Istituto Affari Internazionali

The US-Europe vs. Russia Triangle

by Eugene Rumer

ABSTRACT

Russia's relations with Europe and the United States are at their worst since the end of the Soviet Union. Russian leaders reject the post-Cold War vision of a Europe whole, free, at peace with itself and its neighbours, view NATO as a threat and increasingly consider the EU as a danger to Russia's political system. This is unlikely to change soon. The anti-Western worldview of Russia's national security establishment, the proximity of the NATO-Russia line of contact to the Russian heartland, and Russia's newly assertive posture in many far-flung regions of the world contribute to an atmosphere of heightened tensions between Russia and Europe and the United States. This, however, may not be the biggest challenge facing the West. In the age of Trump, that challenge may come from within, not outside, the Western alliance.

NATO | Russia | European Union | Transatlantic relations

keywords

ISSN 2610-9603 | ISBN 978-88-9368-079-0 © 2018 IAI

IAI PAPERS 18 | 12 - JULY 2018

The US-Europe vs. Russia Triangle

by Eugene Rumer*

Introduction

The year 2014 stands in a row of recent historical turning points, along with 1989, 1991, and 2001. It marks the end of a significant period, during which the West attempted to build a productive and cooperative relationship between the West and Russia. That attempt proved unsuccessful, and 2014 – the year of Russian annexation of Crimea – became the year when Europe fully returned to confrontation and geopolitical competition. The new post-2014 environment lacks some of the key elements of the Cold War, such as the existence of large standing armies poised to attack or to repel an invasion. But it shares some of its important features, such as the tense situation along the line of contact and the ideological confrontation between Russia and the West.

The analogy with the Cold War is not accepted in many quarters on both sides of the Atlantic. Some maintain that the current stand-off is limited largely to Europe and does not have the same global nature as the Cold War did. Others argue that the cooling off of East-West relations is a temporary phenomenon likely to be a relatively brief phase, and that the relationship between Russia and the West is bound to recover and shift to a more cooperative path simply as an imperative mandated by common threats and a number of shared interests.

Four years is not a long time, but what we know and see so far points to a very different conclusion than these optimistic analyses. Since 2014, Russian foreign policy has entered a much more dynamic and ambitious phase, with its geographic scope greatly expanded beyond Dmitry Medvedev's claim to a sphere of privileged interests around the immediate periphery of Russia. And notwithstanding some quite limited cooperation, or, rather, coordination, in Syria, there is little evidence that Russian authorities are inclined to put a cooperative relationship with the West high on their list of priorities. There is little in Russian domestic politics or international posture to suggest that the current phase is likely to be brief, and that in the foreseeable future the relationship with the West will begin to live up to the

* Eugene Rumer is a Senior Fellow and the Director of Russia and Eurasia Programme at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

· Paper prepared for the Istituto Affari Internazionali (IAI), July 2018.

ISSN 2610-9603 | ISBN 978-88-9368-079-0 © 2018 IAI

post-Cold War expectations and hopes.

The argument about the likely long-term nature of the current, confrontational phase in East-West relations is reinforced by a sober look back at the previous quarter century of relatively benign interactions between Russia and the West. The main take away from it is that even that period was not that benign and was fuelled to a large extent by hopes rather than concrete accomplishments.

History does not unfold in a straight line, and scholars' and policymakers' ability to predict its course is modest at best, as demonstrated by their failure to predict the end of the Cold War, the break-up of the Soviet Union, the 9/11 terrorist attacks, and the start of the conflict in Ukraine in 2014. But if one's task is to look ahead on the basis of the post-2014 factual record rather than hopes, then those facts point to an open-ended period of competition and confrontation between Russia and the West.

1. The Europe whole, free, and at peace with itself and its neighbours that wasn't

The end of the Cold War and the break-up of the Soviet Union paved the way for a new, hopeful phase in European politics and diplomacy. Wide-ranging political and economic reforms in the Soviet Union and Russia, the withdrawal of Soviet and Russian troops from Eastern Europe, the dissolution of the Warsaw Pact, and the peaceful reunification of Germany promised an entirely new era in East-West relations. The signing in rapid succession of several landmark treaties – the Intermediate Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty, the Conventional Forces in Europe (CFE) Treaty, and the Strategic Arms Reduction (START) I Treaty – codified a new security arrangement between Russia and the West.

