

Russia's Security Policy since Putin's Munich Speech at the 2007 Munich Security Conference

Kenji IWATA

Graduate school for international development and Cooperation,

Hiroshima University

Research associate, Institute for Peace Science,

Hiroshima University

SUMMARY

On February 10, 2007, at the Munich Conference on Security Policy, Russian President Vladimir Putin delivered the speech to attack the United States. He blamed it for fanning conflicts across the world through the unilateral hyper use of military force. He said America was trying to impose its standards on other nations, stimulating new arms races and the spread of nuclear weapons, and threatening Russia through new missile shield programmes.

Russia and the US started to criticize each other, which reminds us of Cold War days. Today Russia has again become self-assertive. Will this mutual criticism lead to a crucial conflict between both countries and change into so called "New Cold War" ?

First, in this paper I consider why and how Russia criticizes US unilateralism

for undermining global security from the view point of Russia's mounting anger and frustration at the West's failure to adequately address its concerns, especially its concerns with U.S. plans to deploy missile defense components on East European countries, namely former Soviet block countries.

Second, this paper points out that the mutual criticism between the US and Russia reminding us of Cold War days will not change into New Cold War, analyzing such factors to prove that New Cold War will not break out as follows: (1) weakness of Russian economy that largely depends on benefiting from high oil and gas prices, (2) Russian people's new lifestyle in mass-consumption society, (3) Russian economy deeply built into world one.

In conclusion, this paper shows that Russia may look rebellious against the US, but first, it is from Russia's mounting anger and frustration at the West's failure to adequately address its concerns, with the West's supports for groups that have toppled Georgian and Ukrainian governments in Moscow's former sphere of influence, the NATO expansion into the Baltic and East European countries, and U.S. plans to deploy missile defense components on Poland and the Czech Republic, and second, it is for keeping their internal political regime, namely Putin regime and after-Putin one. Russia today is built into the world economy and it would withdraw if the confrontation with the US became crucial. Therefore bipolar system like the U.S.-Soviet bipolar one will not revive even if the Russian national power will be stronger. Russia will stay at the position of one of the players in the multipolar system.

1. Introduction

At the Munich Conference on Security Policy on February 10, 2007, Russian President Vladimir Putin delivered the speech to attack the United States, which was the strongest criticism of his seven-year presidency of the US.¹ He blamed it for fanning conflicts across the world through the unilateral hyper use of military force.² He said America was trying to impose its standards on other nations, stimulating new arms races and the spread of nuclear weapons, and threatening Russia through new missile shield programmes.³

Like this, lately Russia and the US started to criticize each other, which reminds us of Cold War days. Today Russia has been benefiting from high oil prices and has again become self-assertive. When Presidential elections in both the US and Russia will be held in 2008, will this mutual criticism lead to a crucial conflict between both countries and change into so called “New Cold War”? ⁴

The main purpose of this paper is to consider why and how Russia criticizes US unilateralism for undermining global security. Moreover this paper points out that the mutual criticism between the US and Russia reminding us of Cold War days will not change into New Cold War, giving some factors to prove that New Cold War will not break out.

2. Putin’s Criticism of US Unilateralism for Undermining Global Security

Most of the criticism in Putin’s speech on Russia’s role in international politics was aimed at the U.S. government. He stated at the beginning of his speech that the unipolar world order had not proved to be efficient and that the end of the Cold War had produced more casualties and armed conflicts than ever before.⁵

In his opinion this development was caused by the attempt to solve problems “unilaterally,” yet the result were human tragedies. With regard to this in his speech Putin said: 1. The unipolar world that had been proposed after the Cold War did not take place either. 2. What hasn’t happened in world history? However, what is a unipolar world? However one might embellish this term, at the end of the day it refers to one type of situation, namely one centre of authority, one centre of force, one centre of

decision-making. It is world in which there is one master, one sovereign. 3. Unilateral and frequently illegitimate actions have not resolved any problems. Moreover, they have caused new human tragedies and created new centres of tension. 4. Today we are witnessing an almost uncontained hyper use of force – military force – in international relations, force that is plunging the world into an abyss of permanent conflicts.⁶

