be told at the Madrid summit in July that so far from membership freeing them from thinking about Russia, they must be especially active in building bridges to Moscow. Mr. Yeltsin needs more than a piece of paper to convince Russians that NATO has not stabbed them in the back. Confidence-building will be the work of a generation. It must now be made to succeed; for at the end of that period, historians may cite yesterday as the date when the West unintentionally began to dismantle the North Atlantic Alliance."

"Tricky NATO Gamble Pays Off For Clinton"

The independent Financial Times had this commentary by diplomatic editor Bruce Clark (5/15): "If victory always finds a hundred fathers; then yesterday's agreement between NATO and Russia must count as a triumph of the first order.... But the biggest winner is Washington, which, more than two years ago, gambled that it could satisfy eastern Europe's desire for inclusion into the West without overly alienating the Russians... For the United States, the
central and cooperative role Russian reformers played in securing the deal vindicates President Clinton's decision, proclaimed at a NATO summit in January 1994, that the Western bloc must reach out to Central Europe and Russia simultaneously.

"Vindication Of Tough Stance By U.S., NATO Allies"

The independent Financial Times observed (5/15): "There was good news from Moscow yesterday, at last.... It means that Mr. Yeltsin and his successors will have a voice, but not a veto, on the future of Europe's security arrangements. That is just as it should be, and a vindication for the tough stance adopted throughout by the United States and its NATO allies."

FRANCE: "A Historic Agreement Between NATO And Russia"

In its editorial, right-of-center Les Echos said under the headline above (5/15): "Before NATO's impending enlargement, Russia has been able to save face.... Washington may be satisfied with having pushed the Alliance's borders by 1,000 kilometers to the East, and Moscow can be satisfied that a new iron curtain will not be raised in Europe. But the question remains regarding NATO's function, a question raised since the end of the Cold War.... NATO has a few years to define its new mission, a mission in which a stabilized Russia might find its place."

"Yeltsin's Personal Success Story"

Irina de Chikoff pointed out in right-of-center Le Figaro (5/15): "The 'founding act' is halfway between the treaty demanded by Moscow, and the charter proposed by NATO.... in the end, having understood that Russia would not be able to stop NATO's enlargement, (Yeltsin) decided to speed things up. His aim has been to transform what he called 'the West's greatest error' into a personal success story.... As compensation, he also wanted Russia's integration into every international institution, beginning with the G-7. He seems to have won his wager on both counts."

ITALY: "Important Step Toward New European Equilibrium"

A commentary by Giorgio Torchia in Rome's conservative Il Tempo said (5/15): "The agreement...represents an important step along the road of a new equilibrium in Europe. The Atlantic Alliance is changing its role, appearance and goals, even though its military structure remains essentially the traditional one.... NATO is becoming an instrument to control conflicts, a military arm of the UN and an anchor for Eastern European equilibrium."

"The Risks Of The New NATO"

Moscow correspondent Enrico Franceschini's analysis in left-leaning, influential La Repubblica read (5/15): "Is yesterday's agreement indeed a victory for all?... The Russia-NATO pact leaves several key questions unresolved. What will happen to those countries, especially former Soviet republics in the Baltics, that will not be part of the first group of nations joining NATO? Who is going to pay the approximately $40 billion needed to adjust NATO to its new, expanded dimension? And, most of all, how will Russia's parliament and public opinion react?... NATO expansion marks a turning point in East-West relations: it does not have its roots in Russia's agreement, but in its extreme weakness. In other words, it is the evidence that the West has won the Cold War and that it can do what it wants in Europe.... Was it really so urgent, and so indispensable, to underscore that for the Hussians?... The risk that, over the next few years, NATO's expansion will create deep tension in international relations and encourage the rising to power of a nationalist leader in Russia is serious.... Since the mechanism had already been set in motion, the agreement reached yesterday in Moscow is in any case preferable to a break which would have determined an immediate stalemate in Europe; this way, there will at least be time to try to prevent worse scenarios."
BELGIUM: "One Of The Major Developments Of Post-Cold War"

Pierre Lefevre wrote in independent Le Soir (5/15): "This is not Russia's admission to NATO, but it is nevertheless one of the major developments of the post-Cold War, announcing more stability for the European continent.... This 'founding act'...turns the old one-on-one between NATO and Russia into an instrument of cooperation, and the former enemies into new allies.... Significantly, the agreement concluded yesterday is not only the fruit of the traditional Russian-American tête-à-tête. Western Europe played its role in it, indicating its desire to become the third pillar of a new tripolar equilibrium.... NATO's enlargement, combined with the Russian-Atlantic agreement, should in fact play the stabilizing role in post-Communist Europe which NATO itself played in Western Europe after World War II."

