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Russia’s Threat Perception (1)

- Proliferation of WMD and their means of delivery
- Increase of number and role of non-state actors, primarily, of terrorist organizations
- Global stability violation caused by global strategic missile defense development and risk of a new arms race, including into the outer space
- illicit drug trafficking
- Cyber-wars and cyber-crimes


Russia’s Threat Perception (2)

- Uncertainty of international situation
- Growth of conflict potential, sharpening of contradictions; growing chaos in the world affairs
- Unilateral diktat & US-made templates for global solutions: "The unipolar world is simply a means of justifying dictatorship over people and countries"
- The very notion of 'national sovereignty' became a relative value for most countries
- Non-compliance to the norms of international law. Such norms should be based on moral principles of truth, justice, and respect to one's partners and their interests
- Threats to Russian compatriots around the globe (представителям «широкого русского мира»)
- Growing threat of extremism and radicalism
- NATO trend of expansion towards Russia’s borders
- Many types of high-precision weaponry are already close to WMD
- Increased probability of chain of conflicts between or with indirect involvement of major powers

"Forma&on of a polycentric world does not improve stability; in fact, it is more likely to be the opposite. The goal of reaching global equilibrium is turning into a fairly difficult puzzle."

Vladimir Putin to Russian Ambassadors. July 1, 2014; and to Valdai Club members, Sochi, October 24, 2014

Russia’s Threat Perception (3)

International Situation Assessment in the Regions Vital to Russia’s Interests

Who will use or Threaten to Use Nuclear Weapons?

What States are WMD Threats to Russia?

Who will use or threaten to use nuclear weapons?
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Contradictions (1)

Need for economic modernization – and growing isolationism

Contradictions (2)

Declared change of geographic priorities in cooperation (BRICS, SCO, Asia Pacific) – and de facto bipolar vision of the world where United States is still seen as the No.1 rival/partner

Contradictions (3)

Renewed Great Power Status – and lack of capability/ability to promote its interests through multilateral diplomacy, failure of ‘grand initiatives’

Contradictions (4)

Reliance on nuclear weapons – and insufficient development of modern conventional capabilities
Contradictions (5)

- Increase of importance of space- and cyber warfare
- and lack of efficient diplomatic instruments to prevent threats coming from them (lack of "NPT for 21th Century Weapons" ambition/vision)

Nuclear proliferation in the world: 1945 - 2014

Three Pillars of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Regime

Russia & Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy: Rosatom Export Ambitions-2014
In absence of legal and political instruments, arms are once again becoming the focal point of the global agenda; they are used wherever and however, without any UN Security Council sanctions. And if the Security Council refuses to produce such decisions, then it is immediately declared to be an outdated and ineffective instrument.

Many states do not see any other ways of ensuring their sovereignty but to obtain their own bombs. This is extremely dangerous. We insist on continuing talks; we are not only in favor of talks, but insist on continuing talks to reduce nuclear arsenals. The less nuclear weapons we have in the world, the better. And we are ready for the most serious, concrete discussions on nuclear disarmament – but only serious discussions without any double standards.

We have examples when, having common goals and acting based on the same criteria, together we achieved real success. Let me remind you about solving the problem of chemical weapons in Syria, and the substantive dialogue on the North Korean issue, which also has some positive results. Why can’t we use this experience in the future to solve local and global challenges?

We did not change our attitude to the situation in the Middle East, to the Iranian nuclear programme, to the North Korean conflict, to fighting terrorism and crime in general, as well as drug trafficking. We never changed any of our positions even under the pressure of unfriendly actions on the part of our western partners, who are led, very obviously in this case, by the United States. We did not even change our positions even under the sanctions. However, here too everything has its limits. It might be possible that external circumstances can force us to alter some of our positions.

All the rules governing international relations after World War II were designed for a bipolar world. True, the Soviet Union was referred to as the Upper Volta with missiles. Maybe so, and there were lots of missiles. Besides, we had such brilliant politicians like Nikita Khrushchev, who slammed the desk with his shoe at the UN. And the whole world, primarily the United States, and NATO thought: this Nikita is best left alone, he might just go and fire a missile, they have lots of them, we should better show some respect for them.

Now that the Soviet Union is gone, what is the situation and what are the temptations? There is no need to take into account Russia’s views. It is very dependent, it has gone through transformation during the collapse of the Soviet Union, and we can do whatever we like, disregarding all rules and regulations. The bear will not even bother to ask permission. Here we consider it the master of the taiga, and I know for sure that the bear does not intend to move to any other climatic zones – it will not be comfortable there. However, it will not let anyone have its taiga either.