The natural consequence according to Putin was that the fundamental principles of international law were disdained in a world where noboby felt safe. The Russian President's criticism explicitly addressed the role of the United Nations. The use of force could never be more than the last resort in politics and needed to be legitimized by UN resolutions but not by decisions of the European Union or NATO.⁷

In this context, Putin's criticism was mainly directed against the United States who was trying to impose their political will with all means and in all areas. He criticized the US saying, “One state and, of course, first and foremost the United States, has overstepped its national borders in every way. This is visible in the economic, political, cultural and educational policies it imposes on other nations.”⁸

He also criticized unspecified attempts to use the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) for political purposes. He said that the United States had turned OSCE which sends international monitors to election in the former Soviet spheres, into a vulgar instrument of insuring the foreign policy interests of one country.⁹

In order to meet that goal, according to Putin, the OSCE has tailored a bureaucratic apparatus that has no connection with the founding countries. In Russia, he added, Western non-governmental organisations operated as “instruments” of Western governments, saying, “The involvement of so-called non-governmental organisations is tailored for this task [instruments of Western governments].” “But this [observing international human rights norms] does not mean interfering in the internal affairs of other countries, and especially not imposing a regime that determines how these states should live and develop.”¹⁰

With the US pushing for independence for the Albanian-dominated province of Kosovo in former Yugoslavia, Putin stated he would block independence unless Serbia agreed to it. He said: What will happen with Kosovo and with Serbia? Only Kosovars and Serbs know. And let's not tell them how they should live their lives. There is no need to play God and resolve all of these peoples' problems. Together we can only

create certain necessary conditions and help people resolve their own problems. Create the necessary conditions and act as the guarantors of certain agreements. But we should not impose these agreements.¹¹

In other word, as for interfering in the internal affairs of other countries and especially not imposing a regime that determines how these states should live and develop, Putin criticized in his speech, declaring that rubble from the Berlin Wall was hauled away as souvenirs to countries that praise openness and personal freedom, but now there are attempts to impose new dividing lines and rules, maybe virtual, but still dividing our mutual continent.

3. Russia's Rejection of US Plans to Deploy an Anti-Missile Defense Shield in East Europe

In his speech delivered to the conference participants, Putin stressed his determination to pursue the disarmament process. He stated that Russia kept supporting an open dialogue concerning disarmament issues. He pointed out that his nation strictly adhered to the international agreement demanding the destruction of thousands of strategic nuclear weapons before the end of 2012.¹²

Putin joked that he worried the United States was hiding extra warheads under the pillow despite its treaties with Moscow to reduce strategic nuclear stockpiles. And he indicated obliquely that the new Russian ballistic missile, known as the Topol-M, was being developed at least in part in response to U.S. efforts to field missile defenses. He expressed alarm that an effective antimissile shield over the United States would upset a system of mutual fear that kept the nuclear peace throughout the cold war.¹³

He also accused NATO of placing military forces close to the Russian border and criticized U.S. plans to build missile-defense sites in Central Europe, saying that they are also concerned about the plans to deploy elements of a missile defense system in Europe. He expressed “strong doubts” that the Europeans needed such protection, saying, “Who needs the next step of what would be, in this case, an inevitable arms race? I deeply doubt that Europeans themselves do.”¹⁴ He argued that none of the “so-called problem countries” have missiles that present a threat to Europe. He added .that even hypothetically, for example, the launch of a North Korean missile

toward U.S. territory over Western Europe clearly goes against the laws of ballistics.¹⁵

As has been noted, in his speech to a Munich security conference, Putin accused the U.S. of the hyper-use of military force that is plunging the world into an abyss of permanent conflicts. He declared that in the world of one master, one sovereign, Washington has overstepped its national borders, and in every area. Putin has repeatedly expressed concern about the extension of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to Russia's borders.¹⁶

At last, in the matter of disarmament issue, he warned that deploying missile defenses in Europe could unleash a new arms race.¹⁷ At times, he seemed nostalgic for the certainties of the Cold War and the old superpower condominium, with its spheres of influence, its arms control agreements -- and the unquestioned status it afforded Moscow.

