

Dimensions and Trajectories of Russian Foreign Policy

by Sabine Fischer



Ministry of Foreign Affairs
and International Cooperation

ABSTRACT

Russian foreign policy went from integration to confrontation with the West, particularly after the 2014 annexation of Crimea and the war in the Donbas. These two events exemplified the idea prevalent in Moscow's foreign policy elite that Russia's immediate neighbours belonged to its sphere of influence and had only limited sovereignty. Since 2015, Moscow has managed to break out of its post-2014 international isolation by actively developing its Middle Eastern policy (through military intervention in Syria) and by intensifying relations with China and Asia. It seems unlikely that Russian foreign policy will ever return to its previous focus on relations with the West. The reasons for this are to be found in the nature of Russia's political system and the idea of Russia as an international great power. Moreover, Moscow is adjusting to processes of change in the international system, such as the rise of China and the changing role of the US.

Russia's foreign policy | Ukraine | Middle East | China | European Union | NATO | USA

keywords

Dimensions and Trajectories of Russian Foreign Policy

by Sabine Fischer*

Russian foreign policy has four key geographical dimensions: its relations with its immediate neighbourhood, its policy in the Middle East, and its relations with China (Asia) and with the West (the EU, NATO and the US).¹ In its post-Soviet history, Moscow went from rapprochement to confrontation with the West. Today Russian foreign policy focuses on China and aims to fully restore Russia's position as a great power in a multipolar international order.

1. Russia's neighbourhood policy

The events in Ukraine in 2014 are of essential importance for Russia's relations with its neighbourhood. Moscow always ascribed special importance to Ukraine in this key dimension of its foreign policy, conceding only limited sovereignty to its Western neighbour. President Vladimir Putin stressed repeatedly that Russians and Ukrainians are one nation, and that Ukraine was not able to develop a viable state of its own.² Of all the post-Soviet neighbours only Belarus is seen in a similar way.

¹ More recently, Moscow has also stepped up its engagement in Africa and Latin America, but these regions remain of secondary importance in Russia's foreign policy. See Andrei P. Tsygankov, "Directions", in Andrei P. Tsygankov (ed.), *Routledge Handbook of Russian Foreign Policy*, London/ New York, Routledge, 2018, p. 233.

² See the famous quote ascribed to Putin by the Russian daily *Kommersant*, in conversation with George W. Bush at the 2008 NATO Bucharest Summit: "You know, George, Ukraine is not even a state. One half of it is Eastern Europe, and the other half is given by us." See Olga Allenova, Elena Geda and Vladimir Novikov, "Блок НАТО разошелся на блокпакеты" (The NATO bloc separated into bloc fragments), in *Kommersant*, No. 57 (7 April 2008), <https://www.kommersant.ru/doc/877224>. Putin

* Sabine Fischer is Senior Fellow in the Eastern Europe and Eurasia Division at Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik (SWP) in Berlin. She is currently working in Moscow in the EU-funded project "Public Diplomacy. EU and Russia".

· Revised version of a paper presented at the 11th edition of IAI's Transatlantic Security Symposium entitled "The New Great Power Game. Transatlantic Relations and Multipolar Competition", held in Rome on 28 October 2019 and organised by IAI in cooperation with the Policy Planning Unit (UAP) of the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation (MAECI). The project has benefited from the financial support of the Policy Planning Unit of the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation pursuant to art. 23-bis of Presidential Decree 18/1967. The views expressed in this report are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation.