The signing of the Charter of Paris for a New Europe created the conceptual foundation for the next peaceful phase in Europe, including Russia. War was banished from Europe permanently. Newly free nations of Eastern and Central Europe were embracing democratic change and market reforms at home. All European nations, including Russia, pledged to respect their neighbours' territorial integrity, sovereignty, and freedom of choice in foreign policy. Western Europe was coming together to form a new supranational entity, the European Union, which would be built around a shared commitment to democratic values, rule of law, equality, and freedom. The former Eastern bloc nations were offered the possibility of joining the EU once they carried out the necessary political and economic reforms and proved their commitment to those shared values. The continent, it seemed, was entering a period of unprecedented stability, cohesion, and prosperity.

ISSN 2610-9603 | ISBN 978-88-9368-079-0 © 2018 IAI

Events, however, deviated from that idyllic picture very quickly. Yugoslavia erupted in a bloody fratricidal war that threatened to engulf the Balkans. Wars also broke out in Georgia, Moldova, between Armenia and Azerbaijan, and in Chechnya. The disappearance of the old imperial constraints and imperatives of the Cold War was freeing nations to pursue long-suppressed ethnic, religious, cultural, and territorial grudges. Still, these conflicts could be treated as the last gasp of the old order rather than the harbinger of the new European order.

The biggest challenge to the new European, or Euro-Atlantic order came from the east, where Russia, despite its early publicly stated commitment to the European course and shared values enshrined in the Paris Charter was following its own, very different path. Its domestic politics deviated from the democratic path repeatedly: in 1993, when the standoff between the presidency and the legislature escalated into a bloody confrontation and when a new constitution was adopted with authorities heavily skewed in favour of the executive branch; and in 1996, when the presidential election conducted with multiple violations returned Boris Yeltsin to the Kremlin for a second term.

In foreign affairs too Russia followed a different path from the rest of Europe. It repeatedly staked out a claim to a special role among the former Soviet states and a *droit de regard* over the neighbours' foreign policies. It intervened militarily in some of the regional conflicts around its periphery, most notably in Georgia. Russian officials objected to the West's intervention in the Balkans and nearly caused an outright military confrontation with NATO during the Kosovo campaign in 1999.

Russian objections to the new Euro-Atlantic security order were focused on three phenomena. The first was NATO enlargement, which Western leaders intended as an effort to expand the zone of stability and security eastward and provide the newly free nations of Central and Eastern Europe with a viable security framework that would prevent the emergence of new conflicts in a region that has seen too many. The stated purpose of the expansion was not to threaten Russia. That point was reinforced by the dismantlement of the alliance's offensive military capabilities, the emphasis on out of area missions, peacekeeping operations, and subsequently, after 9/11, expeditionary warfare. In many respects, NATO became the vehicle for promoting shared Western values in the former Warsaw Pact and Soviet states, democratic governance, and Western models of civil-military relations. In the view of some observers at the time, it ceased to be a military alliance.

However, Russian officials viewed NATO's expansion primarily as a US-led geopolitical move, a land grab intended to expand the West's sphere of influence right up to Russia's border and marginalize its role in European security affairs taking advantage of its weakness. They interpreted it as a hostile move not *toward* Russia, but *against* it.

ISSN 2610-9603 | ISBN 978-88-9368-079-0 © 2018 IAI

Russian concerns were not without merit. The alliance itself was of two minds about the expansion. While emphasizing the non-threatening nature of the expansion, its leaders also acknowledged its hedging aspect – in case Russia's democratic experiment failed and it reverted to its aggressive, expansionist past. There was also a significant difference between NATO's old and new members and aspirants. NATO's old members tended to minimize the expansion's hedging aspect and rationalized it as a step that, they hoped, Russia would eventually accept and welcome as it transformed itself into a full-fledged member of the new European and trans-Atlantic order. NATO's new members and aspirants viewed the expansion as an opportunity to get under its protective umbrella to secure themselves against the Russian threat that, they were convinced, would re-emerge eventually.