On February 21, Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov dismissed the claim that it is intended to defend against rogue states, saying it could work against Russia's nuclear deterrent.¹⁸ Regarding strategic stability in Europe, he said: In experts' estimate, if potential threats coming from Iran or North Korea, are indeed meant, missile defense elements should be located in a different place, not in the currently proposed place. If they appear precisely in Poland and the Czech Republic, military analysts will have to do the elementary job of calculating the trajectories of missiles to be intercepted by these systems. And we must state here that these facilities would be quite applicable for intercepting missiles launched from Russia.¹⁹

On February 19, Gen. Nikolai Solovtsov, head of Russia's missile forces, warned, speaking of the possibility of Poland and the Czech Republic being targeted by Russian missiles if they agreed to host U.S. missile-defense bases²⁰.

What is really happening? Russia is angry that the US is so indifferent to Russian concerns with the former Soviet bloc countries. The U.S. pressed ahead and often frustrated Russian intentions. Because Russians are accustomed to thinking of themselves as a superpower, U.S. policy is impolite.

4. The US's Reaction to Putin's Criticism

This Putin's Criticism to the US comments prompted sharp criticism from the

Americans in attendance. For example, Senator John McCain, the Republican widely expected to make a bid for the White House, said that the United States had won the Cold War in partnership with power nations of Western Europe and that there are power centers on every continent today²¹.

McCain then hit back at Putin more directly. He asked that Russia's autocratic turn would become more pronounced, its foreign policy would become more opposed to the principles of the Western democracies and its energy policy would become used as a tool of intimidation.²² Furthermore, McCain insisted that Moscow had to understand that it could not enjoy a genuine partnership with the West so long as its actions, at home and abroad, conflicted fundamentally with the core values of the Euro-Atlantic democracies.²³

The day after Putin spoke, U.S. Defense Secretary Robert Gates addressed the same Munich conference and referred to the Russian leader's comments somewhat lightheartedly.²⁴ Gates said, "As an old Cold Warrior, one of yesterday's speeches almost filled me with nostalgia for a less complex time. Almost many of you have backgrounds in diplomacy or politics. I have, like your second speaker yesterday, a starkly different background, a career in the spy business. And, I guess, old spies have a habit of blunt speaking. However, I've been to reeducation camp."²⁵ Gates said at this conference in Munich that "One Cold War was quite enough."²⁶

But Gates followed up more seriously. He said that while the United States and Russia are partners in several undertakings, Moscow's policies also "seem to work against international stability" -- specifically, arms sales to Iran and its use of energy for what he called "political coercion."²⁷ He said: Russia is a partner in endeavors. But we wonder, too, about some Russian policies that seem to work against international stability, such as its arms transfers and its temptation to use energy resources for political coercion. And as the NATO Secretary General said yesterday, Russia need not fear law-based democracies on its borders.²⁸

On February 12, White House spokesman Tony Snow said Putin was wrong to accuse the United States of acting unilaterally and emphasizing military force over diplomacy.²⁹ Still, Snow sought to emphasize the positive side, saying that Russia is, in his words, "a valued ally" and partner in many international endeavors, including efforts to get North Korea and Iran to end their nuclear programs.³⁰

Putin's comments reminded more than a few observers of the verbal exchanges between Moscow and Washington during the Cold War. Even Gates referred to it, saying no one wants it revived, even as one side may express concerns about the other's behavior.

On February 16, General John Craddock, the NATO supreme allied commander, has said Russia has nothing to fear from a planned U.S. missile defense system in central Europe, explaining that the system will provide security from attacks by "rogue regimes."³¹

On February 21 in Berlin, U.S. Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice said Russian threats to target Poland and the Czech Republic are "unfortunate."³² Rice was responding to comments made on February 19 by General Nikolai Solovtsov, who commands the Russian Strategic Missile Forces. Solovtsov said Russia would target Poland and the Czech Republic if the United States built parts of a missile-defense system in those countries³³.