However, Ukraine never reciprocated Russian ambitions to forge a closer union. On the contrary, consecutive post-Soviet Ukrainian leaderships either balanced between the West and Moscow (thereby extracting benefits from both sides) or unequivocally strove for integration into the EU and NATO. Ukraine became the centre stage for the mounting integration competition between Russia and the West in Eastern Europe and the South Caucasus.³

The story of the Russian–Ukrainian conflict cannot be recounted here. Suffice it to summarise what it tells us about Russia’s policy towards its neighbours:

- Moscow considers Russia’s immediate neighbourhood its zone of influence (or zone of privileged interests, as former President Dmitri Medvedev famously put it during the Russian–Georgian war in August 2008). This implies that Russia’s neighbours have, in Moscow’s view, only limited sovereignty; they are not free to choose either their foreign policy orientation or the nature of their political system. Moscow claims the right to interfere with the domestic and external policies of its neighbours if it sees Russian interests and national security jeopardised by them.
- In such cases Moscow is ready to apply the full range of foreign policy tools at its disposal. Over the past 15 years, Moscow has provided political benefits and exerted political pressure; has handed out economic rewards and imposed economic sanctions; and has used hybrid instruments like Russian-language media, secret service operations and concealed and open military action to control or destabilise neighbouring states. It has exploited existing unresolved ethno-political conflicts and, ultimately, created two new conflicts in Crimea and the Donbas to steer its neighbours’ policies in the desired direction.⁴
- Moscow pursues Russia-led regional integration formats to unite and control its neighbourhood. The flag ship of this policy is the Eurasian Economic Union (EAEU). Launched in January 2015, the EAEU includes Russia, Belarus, Kazakhstan, Armenia and Kyrgyzstan.⁵ It remains dominated by Russia both politically and economically, with Russia accounting for more than 80 per cent of the overall GDP

expressed similar views when he addressed the Russian nation on the occasion of the annexation of Crimea in 2014 (Russia’s Presidency, *Address by President of the Russian Federation*, 18 March 2014, <http://en.kremlin.ru/events/president/news/20603>), or during an interview with US film director Oliver Stone broadcast in 2018 (Angela Stent, *Putin’s World. Russia against the West and with the Rest*, New York, Twelve, 2019, p. 176).

³ Tuomas Forsberg and Hiski Haukkala, *The European Union and Russia*, New York, Palgrave Macmillan, 2016, p. 192.

⁴ Sabine Fischer, “Not Frozen! The Unresolved Conflicts over Transnistria, Abkhazia, South Ossetia and Nagorno-Karabakh in Light of the Crisis over Ukraine”, in *SWP Research Papers*, No. 2016/RP 09 (September 2016), <https://www.swp-berlin.org/en/publication/not-frozen-conflicts-in-the-post-soviet-area>; and “The Donbas Conflict. Opposing Interests and Narratives, Difficult Peace Process”, in *SWP Research Papers*, No. 2019/RP 05 (April 2019), <https://doi.org/10.18449/2019RP05>.

⁵ Eurasian Development Bank (EDB), “Eurasian Economic Integration 2019”, in *EDB Centre for Integration Studies Reports*, No. 52 (2019), <https://eabr.org/en/analytics/integration-research/cii-reports/eurasian-economic-integration-2019>.

of the EAEU. Moreover, Russia's recent economic difficulties have impeded intra-EAEU integration. At the same time, however, the EAEU will not disappear from Moscow's political agenda, and integration efforts will continue. The organisation is also building a network of external relations. It concluded a free trade agreement with Vietnam in 2017 and is in the process of negotiating similar arrangements with more countries, among them Egypt, Iran, India, Singapore and Turkey. China and the EAEU have had a non-preferential trade agreement since 2018. Other regional organisations promoted by Russia in Eastern Europe and Eurasia are the Collective Security Treaty Organisation and the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation.

The 2014 events sent shock waves through post-Soviet Eastern Europe, the South Caucasus and Central Asia, and contributed to further polarising and fragmenting the region.

2. Russia's Middle East policy

The Russian intervention in the Syrian war in September 2015 marked Moscow's return to the Middle East after a long period of absence. The Middle East had been an area of priority for Soviet foreign policy during the Cold War, but Russia withdrew almost completely after the dissolution of the Soviet Union. Consumed by internal difficulties and driven by rapprochement with the West, Moscow maintained only very few entry points in the region.⁶ In the 2000s Putin started to reach out more actively towards Middle Eastern countries. His efforts to re-activate Russia's engagement were amplified by Russia's economic consolidation and increasing competition with the United States.