The argument about the alliance's dwindling military capabilities for conventional warfare had little traction with Russian officials in the wake of the first Gulf War and the Kosovo campaign. The two wars had demonstrated to Russian officials that NATO still had impressive military muscle and superior technology especially when compared with Russia's armed forces whose decline was on display during the disastrous campaign in Chechnya.

Taken together, the assumption that Russia would change and the reduction of NATO's military capabilities meant that the alliance's eastward expansion was based on hope. It was hope that the threat of East-West military conflict was once and for all a thing of the past.

The second phenomenon was the expansion of the European Union. For a long time Russian objections focused on NATO expansion as a source of military threat in close proximity to the Russian heartland. By contrast, the process of EU enlargement, while not welcome by Moscow did not encounter strong opposition from it, and its concerns appeared to be largely confined to trade and access to markets in new EU members.[1] That attitude did not seem to change significantly even after the 2008 war with Georgia, especially as the EU-commissioned report on the war placed partial blame on the government of Georgia.[2]

Russian attitudes toward the EU hardened with the return of Vladimir Putin to the presidency in 2012. It followed a tumultuous period in Russian domestic politics marked by large-scale protests against election violations and Putin's return. Europe and the United States were perceived in Moscow as supporting anti-Putin protests

[1] European Council and Russia, *Joint Statement on EU Enlargement and EU-Russia Relations*, Luxembourg, 27 April 2004, http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_PRES-04-122_en.htm.

[2] Timothy Heritage, "Georgia Started War with Russia: EU-backed Report", in *Reuters*, 30 September 2009, https://www.reuters.com/article/us-georgia-russia-report/georgia-started-war-with-russia-eu-backed-report-idUSTRE58T4MO20090930; Independent International Fact-Finding Mission on the Conflict in Georgia, *Report, Vol. I-III*, September 2009, http://www.mpil.de/en/pub/publications/archive/independent_international_fact.cfm.

ISSN 2610-9603 | ISBN 978-88-9368-079-0 © 2018 IAI

and opposed to his re-election as president of Russia.[3] The third Putin presidential term was marked by growing differences with Europe. The Kremlin launched a propaganda campaign that emphasized the cultural differences between Russia and Europe, the gap between Russian traditional values and Europe's hedonistic practices and anti-family values that threatened to corrupt Russia.

The ideological rift was accompanied by growing geopolitical tensions between Russia and the EU. Russian claims of a "sphere of privileged interests" around it periphery came into direct competition with the EU's Neighbourhood Policy and in particular its Eastern Partnership launched in 2009. The six countries of Eastern Europe the EU declared to be in its neighbourhood – Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus', Georgia, Moldova, and Ukraine – were also viewed by Russia as belonging to its neighbourhood. The Eastern Partnership designed to establish stronger ties to those six countries was obviously in competition with the Kremlin's concept of a "privileged sphere". The Ukraine crisis of 2013–14 and the annexation of Crimea became the culmination of that competition and marked a major turning, even breaking, point in the relationship between Russia and the EU.

The third phenomenon that has encountered fierce opposition from Russia was the preeminent role of the West in general and in particular the United States on the world stage. Opposition to the US-led "unipolar world", became the central theme of Russian foreign policy, beginning with the tenure of Yevgeniy Primakov as Russian foreign minister in the mid-1990s and continuing to the present day. NATO expansion, the military campaign in the Balkans, US efforts to promote democratic governance, especially in the former Soviet states and in Russia, the overthrow of the Saddam Hussein regime and occupation of Iraq, as well as US endorsement of the Arab Spring and the Libya campaign have been interpreted by Russian officials as manifestations of US unilateralism, geopolitical pursuits, and aspirations of hegemony. Russian officials maintained that the idea of a values-based security order was unacceptable to them, as those values were defined by Washington and Brussels, and left little room for Russia to have a say in that process unless it embraced their values.

Russia was too weak to oppose actively the US-dominated Euro-Atlantic security order in the 1990s. But as its economy improved and its domestic politics stabilized in the 2000s, it recovered its ability to oppose it. Notwithstanding some notable periods during which Russia sought a rapprochement with the United States and Europe, such as Vladimir Putin's outreach to the Bush Administration early in his tenure and Dmitry Medvedev's attempted "reset" with the Obama Administration, the prevailing trajectory in Russia's relationship with the West was toward alienation at best and confrontation at worst.

