CHAPTER – 6

CONCLUSION
The focus of the study is to understand the nature of Russian security, its perception and military strategy in the changed context of 1991. Immediately after the Bolshevik revolution of 1917 the world was perceived in ideological terms - two rival blocs had emerged. The Soviet hope lay in revolutions in the West especially Europe. Once that hope faded the Soviets began the process of adjustments. During the Soviet period the security question was always preoccupied the leaders. Lenins idea of Peaceful Co-existence and Stalin's enunciation of collective security were steps in the direction of solving the vexed issue of security concerns. But these were adjustments. In fact temporary measures to enable the Soviet Union to catch up with the West. With the end of the Second World War in 1945, the Cold War began and this heightened Soviet security concerns. In Soviet perception the main threat came from Europe and North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) in particular. The Brezhnev- Kosygin period invested massive amount in the military. During the Gorbachev's time the meaning of security underwent a change. Security had moved away from the territorial aspect. Military might was not just enough. Comprehensive security implied political means were equally important as military means. It sought to shift the focus from the politics of co-existence to cooperation, mutual appraisal and confidence building. The Information Revolution and the concept of comprehensive security necessitated the changes ushered in by Gorbachev. Since 1985, changes in the Military Doctrine and strategy of the USSR reflected these changes. The very nature of socio-political relations between East and West. Common interests of survival, of the international community instead of particular class interests were emphasised. The foreign policy
was deideologised. The profound political and economic reforms in the USSR and in the East European countries, led to a re-assessment of past experience and concepts in the areas of national security and military strategy. Concepts of security went beyond the traditional thinking of military preparedness. New vulnerabilities and threats brought about this change.

NATO, a main military grouping underwent significant change in the post-Cold War. After the mid nineties NATO embarked on the road to eastward enlargement. By then the limits of Russia’s partnership with the United States were apparent. It successfully adapted its role to the challenges of the new security environment. The issue of the Russian states perception of NATO, appearing to be the focus of Russian contradictions, developed over the period 1993-2000 according to the inclusion/exclusion logic of determining the Russian position. The 1993 Russian on NATO (in one instance implied as an embodiment of western values) was conducted in terms of cooperation collaboration and intensification of contacts and exchange regarding NATO as one of the several elements of the security mechanism in Europe alone with the European Union (EU), Western European Union, the Organization for Security and Cooperation Europe (OSCE) then in the process of formation, and possibly, the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS). Russia was quite explicit in stating its concern with insufficient efficiency of multilateral mechanisms for maintaining peace and the new NATO Strategic doctrine postulating practices of military action beyond the bloc responsibility zone without the sanction of the UN Security Council. The flat rejection of NATO’s eastward expansion policy is balanced.
by the affirmation that Russia was open for constructive interaction on the basis of due account of the interests in the parties. The National Security Concept, Foreign Policy Doctrine, and Military Doctrine of 2000 presented the nature and purpose of the new Russian State. In the course of history, it underwent some very deeper changes and yet preserved some basic assumptions. The National Security Concept of 2000 reflected the development of political statements of Russian security assessments, interests and policies was therefore a long–term process reflecting the concerns and conclusions of a substantial enlargement, Kosovo Crisis, Chechnya problem disagreements on offensive and defensive nuclear weapons, but its roots lie deep within Russia's political and security establishment.

In modern conditions the line between the domestic and foreign policy becoming thinner. The strengthening of Russian statehood and economic growth had positive effects on the international standing of the country as well. Russia is viewed as a serious partner in solving major international problems. At the same time the increased foreign policy resource has played a vital role in the revival of the country as a whole.

Russia has scored certain results also in the creation of new mechanisms of positive influence on the evolution of the system of international relations. It is system of new organisations, such as Shanghai Cooperation Organisation (SCO) and the nascent common economic space. At the same time, trying to join as many organisations as possible. Russia's energetic operation in the Collective Security
Treaty Organisation (CSTO) and in G-8 and contacts with the organisation of the Islamic Conference are reinforcing contribution to global and regional possess.