The turning point came with NATO's intervention in Libya in 2011. At the time, Russia abstained from voting on the UNSC Resolution (1973) that authorised the use of force because it was trying to mend fences with Washington in the context of the reset policy of the Obama administration. When the intervention was followed by the fall of the Gaddafi regime and the killing of Libya's longstanding autocratic ruler Muamar Gaddafi himself, a feeling of utter betrayal spread among the foreign policy elite in Moscow. From that point on, Russia resolved to pursue its interests without any further consideration of Western interests; it intensified contacts with a variety of actors in the Middle East, including the Western ally and NATO member Turkey.

The military intervention in the war in Syria was based on the lessons Russia had drawn from events in Libya. When in summer 2015 the Assad regime came under existential military pressure, Moscow chose to act. As a result, it achieved a broad range of foreign policy goals in the Middle East and beyond: President Bashar al-Assad remains in power and actually in control of most of the Syrian territory – a

⁶ For instance, the supply point for the Russian naval forces in Tartus, Syria and the construction of a nuclear power plant in Busher, Iran.

fact that by now seems to be accepted even by Western actors. Further, Moscow initiated two international negotiation tracks (Sochi and Astana) in which the US and other Western actors have no role. In short, Russia positioned itself as a key player in the Middle East way beyond Syria. It is the only external player to maintain “cooperative ties with the region’s main protagonists – and antagonists”.⁷

Moscow’s increased engagement in the Middle East is often mainly attributed to its geopolitical competition with the US. While the Russian foreign policy elite is certainly fixated on the country’s perceived rivalry with Washington, Russia’s policy in the Middle East is driven by a more complex set of interests:

- After its long absence from the Middle East in the 1990s and 2000s Russia has rebuilt political and economic ties with different partners and intends to protect them. The region is not seen as an exclusive zone of Russian interest, like the neighbourhood. But Russia expects its interests be taken seriously.
- Seen from Moscow, the Arab Spring brought nothing but the breakdown of political order and control, the destabilisation of the entire Middle East and a surge of religious fundamentalism in the region. Moscow is deeply concerned about possible spill-over effects on Russia’s Muslim population in the North Caucasus – including by the return of fighters from the Middle Eastern battlefields. It is equally worried about the destabilisation of its Southern neighbourhood and Central Asia.⁸
- The Russian political elite are wary of what they perceive as Western “regime change policy”. They have always perceived Western democracy promotion and support for political upheavals – be it in Russia’s immediate neighbourhood, in the Middle East, or elsewhere in the world – as implicitly targeted at themselves. Libya 2011 was seen as a prime example of such regime change policy, and was not to repeat itself.
- Intervention in Syria and active engagement with Middle Eastern states, including with disaffected allies of the West, helped Russia to escape isolation from the West after 2014.

3. Russia’s China policy

Partnership with China became the key priority of Russian foreign policy from 2014. Just like engagement in the Middle East, intensified relations with China helped Russia to counterbalance sanctions and international isolation. But China is much more important because of its growing economic and political power.

⁷ Angela Stent, *Putin’s World*, cit., p. 259.

⁸ Hence Putin’s insistence that Russia’s intervention in the war in Syria was part of the (international) fight against terrorism – although Russia applies a very broad definition of terrorism which also encompasses the political and military opposition to the Assad regime.

Russia's "turn towards China" in 2014 built upon efforts to develop relations with Russia's biggest Eastern neighbour undertaken since the late 1990s.⁹ Already in 2001, Russia and China had concluded a Treaty on Good-Neighbourliness and Friendly Cooperation (which will expire in 2021). In the 2000s, the two former antagonists settled their border disputes, developed economic cooperation and coordinated certain aspects of their foreign policies. China's rapid economic development (as opposed to Russia's relative economic stagnation) created an increasingly unbalanced trade structure.¹⁰ When the EU and the US started to impose sanctions on Russia in 2014, the asymmetry in Russian–Chinese trade relations became even stronger. Overall, Russia is much more dependent on the bilateral trade relationship than is China.