[3] Dmitri Trenin, "The End of the EU-Russia Relationship As You Know It", in *Carnegie Articles*, 25 December 2012, http://ceip.org/2Nzhz86.

ISSN 2610-9603 | ISBN 978-88-9368-079-0 © 2018 IAI

The key milestones on the trajectory of Russia's relations with the United States and Europe were Putin's 2007 speech at the Munich Security Conference,[4] in which he warned the United States and Europe not to expand NATO; the 2008 war with Georgia; and the 2014 annexation of Crimea and undeclared war in eastern Ukraine. The negatives along that trajectory far outweighed the positives. The annexation of Crimea signalled that in pursuit of its geopolitical ambitions Russia was willing to blow up not only the post-Cold War security order in Europe, but the post-World War II arrangements by annexing a portion of a neighbouring country's territory. The period of hope that Russia would change had come to an end.

2. The post-2014 normal

With the return to competition and confrontation, the relationship between Russia and the West has once again settled into a familiar pattern typical of their interactions during much of the 20th century. However, along with the familiar, the post-2014 relationship has some important new features, which are the result of changes of the previous quarter-century.

3. The legacy of 1991

The Putin cohort of Russian leaders can be fairly described as "the 1991 generation". The Russian president's life trajectory is fairly typical of the (almost exclusively) men who are now in charge of the Russian state. Born in 1952 to parents who were part of the Soviet Union's "greatest generation", raised in very modest circumstances, educated by the Soviet state, given an opportunity to pursue a prestigious career, Putin was 39 when everything around him collapsed. The state, the idea that he served, the career he was proud of, all of that vanished virtually overnight, and the country that was left in its place plunged into a series of seemingly endless political and economic crises. For someone who was raised with memories of the Great Patriotic War surrounding him on a daily basis, the devastation of the 1990s, which some economists have compared to that of the war, was probably what prompted the reference to it as "a major geopolitical disaster of the [20th] century".[5]

But 1991 was not the end of the country's troubles. The entire decade of the 1990s was marked by chaos, when the survival of the Russian Federation was in doubt. The war in Chechnya, the emergence of powerful regional governments in such places as Tatarstan and Moscow that were run by local chieftains as feudal fiefs, and the usurpation of major state function by a coterie of businessmen who grew fabulously wealthy in the murkiest of circumstances, all that must have left a deep

[4] Vladimir Putin, *Speech and the Following Discussion at the Munich Conference on Security Policy*, Munich, 10 February 2007, http://en.kremlin.ru/events/president/transcripts/24034.

[5] Vladimir Putin, *Annual Address to the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation*, Moscow, 25 April 2005, http://en.kremlin.ru/events/president/transcripts/22931.

ISSN 2610-9603 | ISBN 978-88-9368-079-0 © 2018 IAI

imprint on the attitudes of an entire generation of servants of the Soviet state, the great power that collapsed without virtually any warning.

In the view of current Russian leaders, the weakness at home translated into a humiliating retreat from the world stage and a fundamental revision of Russia's security situation. Brought up in the Soviet security establishment with its hostile view of the West, they had to give up not only many far-flung outposts, such as Cuba, but the outer and inner protective perimeters of the empire – a situation that Russia had not been in since before the reign of Peter the Great. The NATO 1979 decision to deploy Pershing II missiles and Ground-Launched Cruise Missiles (GLCMs) to Western Europe caused the biggest crisis in East-West relations since the Cuban Missile Crisis because it put at risk critical assets inside the Soviet Union. With the demise of the Warsaw Pact and the Soviet Union, that threat is now within 400 km of Moscow.

That experience – pre- and post-1991 – has shaped the worldview of the current generation of Russian leaders. If that worldview is imbued with zero-sum attitudes, then that too can be understood in the context of the 1990s. The United States and Europe prospered during that decade, while Russia nearly collapsed, and the West cheered. When Russia recovered in the 2000s, the West took a dim view of it and since then has opposed its return to the ranks of major powers. If Europe and the United States demand the kinds of domestic changes that had brought about the chaos of the 1990s, in exchange for good relations with them, then there is no point in trying. As Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov argued recently, Russia's experience with the West has been more challenging than living under the Mongol yoke.[6] The Mongols, unlike the West, always left Russia to manage its own internal affairs.