The system of international relations has become more flexible and relations between states, more democratic.

In this situation Russia must use every opportunity to ensure Russia's participation in the creation of a fair world order that would meet the interests of security and socio-economic development of Russia. The overwhelming majority of the states share same attitudes to the solution of international problems on the basis of multilateral cooperation. Russia is directly contributing to the search for ways to settle the situations in Iraq, Afghanistan, the Middle East and the Korean peninsula.

The wave of EU and NATO expansion has created a new geopolitical situation on the continent. NATO's transformation has been the ambition to act global in a variety of missions. The process of NATO enlargement threw light on the future of the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC). NATO has undergone a geographical shift further east towards the Caucasus and Central Asia.

The Russian government believes that the Euro-Atlantic environment is changing to its advantage. It is concerned that the main Western institutions NATO and EU are on the offensive unifying the continent around norms, values and often policies about which the Russian government is hesitant. Rather than challenging values and norms, it questions the policies. This is pronounced in the case of NATO, its partner adversary, than the EU—although debates the four EU-Russia 'common space' have also demonstrated increasing Russian misgivings about the EU as another
force for Western style European unification. The enlargement processes and
neighbourhood schemes, potentially reinforcing each other, are restricting Russia’s
room for manoeuvre and forcing the Putin Administration into a reassessment of its
former *modus vivendi* with the west. It seems to regard these developments, paired
with changes outside its control in the region. Russia is an important source of energy
and a key player both in the neighbourhood stabilization and the effective
multilateralism strategies. Russia also perceives security challenges in a number of
political development in its immediate and wider neighbourhood, including the
changes political course in Georgia and Ukraine.

Russian attempt to counter NATO ideas such as multipolar world and
strengthening CIS, SCO. Russia has also made moves to reduce its cooperation with
institutions- the Organisation for security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) and the
Council of Europe.

Alongside the enlargement process, NATO has continued to restructure its
strategic command, improve capabilities and build up new relationships with the aim
of better projecting stability and security. As of now NATO is not a military threat like
earlier but it an instrument to contain Russia and create irritants for the latter.

Although tone on the EU and its enlargement has remained relatively soft, the
implied return to amore zero-sum view of Russian and Western interests has
sharpened the policy dilemma facing the EU in particular. There is no alternative
approach but to build up equal cooperation with the European EU and NATO A key
element fo such policy is development of ties with countries that show a real interests in closer contacts.

Relations with the United States likewise call for constant alienation. Russia’s objective pre-requisite for a long term partnership based on mutual interest, constructive dialogue and predictability. All this is required for jointly countering international terrorism, maintaining strategic stability and exercising arms control.

The central challenge for the Twenty first century is to fashion a new and Broader understanding, bringing together all these strands, of what collective security means and all the responsibilities, commitments, strategies and institutions that come with it if a collective security system is to be effective, efficient and equitable.

The threats are from non-state actors as well as states, and to human security as well as state security. The spread of Islamic fundamentalism, a phenomenon of the post Cold War international system, had its roots in the Islamic revivalism. The world is facing additional stress—that is terrorism. The major security concerns are separatism, instability in the countries in South and South West of Russia remains a major threat. North Caucasus is seen as by Russia as an important issue.

Collective strategies, collective institutions and a sense of collective responsibility are indispensable. Today’s threats recognises no national boundaries, are connected, and must be addressed at the global and regional levels. We must not underestimate the difficulty of reaching a new consensus about the meaning and responsibilities of collective security.
The Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI) is a response to the growing challenge posed by the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD), their delivery systems, and related material worldwide.

In the midst of uncertainty, there are challenging issues and some of them are brand new questions in themselves. The nations face additional stress – a global war on terrorism. The horrific events of 9/11/2001, Beslan tragedy (September 13, 2004), London Bomb Blast 7/7/2005 and currently Andijon tragedy have caused societal disorder. It has shaken the world. The world leaders are making synergic effort to find the solution on global terrorism. Many questions remain without answer.