China is of key importance for Russia as a neighbour in Central Asia. It has already become the biggest foreign investor in the Central Asian states through its Belt and Road Initiative (BRI), the massive array of infrastructure funding initiatives that China is pursuing in order to strengthen (and keep control of) trade routes between East Asia and Europe. Russia's initial reaction to the BRI was hesitant – not least because of fears that the BRI would thwart Russian own integration efforts in Central Asia. After 2014 Russia embraced the BRI as a possibility to bring Russia and China closer together and create synergies with the Eurasian Economic Union. However, the relationship remains very asymmetric. Its future will depend on how China's role in Central Asia evolves. For now, the division of labour between Russia as the main security provider and China as the chief investor in the region works in the interests of both sides. Should China one day aspire to become involved in securing its investments, this constellation might become brittle.

The political and economic relationship between Moscow and Beijing has clearly grown deeper and more intense, particularly since the disruption of Russian–Western relations in 2014. However, Russian society clearly remains oriented towards Europe. Concerns about a "yellow peril" in the Russian Far East have waned, but not disappeared completely.

Moscow had several motives for its pivot to China:

- China is the rising power of the 21st century. Like any other country, Russia at some point started to adjust to this fact – compared to many others it is a latecomer in this respect.

⁹ Bobo Lo, *Axis of Convenience. Moscow, Beijing, and the New Geopolitics*, Washington, Brookings Institution Press, 2008.

¹⁰ Russia's exports to China consist mainly of mineral products and hydrocarbons, with the notable exception of advanced weaponry. In 2014 Russia agreed to sell SU35S fighter jets and S-400 surface-to-air missiles to China. Previously Moscow had avoided such deals to protect itself from Chinese reverse engineering. China, for its part, delivers machinery, transport equipment, foodstuffs and textiles to Russia.

- Moscow shares with Beijing the rejection of what both perceive as the Western-dominated liberal order. Both base their foreign policy on the assumption of a multipolar world – with several great powers having an equal right to shape and determine international relations. Indisputable sovereignty is another key term in both Russia's and China's foreign policy discourse. Their relationship is based on strict non-interference in domestic affairs. This is also the basis for their mutual support in the UN Security Council and in other multilateral fora.

- Many policy makers and observers in Russia understand that their partnership with China is not equal and is bound to become less equal in the future. Neither has the relationship achieved what Russia had hoped for in 2014. China keeps looking to Europe and the US economically, carefully balances its partnership with Russia against relations with Western actors, and refrains from any kind of support for Russia that could damage its relations with the West. Moscow reaches out to other Asian states and engages with multilateral cooperation formats in Asia in order to balance this asymmetry. Nonetheless, China has become indispensable in Russian foreign policy, both in its own right and to offset Russia's isolation from the West.

4. Domestic and international roots of Russian foreign policy

In the 1990s, Russia barely had a foreign policy. It was paralysed by domestic turmoil and existential economic crisis. Economic recovery and the ensuing political stabilisation in the 2000s marked the beginning of a normalisation process that enabled Moscow to take a more proactive and confident stance in the international arena. Today Russia's foreign policy is determined by a set of mutually reinforcing internal and external factors.