This worldview is not a passing phase for men who run Russia. Putin was just re-elected for another six-year term and there is every reason to assume that he could remain at the helm well past 2024. He is bringing new, younger faces to the upper echelons of the power vertical, but there is no reason to believe that these men – and a few women – have a different worldview than the generation that is gradually retiring. They have lived through the devastation of the 1990s, the recovery of the 2000, the breakdown in relations with the West since 2014, and the success of Crimea and Syria. Why would the prevailing zero-sum, siege mentality give way to a different point of view?

[6] Sergey Lavrov, "Russia's Foreign Policy in a Historical Perspective. Musings at a New Stage of International Development", in *Russia in Global Affairs*, No. 2 (April/June 2016), http://eng.globalaffairs.ru/number/Russias-Foreign-Policy-in-a-Historical-Perspective-18067.

ISSN 2610-9603 | ISBN 978-88-9368-079-0 © 2018 IAI

4. The geography of NATO-Russia (in)security

Whereas the legacy Soviet mentality and approach to the West is an element of continuity in Russia's relations with Europe and the United States, the geography of Russia-NATO relations is a critical, perhaps even *the* critical new and highly consequential feature of this relationship. Former Speaker of US House of Representatives Newt Gingrich famously observed during the 2016 presidential campaign that "Estonia is in the suburbs of St. Petersburg".[7] Indeed, Russia's second most important city, its second capital is less than 200 km from the border with NATO. While it is improbable that Estonia would ever invade Russia, and Russia's invasion of its Baltic neighbour too appears as an unlikely event, the post-enlargement geography has resulted in fundamentally new threat perceptions on both sides of the border.

For the past four years, since Russia' annexation of Crimea, NATO has been seized with the challenge of defending Russia's Baltic neighbours from a whole range of hybrid, as well as conventional threats. Their size, proximity to Russia, and lines of communication have combined into a source of major vulnerability for the alliance.

On the other side of the divide, the governor of St. Petersburg has warned the city's residents that in the event of a war the authorities will have to resort to rationing bread and other foodstuffs.[8] St. Petersburg, or Leningrad, is the city that endured a 1000-day blockade during the Great Patriotic War when hundreds of thousands of its residents died of starvation.

The new geography of NATO-Russia relations, which is a result of the expansion conducted in the belief that things would never come to this, means that when NATO planes conduct routine air patrols in international airspace over the Baltic and enforce their freedom of navigation right in international waters there, they are flying and sailing in conditions that are comparable to Russian planes flying and ships sailing between Cuba and Florida. The appearance of a Russian intelligence-gathering ship 100 miles off the coast of North Carolina in early 2018 was a cause of some concern in the United States.[9]

Russian harassment of US planes and ships in the Baltic and the Black Sea regions is dangerous and irresponsible, and can lead to a tragedy. But it is not an accident, but a reflection of the profound insecurity along the NATO-Russia divide.

[7] Reena Flores, "Newt Gingrich: NATO Countries 'Ought to Worry' About U.S. Commitment", in *CBS News*, 21 July 2016, https://www.cbsnews.com/news/newt-gingrich-trump-would-reconsider-his-obligation-to-nato.

[8] Marc Bennetts, "St Petersburg Reveals Plans For Bread Rationing", in *The Times*, 12 October 2016, https://www.thetimes.co.uk/article/st-petersburg-reveals-plans-for-bread-rationing-2n7r6mwts.

[9] Ryan Browne and Zachary Cohen, "Russian Spy Ship Spotted 100 Miles Off North Carolina Coast", in *CNN Politics*, 22 January 2018, http://cnn.it/2n16sII.

ISSN 2610-9603 | ISBN 978-88-9368-079-0 © 2018 IAI

5. The return of global Russia

Another key feature of the new confrontation between Russia and the West that combines elements of old and new is the increasingly global ambitions and reach of Russian foreign policy. Gone are the days when Russian energies were focused almost exclusively on preserving the remnants of the old empire under the rubric of a "sphere of privileged interests". The competition between Russia and the West is now global.

