

artillery – 20,000; armoured combat vehicles – 30,000; combat aircraft – 6,800; and purpose-built combat helicopters – 2,000. NATO will reduce armaments by over 13,000 pieces of equipment and Warsaw Treaty countries by over 36,000 to reach these ceilings. The Treaty's Protocol on Reductions sets out detailed procedures for fulfilling the destruction requirements.

The sufficiency rule (Article VI) is of particular importance to the limitations provisions. It establishes the general principle that no state party should possess more than approximately one-third of the armaments and equipment limited by the Treaty, and sets out specific figures for each category of Treaty-limited equipment. That measure, along with regional sub-limits, will seriously constrain the ability of any one state to initiate large-scale offensive action. The concept of national ceilings, although initially avoided by NATO, was introduced in the course of the negotiation as a means of identifying potential violators of collective responsibilities. It represents, along with limited mutual inspections by members of the same groups of states, an important step away from the bloc-to-bloc approach to security.

Exchange of Information

The CFE mandate called for an exchange of information in sufficient detail to allow a meaningful comparison of capabilities and to provide a basis for verification of compliance. Although some would argue that the Treaty does not go far enough, particularly concerning information on Treaty-limited equipment held by paramilitary forces, the exchange will provide the most comprehensive, detailed and — it is expected — reliable read-out of the order of battle of European forces ever obtained. It will also provide a basic road map for verifying compliance.

Verification

Achievements in this area provide detailed procedures for verifying compliance with Treaty obligations, although at present it is not clear how well these procedures will work in practice. For example, some would argue that the numbers of inspections should be

higher. In addition, the challenge inspection measure, while important, could have been strengthened by increasing the amount of territory to which each inspection will be keyed. More importantly, each challenge inspection will be at the expense of a declared site inspection.

Aerial inspections were regarded as being important to the CFE verification regime, but there was insufficient time to conclude negotiations on the modalities for this process. Instead, the issue will be pursued in follow-on negotiations in time for implementation during the residual period (see following articles). Thus it will be possible to corroborate with a reasonable degree of confidence the data provided by an inspected party in the information exchange, and to subsequently make informed judgements concerning Treaty compliance. However, NATO will retain considerable dependence on information derived from sensitive national technical means to detect non-compliance outside declared sites.

Follow-up

As the text makes clear, the CFE Treaty is not the final word on conventional arms control in Europe. The Treaty establishes a Joint Consultative Group to facilitate implementation and, on the basis of consensus, to propose amendments. Furthermore, Article XVIII states that parties to the Treaty shall continue negotiations "with the goal of building on this Treaty" through agreement on additional measures aimed at further strengthening security and stability in Europe. The follow-on CFE I(A) negotiation opened in Vienna in November 1990. Some delegations have already indicated measures for pursuit in these talks. Portions of the Treaty were applied provisionally from signature on November 19; the Treaty enters into force when all 22 states indicate that their national ratification procedures have been completed. It is obvious that the CFE Treaty is the beginning rather than the end of a process.

The CFE negotiation was conducted during a period of the most rapid peaceful change Europe has known since the first Congress of Vienna, 175 years ago. Begun in a climate of scepticism and

suspicion as a diplomatic contest between members of NATO and the WTO, the negotiation concluded as a joint effort by 22 countries to secure the best common, collective advantage from the changes that were taking place, and to provide a solid basis for the elaboration of new, pan-European security arrangements.

As Soviet Ambassador Grinevski observed at the November 15, 1990 plenary session: "Unbeknownst even to themselves, negotiators have, over the past few months, turned from being adversaries to being partners in a common cause — the building of a new Europe and of new relationships throughout the world. The CFE Treaty, by overcoming the bloc-to-bloc approach to security in Europe, can be likened to the destruction of a second Berlin wall." ■

The CFE Treaty: A Summary

The CFE Treaty consists of a main text (containing a preamble and 23 articles), eight protocols and two annexes, all of which constitute an integral part of the Treaty. Throughout the text there are references to specific, complementary time frames that will occur in the following sequence once the Treaty comes into force: a 120-day baseline validation period; a 3-year reduction period; a 120-day residual level validation period; and the residual period.

The Preamble sets the tone of the document and describes the framework within which negotiations took place as well as the participants' objectives in agreeing to CFE.

Article I broadly commits the signatories to carry out the undertakings of the Treaty, in particular with regard to battle tanks, armoured combat vehicles (ACVs), artillery, combat aircraft and combat helicopters, which collectively are referred to as TLE, or Treaty-limited equipment.

Article II provides specific definitions of terms and language used throughout the text, including "area of application,"