1) *Foreign policy as a continuation of domestic politics*: Today's Russia is a hyper-centralised autocracy. It is dominated by a power-vertical with President Putin at the top. In the area of foreign and security policy, the decision-making process is even more personalised and centralised than elsewhere. Putin has been the key figure in Russian foreign policy since the 2000s. Since he came to power, the influence of the so-called siloviki (the security services) has grown steadily. Informal, non-transparent patron–client networks across the political, security and economic spheres, which are the closest thing to corporate interests in today's Russia, also play a role in foreign policy making (for instance with regard to economic interests in Russia's immediate neighbourhood or in the Middle East¹¹). However, Putin remains the dominant figure, not least because he has so far managed to keep competing patron–client networks in check. As a rule, Putin puts security and geopolitics above economic interests.¹² The importance of his

¹¹ Kimberly Marten, "A New Explanation for Russian Foreign Policy: The Power of Informal Patronage Networks", in *PONARS Eurasia Policy Memos*, No. 274 (September 2013), <http://www.ponarseurasia.org/node/6437>.

¹² Dmitri Trenin, "20 Years of Vladimir Putin: How Russian Foreign Policy Has Changed", in *The*

personality and personal ideology has grown even more since his re-election as Russian president in 2018.¹³

The future and stability of the political system depend on two factors. First, will the (prolonged Putin or post-Putin) political leadership be able to maintain the intra-elite balance on which the current political regime is resting? The stagnating economy (itself a result of the regime's policies), might become a serious challenge with potential implications, including for Russian foreign policy. And second, how will state–society relations evolve in the future? Traditionally, society plays a subordinate role in Russian foreign policy making. Foreign policy is not a priority for ordinary Russians; societal actors are excluded from the decision-making process. The majority of Russians support the official narrative on Russia's place in the world. The annexation of Crimea in March 2014 boosted the legitimacy of the political leadership at a moment when the regime found itself in an unprecedented popularity low. The so called "Crimea effect" started wearing off after the 2018 presidential elections; public discontent over economic stagnation and socio-economic inequality became increasingly evident. People still do not question Crimea's affiliation with Russia, or the Russian role in the Donbas or Syria. But they have started to dread the costs of foreign policy and show no appetite for any kind of new adventure.

The first months of 2020 brought unexpected developments in Russian domestic politics. In January, Putin surprised Russia and the world by announcing a comprehensive constitutional reform. The reform law adopted by the Russian State Duma on 10 March removed all obstacles for Putin to run again in the 2024 presidential elections and remain in the Kremlin for another two terms, until 2036. Meanwhile, the collapse of oil prices and especially the coronavirus pandemic faced the Russian leadership with unprecedented challenges. Russian politics reacted rather late to the spread of the virus. As in many other countries, the Russian authorities' ability to manage the pandemic and its economic and socio-economic implications is likely to have a profound impact on the future and the stability of the political system.

2) *Identity and foreign policy discourse*: The idea of Russia in Greater Eurasia has been dominating the official Russian foreign policy discourse in recent years. Greater Eurasia signifies a space from Europe to the Pacific Ocean.¹⁴ This space is characterised by horizontal (in the Russian diction: democratic) relations between equal civilisations and dynamically unfolding bilateral and multilateral political, economic and infrastructure projects. Most importantly – and contrary to the Western-dominated liberal order – no player in Greater Eurasia claims hegemony,

Moscow Times, 27 August 2019, <https://www.themoscowtimes.com/2019/08/27/a67043>.

¹³ Bobo Lo, "Going Legit? The Foreign Policy of Vladimir Putin", in *Lowy Institute Analyses*, 17 September 2018, <https://www.lowyinstitute.org/node/351021>.

¹⁴ Sergei Karaganov, "From East to West or Greater Eurasia", in *Russia in Global Affairs*, 25 October 2016, <https://eng.globalaffairs.ru/?p=12191>.

thus allowing for equal partnerships and communities of values. Greater Eurasia is part of a multipolar world, in which great powers with equal rights determine the course of history. Russia is one of those great powers, equipped with a zone of influence, and on equal footing with other great powers (such as China, the US and other countries with significant military and/or economic resources).