Russia's role as an "indispensable nation" in the Middle East is now widely accepted as a given. The military intervention in Syria beginning in 2015 and the decisive role it has played in turning the tide in the Syrian civil war have positioned Russia as a critical actor not just in that conflict but in the broader Middle Eastern context. Since then Russia has engaged in active diplomacy throughout the Persian Gulf, conducted a joint military exercise with Egypt, and positioned itself as one of the likely brokers in any future settlement in Libya. All that, while it also enjoys relations with Israel that close observers describe as the best ever.

Evidence of Russian ambitions and reach can be seen in Venezuela, where Rosneft' has been busy doing deals and bailing out the Maduro government. In South Africa, the Russian state-owned nuclear energy monopoly Rosatom signed a major contract with the Zuma government to build a series of nuclear power plants. In Mexico, allegations of Russian meddling in the campaign for the July 1 presidential election have raised concerns about Andrés Manuel López Obrador's alleged ties to Moscow.

Russian meddling in the domestic politics of many countries in Europe and in the United States has become a common concern of officials on both sides of the Atlantic. From the perspective of many Russian officials who have long accused the West of meddling in Russian politics, Russian meddling in the 2016 US presidential campaign, as well as suspected activities in the Brexit vote, in the French presidential election, in Catalonia's independence referendum, etc., is only to be expected – what goes around comes around. It is also hardly a new phenomenon, as earlier periods, during the Cold War, were filled with rumours of communist agents and "Red scares". The novelty of the current situation is mainly in the new and much more powerful tools that technology has put at the disposal of agents of the Russian state and their reach as a result of it.

6. Where do the West and Russia go from here?

The current state of affairs between Russia and the West is here to stay. It is a product of several important structural factors, personal experiences of key decision-makers, and the legacy of the previous periods. Betting on Russia changing its policy under the press of economic difficulties is hardly a realistic proposition – Russian currency lost half of its value in 2014-2015, and the Kremlin only stepped

ISSN 2610-9603 | ISBN 978-88-9368-079-0 © 2018 IAI

up its activities in the Middle East, in Europe, and the United States.

Equally unlikely is the prospect of Russia's internal change. Policies intended to encourage it or betting on it will probably disappoint and possibly cause harm. While it is increasingly the case already, in the words of one senior US diplomat, the West should stop treating Russia as reform project.

Neither Russia nor the West is content with the status quo. Neither Russia nor the West is interested in escalating the tensions. But neither is prepared to back down. This situation is indeed reminiscent of the Cold War. Perhaps, some lessons from the Cold War could prove relevant for managing the relationship.

At the top of the list are some familiar, but nonetheless important standbys: accepting the situation and the need to manage it, rather than trying to fix it proceeding from unrealistic assumptions; maintaining communication channels; avoiding misperceptions; making every effort to understand the other side's drivers and motivations behind its actions, including seemingly unrelated events.

Other lessons of the Cold War include making sure that nobody on either side of the East-West divide has any doubts about the credibility of NATO's deterrent and commitment to defend its neighbours. This calls for a new, robust effort for the alliance to think anew about what it takes to deter an adversary in multiple domains, pushing the bounds of creativity and taking full advantage of the technological edge it enjoys and is poised to maintain for the foreseeable future.

A related lesson of the Cold War era is the utility, even necessity, of two-track solutions: firmness, resolve, and credibility of commitment to defence and deterrence need to be combined with an open door to negotiate. This calls for the allies to identify goals at the end of both tracks and policy approaches to accomplish them in a complementary, not contradictory manner.

Last, but not least, one of the most important lessons of the Cold War has to do with the ability of the allies to speak with one voice and maintain their unity. This, arguably, could be one of the biggest challenges facing the trans-Atlantic alliance today. In the words of Carl Bildt, it "[t]urns out that the most critical issue for EU today isn't a Russia policy, but a Trump policy. That might well be the number one foreign policy challenge we face at the moment".[10] Addressing it is just as important as dealing with the Russian challenge.

Updated 9 July 2018

[10] Carl Bildt, *Twitter post*, 2 June 2018, https://twitter.com/carlbildt/status/1002961474430652417.