"Yeltsin Loses Game Without Losing Face"

Under the headline above in independent Le Soir (5/15), Pol Mathil observed: "Boris Yeltsin is probably happy. He has extricated himself from an embarrassing situation which he created himself by excessively blowing on the NATO issue. And he has, in Mr. Primakov, a designated scapegoat.... Does that mean that the curtain can be lowered? No. In fact, the Kremlin has not surrendered.... The enlargement treaty must be ratified by the parliaments of the 16 member countries.... The Russians discreetly remind the Western partners that an American--or Englishman, Frenchman, etc.--should not pledge to defend a country which he cannot even locate on the map. Would-be members of NATO should consequently finance geography lessons in the West. It would be a very good investment for them."

HUNGARY: "The Victory Of Common Sense"

Top-circulation Nepszabadsag (5/15) held, "The developments must be seen as a breakthrough, the victory of common sense.... Russia is not in the position of choosing confrontation with the West...and it cannot force its will on the United States or Europe, either.... Yeltsin, of course will be crucified by his opposition, but that is another issue. It clearly seems that the document is closer to the original proposals of Brussels than those of Moscow. However, it would be a mistake to indicate that Russia suffered a defeat by giving its consent to the document. Primakov gave nothing for free and under the present circumstances he reached the utmost possible.... The real winners are, of course, the prospective new members of the Alliance--including Hungary--which stated from the very first minute that Russia's interests must be taken into account and at the same time feared in secret that the West would be too generous with the Kremlin. To be left out from NATO would have been a disaster but receiving second-class membership would not have been satisfactory, either."

POLAND: "A Compromise"

Channel 2's main news "Panorama" (5/14) called the document "a compromise between the willingness of acceptance of new members and protection against the nervous Russian reaction."

"Crowning Of Clinton Era In International Politics"

Center-left Gazeta Wyborcza (5/15) ran this commentary by Leopold Unger, "The enlargement of NATO is the crowning of (Clinton's) era in international politics, the first and actually undisputed evidence of the victory of the United States and the West in the Cold War. One could even say...that yesterday in Moscow the West convinced Russia that it is high time to begin the process of genuinely closing the chapter in history titled Yalta.... Does that mean that we can start dancing? The Russia and the United States are going from rivalry to the positions of allied the early. The irony on NATO enlargement, not the charter will have to be ratified by the parliaments of the 16 countries of the Alliance. The whole campaign of the opponents of
NATO enlargement, from Moscow, the New York Times, on down to French Socialist Michel Rocard, is directed not at the governments (that would be hopeless), but at the parliaments, i.e., public opinion. The American--the opponents of the expanded NATO say--should not get involved in the defense of a state that he is unable to find on the map. The candidates for NATO should launch in the United States a (large program) for learning geography. It will pay."

JAPAN: "U.S. Scores Big Diplomatic Win"

While liberal Asahi headlined "U.S. Scores Big Diplomatic Win," liberal Tokyo Shimbun's Moscow correspondent Inakuma observed (5/15), "It seems clear that Russia's international prestige will decline further yet. If Yeltsin's economic policies fail to revive Russia, the conservatives are sure to challenge the Russian president's political control."

SOUTH KOREA: "Europe Gains Security And Russia Practical Benefits"

Readers of independent Dong-A Ilbo (5/15) saw this comment, "NATO's eastward expansion has finally been achieved. The dramatic agreement between NATO and Russia will bring about the most significant military and political changes Europe has seen since the collapse of the Berlin Wall. The expansion will not only provide Central European countries with a Russian security guarantee, it will establish a strong security mechanism to fill the power vacuum left by the end of the Cold War. With Russia tied to the transatlantic Alliance, the United States can now focus on the Asia-Pacific and potential adversary China.... With Russian agreement to the expansion, the U.S. and Russia, former rivals, are heading into a new partnership of security."