Rice said: Poland and the Czech Republic were independent countries that make their own decisions. I think it's unfortunate that the Russian head of strategic rocket forces would come out and say that somehow Poland and the Czech Republic will now be on the target list of Russia. I think that was an extremely unfortunate comment. But we will continue to talk to Russia about these issues³⁴. She said that the missile-defense system was necessary to counter what she called "a growing Iranian missile threat."³⁵

As I have analyzed, on the whole, Putin's criticisms to the US have not had their intended effect. In particular, U.S. officials, including Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice, repeated that the missile defense does not -- and cannot -- neutralize Russia's strategic force. The Russian threats have not had much impact on the intended hosts. Czech and Polish officials have expressed determination to go ahead with the deployments.³⁶ The Russian warnings may even have had the reverse effect.

5. Russia's Security Policy at Putin's Final State-of-the-Nation Address

On April 26, 2007, President Vladimir Putin used his final state-of-the-nation address to accuse the west of colonial-style interference in Russia's domestic affairs and threatened

to stop implementing an important arms limitation treaty.³⁷ Putin called for a moratorium on Russian observance of the 1990 Conventional Forces in Europe treaty, which imposes limits on non-nuclear arms in Europe.³⁸ The CFE Treaty, signed in 1990 and revised in 1999, commits 28 European countries, the United States, and Canada to limit military deployments across the continent. He threatened that Russia might withdraw from the treaty unless NATO countries ratified a revised version agreed in 1999.³⁹

He linked the decision of stopping implementing the CFE Treaty to US plans to site elements of its missile defence in eastern Europe, but also alleged that European countries were not fulfilling their obligations under the treaty.⁴⁰ He said: Despite our earlier agreements with NATO, new NATO members, such as Slovakia and the Baltic states, for instance, have not yet joined the Conventional Forces in Europe Treaty, which creates real dangers with unpredictable surprises for us. In this regard, I consider it expedient to declare a moratorium on Russia's implementation of this treaty -- at least until all NATO countries, with no exception, have ratified it. This gives us full grounds to declare that our partners are, to say the least, behaving incorrectly ... using this situation to build up systems of military bases near our borders.⁴¹

Speaking On April 26 at a NATO foreign ministers meeting in the Norwegian capital of Oslo, NATO Secretary-General Jaap de Hoop Scheffer was seeking clarification of Russian President Vladimir Putin's call for a moratorium in Russia's compliance with the Conventional Forces in Europe (CFE) Treaty. Responding to comments of Putin during his annual address to parliament, de Hoop Scheffer said, "NATO remains committed to the CFE, which limits military deployments across Europe."⁴² He expected Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov to explain the words of his president⁴³.

Speaking before a NATO foreign ministers' meeting, Condoleezza Rice, US secretary of state, called it ludicrous to believe US plans to install 10 interceptors in Poland and a radar system in the Czech Republic posed Russia any threat.⁴⁴ She again had played down Moscow's concerns over missile defence.

The CFE Treaty modified in 1999 after the breakup of the Warsaw Pact and expansion of NATO. Only four countries—Belarus, Kazakhstan, Russia, and Ukraine—have ratified the revised treaty. NATO members say they will ratify the new version of

the treaty once Russia meets commitments it made in 1999 to withdraw its forces from Georgia and Moldova.⁴⁵

The threat from Russia came as NATO ministers were discussing a plan by the United States to base parts of a new missile-defense system in Poland and the Czech Republic. The U.S. says the system is needed to protect the West against a possible missile attack by Iran. Russia has been unremitting in its opposition to the proposal. It accuses Washington of seeking to build up a defense shield that could eventually be used to repel Russia's own nuclear arsenal. Lavrov defended Russia's sense of alarm, speaking in Oslo, "We can't be unconcerned by the fact that the NATO military infrastructure is drawing closer to our borders."⁴⁶

Putin's CFE warning is just the latest in a series of hostile gestures from Russia toward the West. Russia in recent months has stepped up its anti-American rhetoric, accusing the United States of seeking to undermine upcoming parliamentary and presidential elections in Russia. At his final state -of-the-nation address in April, Putin declared that there was a growing influx of money from abroad to be used for direct interference in Russian internal affairs⁴⁷. He has also repeatedly warned against NATO expansion, making no secret of its displeasure with the military alliance's continued dialogue with Georgia and Ukraine⁴⁸.