3) *A changing world*: Official Russia blames the West for the deterioration of mutual relations. Moscow explains the annexation of Crimea, its military intervention in Syria and other foreign policy moves with the need to defend Russia and its partners against the US's and its allies' aggressive policies towards Russia – embodied, in particular, in NATO's eastward enlargement. At the 2017 Valdai Forum, the author of this paper asked the Russian president what mistakes Russia had made in its foreign policy over the past 15 years. His answer was: "Our most serious mistake in relations with the West is that we trusted you too much. And your mistake is that you took that trust as weakness and abused it."¹⁵

This reading of Russian foreign policy is one-sided and mono-causal. It claims that over the past 25 years the West has been acting (attacking Russia) and Russia has been reacting (defending itself from Western attacks). This perspective is disputed by Putin's critics both in and outside Russia. Many of those critics place a strong accent on Russian authoritarianism as the main source of Moscow's external behaviour. While domestic factors are indeed important, changes in the outside world have always had an effect on Russian foreign policy. Three developments have been particularly important:

- In the early 2000s, the enlargement of the European Union and NATO, combined with US engagement in Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia under George W. Bush, led to tectonic changes in the post-Soviet space. Particularly in Ukraine and Georgia, parts of the societies saw the accession of Central and Eastern European states to the EU and NATO as a model for their own future. Political leaderships had to position themselves in a radically changed regional environment, in which closer alignment with the EU and NATO had become an appealing and realistic option, and was now actively promoted by some of the new member states. Having little to offer in this new competition, Moscow reacted by reverting to coercion vis-à-vis the other post-Soviet countries.
- The US plays a much more important role in Russian foreign policy thinking than vice versa. Several consecutive American administrations treated Russia as a secondary foreign policy issue.¹⁶ Washington's changing strategic priorities have directly affected Russia's foreign policy options and actions. American engagement or disengagement in different world regions or on different political

¹⁵ Russia's Presidency, *Meeting of the Valdai International Discussion Club*, 19 October 2017, <http://en.kremlin.ru/events/president/news/55882>.

¹⁶ Angela Stent, *The Limits of Partnership. U.S.-Russian Relations in the Twenty-First Century*, Princeton/Oxford, Princeton University Press, 2014.

matters impacts directly on Russian foreign policy. Even Moscow's possibilities to expand ties with Beijing and other Asian states are to a considerable degree shaped by US–China relations and American policy in Asia.

- Last but not least, Russian foreign policy reacts and adjusts to the structural changes in the international system caused by China's increasing power and influence.

Conclusion: Changing trajectories in Russia's foreign policy and implications for Russia's relations with the EU and the US

2014 marked a watershed in Russian foreign policy and in Russia's relations with the EU and the US. Russia's annexation of Crimea and the war in the Donbas pushed Russian hegemonic ambitions in the neighbourhood to the extreme, disrupted relations with the EU and the US and boosted the importance of the two other key dimensions of Russian foreign policy, the Middle East and particularly China/Asia.

In 2014, Moscow clearly underestimated the scale and resolve of Western actors in response to the annexation of Crimea and the war in the Donbas. It also misjudged the EU's ability to keep up sanctions in the long term. Russia's actions in Ukraine accelerated a deterioration that had started a decade earlier. Almost six years later, going back to the status quo ante is no longer an option.¹⁷ The EU and Russia remain important economic and trade partners. In fact, Russia still realises the largest part of its external trade with the EU.¹⁸ The previously intense political relationship, however, has become largely de-institutionalised and is marred by mutual mistrust. Russia has shifted its attention to EU member states it considers Russia-friendly, and to right-wing populist and Eurosceptic political movements across the EU. Moscow has extended the use of instruments previously applied to post-Soviet neighbours – such as the promotion of propaganda through Russian media, interference with election campaigns, cyber-attacks, etc. – to the EU. The EU, on its part, bases its Russia policy on the five guiding principles released in 2016, which mark a clear departure from the idea of a strategic partnership with Russia, as prevalent in EU rhetoric prior to 2014.¹⁹

¹⁷ Kadri Liik, "EU-Russia Relations: Where Do We Go From Here?", in Kristi Raik and András Rácz (eds), *Post-Crimea Shift in EU-Russia Relations: From Fostering Interdependence to Managing Vulnerabilities*, Tallinn, International Centre for Defence and Security (ICDS), 2019, p. 276-286, <https://icds.ee/?p=45116>.

