



Newsletter

Volume 1, Issue 1

21 June 2013

Inside this issue:

Nexus newsletter	1
Nexus website	1
Global Peace Index	1
Legacy of Susan Rice	2
How Russia is viewed by the EU and the US	4
Youth Economic Forum	4
NATO articles and speeches	4

The annual Global Peace Index

- *The annual Global Peace Index, prepared by a group of academics and media agencies, has just been published and is conveniently summarized by The Guardian at <http://www.guardian.co.uk/news/datablog/2013/jun/11/global-peace-index-2013e>. By scrolling down you can find the full listing, in which Iceland is again No 1! It is also interesting that about half of the top ten peaceful states would normally be considered 'small' ones.*

Nexus newsletter

Dear Nexus member

Nexus is provided with numerous articles and other interesting information. Repeated emails can however become overwhelming and perhaps tedious when received too often.

To resolve this without depriving Nexus members of useful and interesting information, the board of Nexus decided to create a biweekly newsletter. You are now reading the first issue of the newsletter and any feedback from you on form or content would be most welcome.

Nexus website

Dear Nexus members

The work on the new website has officially started.

The board would appreciate your input and assistance to make the website as good as possible.

- Any articles written by members possible for publication on the website are appreciated.
- Information on interesting events or opportunities that may be of interest to Nexus members is also welcomed.
- Book reviews would also make a welcome addition to the website.



If any member is interested in participating in the creation of the website and be a member of the editorial board please contact Gyða Einarisdóttir, chair of Nexus.

Legacy of Susan Rice by Richard Gowan



Diplomatic Fallout: Did Susan Rice Save the U.N. From Irrelevance?

By Richard Gowan <<http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/authors/541/richard-gowan>>, 10 Jun 2013

<http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/13007/diplomatic-fallout-did-susan-rice-save-the-u-n-from-irrelevance>

How will Susan Rice be remembered at the United Nations? Since President Barack Obama announced his decision to appoint Rice as his national security adviser <<http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/13002/the-realist-prism-obama-s-appointments-offer-new-paths-for-power-projection>> last week, analyses of her service at the U.N. since 2009 have swung from the gossipy to the philosophical. The gossips have recycled stories of Rice's robust sparring with her counterparts, which at times involved fiery language. The philosophers have reflected on the ambassador's role in advancing the cause of humanitarian intervention in Libya, as well as in later debates over nonintervention in Syria.

But many commentators have missed one basic point: Rice kept the job of U.S. permanent representative to the United Nations from becoming irrelevant. By 2009, the post risked marginalization due to factors ranging from the George W. Bush administration's ill-treatment of the U.N. to the rise of the G-20 as an alternative forum for the big powers. Rice reasserted the centrality of the U.N. to American policy on issues from Iran to the Koreans.

Over the past two years, as the U.S. and Russia have traded blows over Syria in the Security Council, it has been easy enough to feel depressed about the state of multilateralism. But it's equally easy to forget how excruciating U.N. diplomacy had become during the later years of the Bush administration.

After disregarding the Security Council over Iraq, Bush selected the fiercely conservative John Bolton as ambassador to the U.N. in 2005. Bolton worked hard to undo then-Secretary-General Kofi Annan's efforts to revitalize the organization following the Iraq War. But it was no secret that more powerful figures in the U.S. foreign policy apparatus, including then-Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice, had little time for the ambassador. As Bolton's own memoirs <http://www.amazon.com/gp/product/B002YX0BDM/ref=as_li_ss_tl?ie=UTF8&camp=1789&creative=390957&creativeASIN=B002YX0BDM&linkCode=as2&tag=worlpolirevi-20> suggest, his posting to New York was a form of internal exile.