On the whole, the debate over the missile-defense system is not even about interceptors and radar installations in Eastern Europe. Their effectiveness is unclear. What is important is about Russia's perception of its role in Westward-facing Europe. Russia feels insecure facing Westward-facing Europe. Thus, both the US and Russia are appealing to the populations of Poland and the Czech Republic to support them, and also to ambivalent European people who stands between the both two big powers.

6. Europe's Reaction to Putin's state-of-the-nation address and Russia's Frustration to the West

On April 27, the day after the NATO foreign ministers meeting in Oslo, speaking publicly, European officials seemed to fall back into the ambivalence and wariness that has characterized their position toward the missile defense proposal for months now. Frank-Walter Steinmeier, the German foreign minister, warned in the name of

Europeans against a growing spiral of mistrust between Russia and the United States.⁴⁹ What is the immediate European interest is to prevent a spiral of mistrust between Russia and the U.S.

Merkel, the German chancellor and current president of the EU Council, has not publicly responded to Putin, echoing the cautious approach she took when the Russian president made similarly aggressive remarks at the security conference in Munich in February.⁵⁰ For Germany, the most immediate effect of the deepening rift is to undermine Merkel's efforts to forge closer economic and trade ties, above all energy security, between the European Union and Russia.

Putin's ultimatum at the state-of-the-nation address reflects Russia's mounting anger at the West's failure to adequately address its concerns.⁵¹ Putin is prompted by frustration over lack of attention to Russian concerns. The Russians have stated repeatedly over the last several months, and Putin himself was very articulate on this subject during his speech in Munich back on February 10, that they've been very frustrated with U.S. plans to deploy missile defense components on Poland and the Czech Republic. They have been pushing back very strongly against this, and it seems to have caused a great deal of anger and frustration in Putin himself.

It is dangerous for Russia, the United States, or any NATO partner to tamper with existing security agreements like the CFE. Putin's announcement was the wrong move. But it should not be interpreted as a return to Cold War-style tactics. That is a strong overstatement. We agree with Bob Gates, U.S. Defense Secretary, in his original response to Putin at the time of the Munich speech, when he said "one Cold War was quite enough."⁵² The facts on the ground show a much different situation than during the Cold War. Most important, cooperation has continued on the level of the NATO-Russia Council, for example.

Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov said on February 25, 2007, that there was a deliberate, anti-Russian campaign in some unnamed Western media circles. He added: The campaign gained momentum exactly when Russia has begun to grow stronger, when it has become financially independent. . . . The stronger we become, the greater, perhaps, is the number of those willing to fight for influence and...prevent us from getting stronger.⁵³

Lavrov believes that the purpose of this anti-Russian campaign is to keep

Russia tense and provoke some irritation. Writing in “The Washington Post” of February 25, Lavrov argued that President Vladimir Putin’s February 10 speech in Munich is being used by unnamed people in the United States to look for a pretext...to treat Russia as a hostile nation⁵⁴. Lavrov said, “What Putin said in Munich was not new. Nothing that we have not discussed directly with the Bush administration and that is not whispered in political circles in Europe and elsewhere. He made these statements at a conference because he wanted to get the world's attention to begin a dialogue.”⁵⁵ Lavrov added that Putin was neither attacking the United States nor proposing Russia as a counterbalance to U.S. unilateralism.⁵⁶