¹⁸ China replaced Germany as Russia's largest individual bilateral trade partner in 2018.

¹⁹ The five guiding principles: full implementation of the Minsk Agreements; strengthening of relations with the Eastern partners and other neighbours; strengthening internal European resilience, in particular in view of energy security, hybrid threats and strategic communication; selective engagement with Russia, both on foreign policy issues, but also in other areas where there is a clear EU interest; and support for the Russian civil society and people-to-people contacts. See European External Action Service (EEAS), *Remarks by High Representative/Vice-President Federica Mogherini at the Press-Conference Following the Foreign Affairs Council*, 14 March 2016, <https://europa.eu/!kY34bM>.

Relations with the US plunged even deeper into crisis with Donald Trump's victory in the 2016 presidential elections. Because of its meddling with the US election campaign, Russia ended up in the crosshairs of domestic conflict in the US, which led to a new wave of sanctions (now codified into law and therefore much more difficult to lift). Moscow was not able to reap the benefits of its support for Trump. Meanwhile, important aspects of the Trump administration's foreign policy, for instance its destructive assaults against multilateral regimes, including in the area of arms control, hurt Russian interests.

Russia's sharp turn away from the West in 2014 would not have happened had it not been for the Russian–Ukrainian conflict and the West's reaction to it. At the same time, however, the 2014 events accelerated and amplified underlying trends, which have since become even further engrained in Russian foreign policy. The trajectories across the geographic dimensions of Russia's foreign policy are not likely to change in the foreseeable future. In other words, Russia should not be expected to want to "return to the West" any time soon. Moreover, the West itself is undergoing a potentially existential transition. This raises the question: What "West" would Russia return to?

Updated 27 April 2020

References

Olga Allenova, Elena Geda and Vladimir Novikov, "Блок НАТО разошелся на блокпакеты" [The NATO bloc separated into bloc fragments], in *Kommersant*, No. 57 (7 April 2008), <https://www.kommersant.ru/doc/877224>

Eurasian Development Bank, "Eurasian Economic Integration 2019", in *EDB Centre for Integration Studies Reports*, No. 52 (2019), <https://eabr.org/en/analytics/integration-research/cii-reports/eurasian-economic-integration-2019>

European External Action Service (EEAS), *Remarks by High Representative/Vice-President Federica Mogherini at the Press-Conference Following the Foreign Affairs Council*, 14 March 2016, <https://europa.eu/!kY34bM>

Sabine Fischer, "Not Frozen! The Unresolved Conflicts over Transnistria, Abkhazia, South Ossetia and Nagorno-Karabakh in Light of the Crisis over Ukraine", in *SWP Research Papers*, No. 2016/RP 09 (September 2016), <https://www.swp-berlin.org/en/publication/not-frozen-conflicts-in-the-post-soviet-area>

Sabine Fischer, "The Donbas Conflict. Opposing Interests and Narratives, Difficult Peace Process", in *SWP Research Papers*, No. 2019/RP 05 (April 2019), <https://doi.org/10.18449/2019RP05>

Tuomas Forsberg and Hiski Haukkala, *The European Union and Russia*, New York, Palgrave Macmillan, 2016

Sergei Karaganov, "From East to West or Greater Eurasia", in *Russia in Global Affairs*, 25 October 2016, <https://eng.globalaffairs.ru/?p=12191>

Kadri Liik, "EU-Russia Relations: Where Do We Go From Here?", in Kristi Raik and András Rácz (eds), *Post-Crimea Shift in EU-Russia Relations: From Fostering Interdependence to Managing Vulnerabilities*, Tallinn, International Centre for Defence and Security (ICDS), 2019, p. 276-286, <https://icds.ee/?p=45116>

