



Russia-Europe-United States: Changing Global and Regional Environment

Monday, March 21, 2011

10:00 am-5:00 pm, Georgetown University Conference Center

Co-sponsored by the Center for Eurasian, Russian and East European Studies (CERES) and the Moscow State Institute for International Relations (MGIMO)

<http://ceres.georgetown.edu>

Panel One : Is there a New Euro-Atlantic Security Architecture?

Chair Bruce Parrott, Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies

Panelists- Catherine Kelleher, Center for International and Security Studies at University of Maryland; Manfred Huterer, Embassy of the Federal Republic Germany; Tatiana Shakleina, Moscow State Institute of International Relations (MGIMO)

Manfred Huterer opened the conference by saying that the Charter of Paris (21 November 1990) invoked a new era of democracy, peace, and security stretching from Vancouver to Vladivostok and that since then there has been considerable progress towards that goal. Huterer added that the US, Europe, and Russia are facing similar threats; therefore, Russia needs to officially declare that there isn't a military threat from the West. This will allow a shift in Russia's relationship with NATO from "adversary" to "partner." Catherine Kelleher focused on image perception as a key to building a common security architecture. She explained that the trans-Atlantic community's relationships are now of a domestic political character and concluded that static image perceptions between the West and Russia prevent the recognition of shared threats. In turn, Tatiana Shakleina of MGIMO emphasized the West's inability to fully grasp the difficulty for Russians to trust the historical discontinuity that the West is not a threat, considering its experience in the 20th century. During the question and answer session, in response to questions about hypothetical Russian membership in NATO and the effects on the current status of Ukraine and Georgia, Manfred Huterer explained that NATO has an open-door policy, but it is contingent upon potential new members' capability and willingness to honor Article 5. Kelleher added that overlapping interests require for both sides to respect the security interests of each other and Shakleina stated that she believes it is practically impossible to speak of Russia as a member of NATO. Huterer concluded the session by commenting on the current Russian-NATO relationship and what it means for the future of Euro-Atlantic security, "I think we live in interesting times right now and I do believe that we have a window of opportunity, it really exists, thanks to the "Reset" policy."

Panel Two: Energy and Economic Security

Chair: Theresa Sabonis-Helf, National War College/National Defense University

Panelists: Mark Entin, MGIMO; Thane Gustafson, Georgetown University, Daniel Kostoval, Embassy of the Czech Republic.

Mark Entin began the discussion by emphasizing that although strategic considerations are important, energy security needs economic coordination, especially considering the size of

future planned investments into the energy sector combined with the unreliability of forecasting. Thane Gustafson followed up by pointing out that the common theme is surprise and the only maxim that applies, “in all times and all places is ‘diversify!’” Daniel Kostoval agreed and explained that the more the market develops, the less politicized energy will become, even with different perceptions of security: security of demand (Russia) vs. security of supply (EU). During the question and answer session, Entin was asked to comment on the energy charter, to which he responded that there needs to be a legal basis for the development of an energy relationship. Kostoval added that even with Russian President Dmitry Medvedev’s new proposed framework, the EU believes that the basis, nonetheless, should be the Energy Charter. The next question concerned the effects of shale gas on current trends. Gustafson responded by saying that even “according to the most optimistic prediction, it [Europe] would only be able to sustain current levels of production.” Kostoval agreed that shale gas is not a game changer, but that it can certainly help the region’s diversification goals. On the question of Russian gas flaring Gustafson observed that gas trunk lines in West Siberia pass “overhead”, making it very expensive for the oil companies to recover associated gas. Finally, in response to a question concerning the appropriateness of the moniker “Energy Superpower,” Kostoval responded that the slogan, “Energy Superpower” was not conceived for the purposes of cooperation in this field, but as a threat. Gustafson added that it is important to note that the Soviet Union was not an “Energy Superpower,” while highlighting the dependence of the current regime on inherited Soviet energy infrastructure for rents. In conclusion, Entin said that energy is not the problem in Russia, at the end of the day, it’s the other sectors that are struggling.

Panel Three: Arms Control and Non-Proliferation

Chair: Angela Stent , Georgetown University

Panelists: Alexei Bogaturov, MGIMO; Dieter Dettke, Georgetown University; Robert Nurick, Georgetown University

The third panel began with Alexei Bogaturov highlighting the remarkable shift in the perception of European security to outside of the Euro-Atlantic area; to the Middle-East and Asia. However, there is an unclear threshold division line above which Russia can’t get closer to the West because it seeks tools with which it could provide possible counter pressure and influence security decisions in Europe. Dettke commented while that arms control lost the centrality that it once had during the Cold War, without the Treaty on Conventional Forces in Europe (CFE) or a CFE-like treaty it is difficult to see how the West can engage in serious talks about a new security architecture. In addition, Russia is more dependent on tactical nuclear arms due to its conventional military inferiority. A shared security system would move away from classical deterrence, however, even if it is tactically possible, it might not be available politically. Robert Nurick observed that both sides have invested quite a bit of political capital on the missile defense issue. However, the underlying issue is command and control, which is based on different threat perceptions. Importantly, the resolution of the missile defense issue could transform the US-Russian bilateral relationship. In response to a question concerning the possible effects of the upcoming Russian and US elections on the situation, Bogaturov responded that the Obama case is atypical because normally Russia has had better relations with Republicans than Democrats. Concerning Russia’s elections, Bogaturov believes that America is not on the agenda. Dettke commented that Russia and Europe lack clarity of vision and Nurick replied that the elections have already had an effect in terms of time-pressure for an agreement to

be concluded. Nurick added that consensus on the architecture for such an agreement would be a serious step in the right direction.