Due to so called deliberate, anti-Russian campaign in some unnamed Western media circles, it seems that Putin's uncompromising rhetoric at the Munich security conference in February has prompted waves of speculation that a new Cold War is on the horizon. In spite of that, in his speech on March 17, taking up the issue of Russia-U.S. relations, Lavrov said there were no objective grounds for such a conflict.⁵⁷ The foreign minister said, “In general, Washington and Moscow will continue their existing dialogue on combating international terrorism, resolving regional conflicts, and nonproliferation and strategic stability issues.”⁵⁸

At the same time, Lavrov was critical of Washington for its support of pro-Western governments in the CIS.⁵⁹ He also addressed the issue of Russia's rising role in energy geopolitics. He dismissed allegations that Moscow had engaged in energy blackmail of its CIS neighbors and the European Union⁶⁰. Lavrov said, “Russian foreign policy today is such that for the first time in its history, Russia is beginning to protect its national interest by using its competitive advantages.”⁶¹

7. Conclusion

As has been noted, lately Russia and the US started to criticize each other, echoing recent remarks, on the one hand, by Russian President Vladimir Putin and several Russian civilian and military leaders, on the other, by the Bush administration's high government officials. It reminds us of Cold War days. Russia has again become self-assertive. With Presidential elections in both the US and Russia in 2008, will this mutual criticism create a serious confrontation between both countries, so called New

Cold War ?

It could scarcely do so. Such factors as follows show us that New Cold War will not occur: (1) First of all, the Russian economy is still weak and depend largely upon oil and gas exports. (2) Second, Russian society has become mass-consumption one. Russian people will not welcome the return to the militarism economy from the mass-consumption one.⁶² (3) Finally, Russia is built into the world economy. Russia needs to export oil and the natural gas. At the same time, the direct investments from the West are indispensable to manufacture consumer goods for Russian people. Russia hopes to enter into the WTO, and it would withdraw if the confrontation with the US became crucial.

In my opinion, the second and the last factors are most important because these two factors are fundamental internal and external changes, from socialism to capitalism, which Russia has undergone after the collapse of the Soviet Union. The serious confrontation with the US will easily destroy economic, social and political stability in Russia.

Russia may look rebellious against the US, but first, it is from Russia's mounting anger and frustration at the West's failure to adequately address its concerns with the West's supports for groups that have toppled Georgian and Ukrainian governments in Moscow's former sphere of influence, the NATO expansion into the Baltic and East European countries, and U.S. plans to deploy missile defense components on Poland and the Czech Republic, especially its concerns with U.S. plans to deploy missile defense components on East European countries called former Soviet block countries, and second, it is for keeping their internal political regime, namely Putin regime and after-Putin one.⁶³ They have to balance their rebellious way against the US with their real situation that their economy and political stability depends upon their relations with the West.

Anti-Americanism would isolate Russia. China and Western Europe will not accompany her as risky players to satisfy Russian national interest. Russia today is built into the world economy and it would withdraw if the confrontation with the US became crucial. Therefore, bipolar system like the U.S.-Soviet bipolar one will not revive even if the Russian national power will be stronger. In addition, China and India are strengthening power. Russia will stay at the position of one of the players in the

multipolar system.

Notes

¹ Putin, Vladimir, *Speech and the following Discussion at the Munich Conference on Security Policy* (Official Website of President of Russia, <http://president.kremlin.ru/eng/sdocs/speeches.shtml>).

² *Ibid.*

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ For example on New Cold War, see Kramer, Andrew, “Putin likens U.S. foreign policy to that of Third Reich,” *International Herald Tribune*, 11 May 2007. In this article, we see such phrase as follows: Some political analysts see the new tone as a return to Cold War-style rhetoric by a country emboldened by petroleum wealth. But Russians say the sharper edge is a reflection of frustration that Russia's views, particularly its opposition to NATO expansion, have been ignored in the West.

⁵ Rolofs, Oliver, *Putin attacks United States and warns about NATO east expansion* (Official Website of Munich Conference on Security Policy, <http://www.securityconference.de/>) ; Batiuk, Vladimir and Pavel Kassin, “Miunkhen-2007,” *Moskovskie novosti*, No.6, 16 February 2007.