ZAIRE: ANOTHER CANCELED SUMMIT

ZAMBIA: "Kabila Should Keep Elections Promise"

The independent Chronicle (5/13) observed, "The civil war in Zaire marks the close of a period in African history that would like to be forgotten by many Africans who watched helplessly as the Cold War perpetrated by the United States and the former Soviet Union took the lives of innocent men and women. Mobutu for his part enjoyed favor from the West and at the same time developed an autocratic government which plundered Zaire's wealth and tolerated no opposition, political or otherwise. But some Westerners will argue that Mobutu was a necessary figure in that he was the only man able to keep the country as one entity. We beg to differ with such pundits. Mobutu's rule has left a shell of what is probably the richest country in this region. It is common knowledge that there was no distinction between the national treasury and the despot's personal bank account."

"It is with this in mind that Kabila's rebel advance should be looked at as a breath of fresh air. We just urge Kabila to keep his promise of not clinging on to power. He should, as he has already stated, allow for democratic elections within a year and accept whatever the people of Zaire decide. The time for leaders of Mobutu's shallow caliber is long gone. Africa has said, 'Enough is enough.'"

BELGIUM: "In Africa, Things Never Happen As Expected"

In conservative La Demiure Heure (5/15), Paul Masson commented: "In Africa, things never happen as expected. Kabila could enter Kinshasa without fighting after having negotiated Mobutu's departure, or conquer the city by force, or even surround it and let the situation rot. He preferred, once again, to maintain doubts about his intentions.... on the other hand, what is clear is that in the field of foreign relations, things will change deeply. France, which committed itself openly in Rwanda, as well as in Zaire, will certainly lose those countries which it sanctified as part of its sphere of influence. As for Belgium, for many years it has ceased to have an African policy and it has hesitated, over the last few months, between the Alliance and
a rotten and moribund regime. Their replacement will perhaps be American or Anglo-Saxon, most probably South African. A page of history is being turned under our eyes, not only for Mobutu and Kabila, but also for us, Westerners and Francophones who considered ourselves Central Africa's favorite interlocutors.

BRITAIN: "Fear for Foreigners in Kinshasa Countdown"

The conservative Times (5/15) held, "Fears are growing that the Zairean capital could become a killing ground as rebel forces close in. Western intelligence reports say foreigners as well as Zairean politicians could be marked out by the beleaguered Zairean army.... Documents shown to this newspaper name individuals and installations to be targeted. On the list for destruction are government buildings, power and water installations, the American ambassador's residence and the British embassy.... The Zairean regime is particularly critical of the United States, which it accuses of having sided with rebel leader Laurent Kabila."

FRANCE: "Transition in Kinshasa"

Communist L'Humanite (5/15) asserted: "The Mobutu era is over.... Joseph Desire Mobutu is out. Laurent Desire Kabila is in.... But as an American official recently said: "There are many questions and very few answers when it comes to Kabila.'... In 994, South Africa proved that democracy could become an African reality. In a way, it freed Africa from its colonialist inferiority complex. Today, Kinshasa, tomorrow who knows? Bangui, Libreville? It could be that the era of private hunting grounds is also over--whether Belgian, French or American."

"A Canceled Summit"

Stephen Smith pointed out in left-of-center Liberation (5/15): "The summit's cancellation marks a failure for Mobutu, who had a very narrow margin of maneuver, and for the international community, namely for Mandela.... But Kabila's last-minute turn-around marks also the failure of U.S. diplomacy."

INDIA: "Hope In Africa"

In the opinion of the centrist Hindu (5/15): "Whether Mobutu Sese Seko survives for one more week or his benefactors manage to keep him in the seat for a while longer may soon be irrelevant to Africa, for the continent may have found an effective answer to such despots who had flourished during the Cold War years benefiting by the competitive ideological needs of the West and the Soviet Union.... The black continent is demonstrating encouraging signs that all is not lost.... After disappointing the world by remaining on the sidelines ever since he took over in post-apartheid South Africa, Nelson Mandela has for the first time shown the flag and let the world know that his country is ready to assume its legitimate leadership role.... Mandela's action in inviting Zaire's rebel leader, Laurent Kabila, and being seen with him in public was a strong signal to the surviving military men ruling in pockets of Africa that their days are numbered, and a message to their Western, mostly American and French, benefactors that the people have found their voice."

