

Iain Ferguson:

The paper focuses on conservatism in the Russian foreign policy culture and the potential for future reform and improvement of the Security Council (UN). So, it provides a review of basic contradictions between Russia and SC UN. Focuses on ideological contradictions.

“Defend and resist” – paradoxal line of behavior in relation to SC.

Russian self-identity and legitimization partially based on the historical points, such as being main winner of the WW2. But times has changed, and SC gets fragmented.

Defense of the model of “State-civilization”, which Russia is. Nevertheless, that legitimacy works only in domestic scale and does not fit the international identity.

Andrey Kazantsev:

The paper was originally prepared for a special event.

It’s common for Central Asian states to be precepted as passive subjects of Eurasian integration. Nevertheless, that paper approaches them as active ones.

Chinese economic influence in region is becoming more and more profound. EEU-China agreement represents the will of Russia and China to cooperate in a region. In addition, there’s attendance to cooperate in sphere of security and anti-terrorism struggle. But what do Central Asian states want?

Mostly they are balancing between huge powers (multi-vectoral foreign policy). It represents tight cooperation with both Russia, West (NATO, for inst.), Islamic world etc. (“Spaghetti bowl” of international organizations).

There are differences between CSTO and EEU formats. In addition, Central Asian states do not support Russian policy on Ukraine and Georgia. Kazakhstan rejects any economic unification in basis of EEU. So, Russia and Kazakhstan have diametral opposite vision of particular perspectives of EEU.

To conclude, Russia does not ignore the interests of Central Asia States. There are three main scenarios of the future of the region:

- 1) Russia and China solve the most problems.

- 2) Russia and China do not solve the most problems, Central Asian nations are rotating towards the West.
- 3) Discord between China and Russia, continuation of multi-vector policy and playing on contradictions.

Andrej Krickovic:

The paper is about the modern states (both developed and developing ones) and the way they react to the liberal globalization (on example of Brazil, Japan, Russia).

“Russia is a Firestarter (bandwagon) of anti-liberal globalization.”? Nope. Russia just offers an alternative way of that globalization and wants to be involved. The main problem is Ukraine, Georgia, etc.

In a multipolar world Russia may be an option for those, who don't want to make a choice between East and West. Just because of the energy export – oriented economy, Russia has a huge room for material support around the globe.

Sergei Akopov:

The paper is dedicated to term of sovereignty and political identity. It approaches “horizontal” and “vertical” “models of loneliness” in IR. It examines three main examples of “loneliness anxiety” and Sovereignitism as a political ideology and its implications on Russian foreign policy.

Negative loneliness (in psychology), as well as positive loneliness are philosophic terms. Model of Vertical “Politics of loneliness” is implied to Russian idea of “State-civilization”. The paper operates such models, as:

- Historical uniqueness
- Collective memory
- Fear for losing its power
- National pride
- Cult of sacrifices
- Spiritual unity
- Concept of narrative
- Historical experience of isolation

- Russia – “Third Rome” concept

Generally speaking, that kind of loneliness may be a threat both for the world and for Russia – brain drain, interventions, etc.

Richard Sakwa:

Loneliness is a phenomenon of modernity and post-modern.

When it comes to Sergei, it's needed to address the question in a more exact way. It's a challenge for International order?

Motivatorism is a door to failure and puts the state in a victim position.

There is a «division of labour» between Russia and China in Central Asia – security is for Russia and economics is for China, but it has an attendance to decrease.

Non-Aligned movement is no more non-aligned, it's more about opposing the western vision of globalization.

Final comments:

Richard Sakwa

Anything which goes out of UN world order's borders is revisionism, even telling “Let's make the world better.”.

Andrey Kazantsev

Being non-aligned is an act of diminishing of your options and its increasing at the same time. (in a context of post-soviet Central Asia)