⁶ Putin, *Speech and the following Discussion at the Munich Conference on Security Policy, loc. cit.*; “Proshu na menia ne serdit' sia,” *Rossiiskaia gazeta*, 12 February 2007.

⁷ Putin, *Speech and the following Discussion at the Munich Conference on Security Policy, loc. cit.*

⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹ *Ibid.*; “My zhe s vami seichas dickutiruem,” *Rossiiskaia gazeta*, 12 February 2007.

¹² Putin, *Speech and the following Discussion at the Munich Conference on Security Policy, loc. cit.*

¹³ *Ibid.*

¹⁴ *Ibid.*; “Putin Says West Forcing Will on World,” *Radio Free Europe/ Radio Liberty*, 15 February 2007.

¹⁵ Putin, *Speech and the following Discussion at the Munich Conference on Security Policy, loc. cit.* ; “Putin Says West Forcing Will on World,” *loc. cit.*

¹⁶ Putin, *Speech and the following Discussion at the Munich Conference on Security Policy, loc. cit.*

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁸ “Lavrov: Russia will respond to missile defense in Europe without hysteria,” *Interfax*, 21 February 2007

¹⁹ *Ibid.*

²⁰ “Polish, Czech Leaders Discuss Missile-Defense Plan,” *Radio Free Europe/ Radio Liberty*, 19 February 2007.

²¹ McCain, Jhon, *Speech at the 43rd Munich Conference on Security Policy* (Official Website of Munich Conference on Security Policy, <http://www.securityconference.de/>); “Miunkhenskii vygovor,” *Kommersant*, 12 February 2007.

²² McCain, *Speech at the 43rd Munich Conference on Security Policy, loc.cit.*

²³ *Ibid.*

²⁴ Gates, Robert, *Speech at the 43rd Munich Conference on Security Policy* (Official Website of Munich Conference on Security Policy, <http://www.securityconference.de/>); Petrovskaya, Iuliia ,“Kholodnaia voina bez izlishnego politesa,” *Nezavisimaia gazeta*, 12 February 2007; Blinov, Artur, “Strategicheskoe partnerstvo priobretaet uzkii smysl,” *Nezavisimaia gazeta*, 19

February 2007.

²⁵ Gates, *Speech at the 43rd Munich Conference on Security Policy*, loc.cit.

²⁶ *Ibid.*

²⁷ *Ibid.*

²⁸ *Ibid.*

²⁹ “Russia: Washington Reacts To Putin’s Munich Speech,” *Radio Free Europe/ Radio Liberty*, 13 February 2007

³⁰ *Ibid.*

³¹ “NATO Says Russia Shouldn’t Fear Missile Shield,” *Radio Free Europe/ Radio Liberty*, 16 February 2007.

³² Kralev, Nicholas, “Rice: Russia’s Missile-defense Criticism Unfortunate,” *The Washington Times*, 22 February 2007.

³³ “Polish, Czech Leaders Discuss Missile-Defense Plan,” loc.cit.

³⁴ “Russia Says U.S. Seeking Nuclear Superiority,” *Radio Free Europe/ Radio Liberty*, 21 February 2007.

³⁵ *Ibid.*

³⁶ “Polish, Czech Leaders Discuss Missile-Defense Plan,” loc.cit.

³⁷ Putin, Vladimir, *Annual Address to the Federal Assembly* (Official Website of President of Russia, <http://president.kremlin.ru/eng/sdocs/speeches.shtml>); “Poslanie Federap’nomu Sobraniiu Rossiisoi Federatsii Prezidenta Rosii Vladimira Putina,” *Rossiiskaia gazeta*, 27 April 2007; “Poslanie prezidenta Vladimira Putina Federap’nomu Sobraniiu,” *Izvestia*, 27 April 2007.

³⁸ Putin, *Annual Address to the Federal Assembly*, loc.cit.; “Kurs PUTina: seria vos’maina, zakliuchitel’naia,” *Nezavisimaia gazeta*, 27 April 2007.