ISSN 2610-9603 | ISBN 978-88-9368-079-0 © 2018 IAI

References

Marc Bennetts, "St Petersburg Reveals Plans For Bread Rationing", in *The Times*, 12 October 2016, https://www.thetimes.co.uk/article/st-petersburg-reveals-plans-for-bread-rationing-2n7r6mwts

Ryan Browne and Zachary Cohen, "Russian Spy Ship Spotted 100 Miles Off North Carolina Coast", in *CNN Politics*, 22 January 2018, http://cnn.it/2n16sII

European Council and Russia, *Joint Statement on EU Enlargement and EU-Russia Relations*, Luxembourg, 27 April 2004, http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_PRES-04-122_en.htm

Reena Flores, "Newt Gingrich: NATO Countries 'Ought to Worry' About U.S. Commitment", in *CBS News*, 21 July 2016, https://www.cbsnews.com/news/newt-gingrich-trump-would-reconsider-his-obligation-to-nato

Timothy Heritage, "Georgia Started War with Russia: EU-backed Report", in *Reuters*, 30 September 2009, https://www.reuters.com/article/us-georgia-russia-report/georgia-started-war-with-russia-eu-backed-report-idUSTRE58T4MO20090930

Independent International Fact-Finding Mission on the Conflict in Georgia, *Report, Vol. I-III*, September 2009, http://www.mpil.de/en/pub/publications/archive/independent_international_fact.cfm

Sergey Lavrov, "Russia's Foreign Policy in a Historical Perspective. Musings at a New Stage of International Development", in *Russia in Global Affairs*, No. 2 (April/June 2016), http://eng.globalaffairs.ru/number/Russias-Foreign-Policy-in-a-Historical-Perspective-18067

Vladimir Putin, *Annual Address to the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation*, Moscow, 25 April 2005, http://en.kremlin.ru/events/president/transcripts/22931

Vladimir Putin, *Speech and the Following Discussion at the Munich Conference on Security Policy*, Munich, 10 February 2007, http://en.kremlin.ru/events/president/transcripts/24034

Dmitri Trenin, "The End of the EU-Russia Relationship As You Know It", in *Carnegie Articles*, 25 December 2012, http://ceip.org/2Nzhz86

ISSN 2610-9603 | ISBN 978-88-9368-079-0 © 2018 IAI

Istituto Affari Internazionali (IAI)
Founded by Altiero Spinelli in 1965, IAI does research in the fields of foreign policy, political economy and international security. A non-profit organisation, IAI aims to further and disseminate knowledge through research studies, conferences and publications. To that end, it cooperates with other research institutes, universities and foundations in Italy and abroad and is a member of various international networks. More specifically, the main research sectors are: European institutions and policies; Italian foreign policy; trends in the global economy and internationalisation processes in Italy; the Mediterranean and the Middle East; defence economy and policy; and transatlantic relations. IAI publishes an English-language quarterly (*The International Spectator*), an online webzine (*Affarinternazionali*), two book series (*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

18 | 12 Eugene Rumer, *The US-Europe vs. Russia Triangle*
18 | 11 Carolina Pavese, *The European Union and Brazil in the Quest for Global Climate Governance: Potentials and Perils of a Partnership*
18 | 10 Luca Bergamaschi and Nicolò Sartori, *The Geopolitics of Climate – A Transatlantic Dialogue*
18 | 09 Emanuele Bobbio, *Winning Back the "Left Behind": Iran's New Nationalist Agenda*
18 | 08 Anna Ayuso and Susanne Gratius, *The Economic Agenda between Brazil and the EU: Prospects for a Bilateral and Global Upgrading*
18 | 07 Riccardo Alcaro, *All Is Not Quiet on the Western Front. Trump's Iran Policy and Europe's Choice on the Nuclear Deal*
18 | 06 Leonardo Paz Neves, *Roadblocks and Avenues for Brazil-Europe Cooperation: Exploring a Wider Security Agenda*
18 | 05 Carolina De Stefano, *Towards Putin's Last Presidency?*
18 | 04 Simone Romano, *The Germany Italy Wants: A More Daring Leader of a More United Europe*
18 | 03 Davide Cichero, *The G7 and International Trade*

ISSN 2610-9603 | ISBN 978-88-9368-079-0 © 2018 IAI