Bobo Lo, *Axis of Convenience. Moscow, Beijing, and the New Geopolitics*, Washington, Brookings Institution Press, 2008

Bobo Lo, "Going Legit? The Foreign Policy of Vladimir Putin", in *Lowy Institute Analyses*, 17 September 2018, <https://www.lowyinstitute.org/node/351021>

Kimberly Marten, "A New Explanation for Russian Foreign Policy: The Power of Informal Patronage Networks", in *PONARS Eurasia Policy Memos*, No. 274 (September 2013), <http://www.ponarseurasia.org/node/6437>

Russia's Presidency, *Address by President of the Russian Federation*, 18 March 2014, <http://en.kremlin.ru/events/president/news/20603>

Russia's Presidency, *Meeting of the Valdai International Discussion Club*, 19 October 2017, <http://en.kremlin.ru/events/president/news/55882>

Angela Stent, *The Limits of Partnership. U.S.-Russian Relations in the Twenty-First Century*, Princeton/Oxford, Princeton University Press, 2014

Angela Stent, *Putin's World. Russia against the West and with the Rest*, New York, Twelve, 2019

Dmitri Trenin, "20 Years of Vladimir Putin: How Russian Foreign Policy Has Changed", in *The Moscow Times*, 27 August 2019, <https://www.themoscowtimes.com/2019/08/27/a67043>

Andrei P. Tsygankov, "Directions", in Andrei P. Tsygankov (ed.), *Routledge Handbook of Russian Foreign Policy*, London/New York, Routledge, 2018, p. 233-236

Istituto Affari Internazionali (IAI)

The Istituto Affari Internazionali (IAI) is a private, independent non-profit think tank, founded in 1965 on the initiative of Altiero Spinelli. IAI seeks to promote awareness of international politics and to contribute to the advancement of European integration and multilateral cooperation. Its focus embraces topics of strategic relevance such as European integration, security and defence, international economics and global governance, energy, climate and Italian foreign policy; as well as the dynamics of cooperation and conflict in key geographical regions such as the Mediterranean and Middle East, Asia, Eurasia, Africa and the Americas. IAI publishes an English-language quarterly (*The International Spectator*), an online webzine (*Affarinternazionali*), three book series (*Global Politics and Security*, *Quaderni IAI* and *IAI Research Studies*) and some papers' series related to IAI research projects (*Documenti IAI*, *IAI Papers*, etc.).

Via Angelo Brunetti, 9 - I-00186 Rome, Italy

T +39 06 3224360

F + 39 06 3224363

iai@iai.it

www.iai.it

Latest IAI PAPERS

Director: Riccardo Alcaro (r.alcaro@iai.it)

- 20 | 08 Sabine Fischer, *Dimensions and Trajectories of Russian Foreign Policy*
- 20 | 07 Ehud Eiran, *Structural Shifts and Regional Security: A View from Israel*
- 20 | 06 Daniela Huber, *The New European Commission's Green Deal and Geopolitical Language: A Critique from a Decentering Perspective*
- 20 | 05 Barbara A. Finamore, *China's Quest for Global Clean Energy Leadership*
- 20 | 04 Matteo Bonomi, Ardian Hackaj and Dušan Reljić, *Avoiding the Trap of Another Paper Exercise: Why the Western Balkans Need a Human Development-centred EU Enlargement Model*
- 20 | 03 Ettore Greco, *Il Regno Unito post-Brexit tra Ue e Usa*
- 20 | 02 Ian O. Lesser, *What to Expect from the United States: A Look Ahead at US Foreign Policy*
- 20 | 01 Niccolò Petrelli, *Military Innovation and Defence Acquisition: Lessons from the F-35 Programme*
- 19 | 28 Christos Kolokhatis e Michael Hogan, *Le opzioni di riforma del mercato per un sistema italiano dell'energia affidabile, redditizio e decarbonizzato*
- 19 | 27 Sophia Kalantzakos, *The Geopolitics of Critical Minerals*