³⁹ Putin, *Annual Address to the Federal Assembly*, loc.cit.; “Mne vystupat’ s politicheskimi zaveshchaniami prezhevremeno,” *Rossiiskaia gazeta*, 27 April 2007.

⁴⁰ Shchedrov, Oleg, “Putin hawkish in final state-of-nation address,” *The Washington Post*, 26 April 2007; Claire, Bigg, “Russia: Putin Delivers Annual State-of- the-Nation Address,” *Radio Free Europe/ Radio Liberty*, 26 April 2007.

⁴¹ Putin, *Annual Address to the Federal Assembly*, loc.cit.

⁴² “NATO Seeks Clarification of Putin’s Remarks on CFE,” *Radio Free Europe/ Radio Liberty*, 26 April 2007.

⁴³ *Ibid.*

⁴⁴ John, Mark and David Brunnstrom, “Putin comments escalate U.S.-Russia missile shield row,” *The Washington Post*, 26 April 2007.

⁴⁵ Danilova, Maria, “Putin Threatens Pullout from Arms Pact,” *The Washington Post*, 26 April 2007; Lowe, Christian, “Putin Freezes Russia’s Commitment under Arms Treaty,” *The Washington Post*, 26 April 2007; Finn, Peter, “Russia to Suspend Compliance with Key European Pact,” *The Washington Post*, 27 April 2007.

⁴⁶ “Russia: CFE ‘Moratorium’ Causes Consternation in Europe,” *Radio Free Europe/ Radio Liberty*, 27 April 2007; Chivers, C. J. and Mark Lander, “Putin to Suspend Pact with NATO,” *The New York Times*, 27 April 2007.

⁴⁷ Putin, *Annual Address to the Federal Assembly*, loc.cit.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*

⁴⁹ “Russia Says it’s Ready to Discuss Future of Arms Treaty,” *Radio Free Europe/ Radio Liberty Newsline*, Vol.11, No.78, 27 April 2007.

⁵⁰ Bohn,Jochen, *Chancellor Merkel Calls for a Global System of “Networked Security”* (Official Website of Munich Conference on Security Policy, <http://www.securityconference.de/>).

⁵¹ Russians say the sharper edge is a reflection of frustration that Russia’s views, particularly its opposition to NATO expansion, have been ignored in the West. About this viewpoint, see such an article as follows: Kramer “Putin likens U.S. foreign policy to that of Third Reich,” loc.cit.

⁵² Gates, *Speech at the 43rd Munich Conference on Security Policy*, loc.cit.

⁵³ “Russian Minister Slams ‘Anti-Russian Campaign’,” *Radio Free Europe/ Radio Liberty Newsline*, Vol.11, No.36, 26 February 2007.

⁵⁴ Article by Minister of Foreign Affairs Sergey Lavrov “One Cold war was enough”, *The Washington Post*, February 25, 2007 (Official Website of Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, http://www.mid.ru/brp_4.nsf/).

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*

⁵⁷ *Speech by Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation Sergey Lavrov at the XV Assembly of the Council on Foreign and Defense Policy* (Official Website of Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, http://www.mid.ru/brp_4.nsf/).

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*

⁶¹ *Ibid.*

⁶² For example on Russia’s will not to return to Cold War, see Brich, Douglas, “After years of feeling powerless in relations with the West, Russian leader is combative, defiant,” *International Herald Tribune*, 28 April 2007. In this article, we see such phrase on Russia’s will not to return to Cold War as follows: “The Russians don’t want a return to the Cold War,” said Andrew Kuchins, an analyst with the Center for Strategic and International Studies in Washington. “They don’t want to raise their defense spending to the very high levels of the Soviet period. But on issues they care about, they’re going to play harder ball.”

⁶³ Karaganov, Sergei, “Khlodnyi mir –poopasnei ‘kholodnoi voiny,’ ” *Rossiiskaia gazeta*, 7 March 2007.