BRIEFS

TURKISH OFFENSIVE AGAINST THE PKK: NO END IN SIGHT

GERMANY: "The Same Old Offensive"

Wolfgang Guenter Lerch said in an editorial in right-of-center Frankfurter Allgemeine (5/15): "There is no doubt that the latest military efforts of the Turks in Northern Iraq will be successful. But after the Turkish forces have withdrawn from their usual offensive at the beginning of the
year against the Kurdish PKK, the conflict will continue to exist as always before. A political solution of the permanent conflict in Southeastern Turkey is not in sight, and the government in Ankara does not seem to have any idea of how to solve it. Together with the army leadership, it is clinging to the illusion that it can extinguish this trouble spot by killing as many PKK fighters as possible. But the past few years proved that this is not possible. We hear again and again from Ankara that the PKK will soon be 'exterminated,' but that never happens. The Turkish figures about the numbers of PKK killed (are inflated) and Turkish losses (downplayed).... This dirty war is also the reason for an increase in deserters, something which was almost unknown in Turkey before. The situation in the country is not very favorable."

**ZIMBABWE URGES 'DOWNLISTING' OF ELEPHANTS**

**ZIMBABWE: "Elephants Not Endangered"**

Under the above headline, an editorial in the government-controlled *Daily Chronicle* petitioned (5/13) the U.S. government to continue to support the USAID-funded "Campfire Programs" and underwrite proposals for resumed trade in ivory by downlisting elephants during the CITES conference to be held in Harare next month: "Zimbabwe has many friends in high places of the U.S. government, and we appeal to them, not only to continue to promote the aims and objectives of the 'campfire movement,' not only by continuing to give it financial support, but also by spreading the benefit to include other areas of the country to which the overflow of elephants from our national parks can be translocated and a check on their population's impact can be monitored. We believe that a good start towards the achievements of these aims could be made with the removal of elephants from the endangered species list."
Sothing the bear

Triumphalism is not in order. But last week's US-Russian summit in Helsinki was in fact a triumph for President Bill Clinton. In managing relations with Russia his administration has, after many understandable hesitations and contradictions, got it just right.

Although, like former president Franklin D. Roosevelt, Mr Clinton appeared in a wheelchair, this summit was no Yalta. Indeed it was Yalta in reverse. Instead of conceding a Russian sphere of influence, Mr Clinton preserved the rights of central and east European countries to join alliances of their choice. A clear stage management on both sides made it look like a triumph for President Boris Yeltsin, but in reality the US gave little or nothing away.

Mr Clinton repeated Nato's December statement that it has "no intention, no plan and no reason" to deploy nuclear weapons on the territory of new member states, and does not foresee any future need to do so. Reference to this is to be included in a document to be negotiated with Russia, but that document will not be a binding treaty.

Mr Clinton also accepted the principle of a "Start III" agreement which will bring the US nuclear arsenal down to de facto as well as de jure equality with that of Russia, while allowing the Russians four extra years to dismantle the warheads they already agreed to scrap under Start II. In a sense this means paying twice for the same Russian concession. Still, this will be a good deal for the West — indeed for the world — if it can be implemented. Russia's nuclear stockpile is now a source of danger almost irrespective of any hostile Russian intent. There is a vital global interest in seeing as much as possible destroyed under controlled and verifiable conditions.

Finally, Mr Clinton promised to help speed Russia's entry into various international bodies. But this is happening anyway, and can only be welcomed so long as Russia meets the criteria and respects the rules of those bodies that have them, such as the World Trade Organisation. As for the G-7, it is essentially a talking shop to call its annual summit "the summit of the eight" will not make a great difference, since Mr Yeltsin already attends the political part of the discussions.

These are small prices to pay for retaining Russia's goodwill and co-operation in the management of European security, where its ability to cause trouble, but also to contribute constructively when it so chooses, remains considerable.

Banking risk

The Bank of England's new framework for banking supervision is proving to be a risk. So far so good. But in other respects the new system will be cheaper and less bureaucratic than the old one.

The first two months of the year have brought a real annual rate of inflation of about 3.5 per cent, which is more in line with the government's targets. The growth of the money supply is below the 10 per cent rate the Bank of England had hoped for.

But the consumer price index was up 3.9 per cent in the 12 months to February, which is a little surprising, given the low level of interest rates.
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