This sent a poor signal about the value of the ambassadorship in Washington's eyes. Matters improved in 2007 when Bolton was replaced by Zalmay Khalilzad, a considerably more subtle operator. But Khalilzad's stint at the U.N. was complicated by disputes with Russia over Kosovo's declaration of independence in early 2008 and Moscow's invasion of Georgia later that year. In both cases, the Security Council was paralyzed, although a temporary compromise was found for Kosovo after almost 10 months of bargaining.

If Russia has proved hard to deal with over Syria, therefore, it is in keeping with its previous posture in the Security Council. From the start of Rice's term, the possibility of a showdown with Moscow was always present. Despite this, the U.S. was able to secure a new resolution <<http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2010/sc9948.doc.htm>> ratcheting up sanctions on Iran in 2010. Rice has also engineered deals with China <<http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/12780/diplomatic-fallout-china-s-crisis-management-crisis>> on issues including Sudan and North Korea.

Such big-power diplomacy has arguably been the hallmark of Rice's tenure. It is not unprecedented? Bolton also secured resolutions sanctioning both Iran and North Korea, after all. Nor has this approach always delivered easy results. China and Russia have been recalcitrant on many issues other than Syria, including any suggestions of a further resolution on Iran. But Rice can still take a great deal of credit for one startling achievement of power politics: securing a mandate for the use of force in Libya in 2011. Her presentation of the case for intervention to the Security Council, which involved a detailed account of the military steps required to suppress Libya's defenses that caught many other ambassadors off-guard, is already the stuff of U.N. legend.

Outplayed over Libya, some members of the Security Council, including China, India and Russia, later complained that the U.S. had misled them over the nature of the ensuing campaign. Rice and her aides dismissed such arguments as disingenuous. In playing big-power diplomacy, the U.S. Mission to the U.N. has not warmed to anyone who does not take the game equally seriously. During the Syrian war, Rice has reportedly been frustrated with not only her Russian opposite number, the calculatedly pugnacious Vitaly Churkin <http://articles.washingtonpost.com/2013-06-04/world/39732112_1_u-s-russia-u-n-ambassador-vitaly-churkin-russian-diplomats>, but also those European governments that repeatedly advocated for Security Council resolutions condemning Damascus despite the near-certainty of vetoes <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/08/03/syrian_shadow_boxing> from Moscow and Beijing.

As I noted in a recent column <<http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/12944/diplomatic-fallout-a-more-hawkish-europe-gives-u-s-second-thoughts>>, the U.S. has also criticized France over its efforts to manage the Malian crisis through the Security Council. More generally, some European diplomats grumble that the Americans have not been sufficiently collegial at the U.N. in recent years. But again, their memories may be too short. Rice's team might have clashed with them over tactics, but Bolton wanted to limit the European Union's power at the U.N. on principle, arguing that the 'Euroids' threatened American sovereignty <<http://prospect.org/article/john-bolton-agenda>>.

Ultimately, Rice's form of big-power politics at the U.N. was always likely to create frictions. Yet she has restored credibility to her job. A more cautious ambassador might have ruffled fewer feathers, but he or she would probably not have kept the U.N. at the center of serious diplomacy as Rice has done. If the U.S. had not been able to keep security Council diplomacy over Iran alive, the advocates of air strikes on Iranian nuclear facilities might have gotten their way. If the council had not approved action over Libya, Moammar Gadhafi might still be in power?and nobody would have asked what the U.N. had to say about Syria.

Iran and Syria will remain challenges for Rice's nominated successor, Samantha Power. China and Russia are likely to continue to be troublesome partners at best. As the senior official in the U.S. National Security Council dealing with multilateral affairs, Power backstopped many of Rice's initiatives. Power is likely to maintain her predecessor's hard-nosed approach to U.N. diplomacy. Potential critics should note that the alternative is the gradual downgrading of the post of U.S. Permanent representative to the U.N. to a state of dignified insignificance. That would signal the marginalization of the U.N. itself.

Richard Gowan is the associate director for Crisis Management and Peace Operations at New York University's Center on International Cooperation and a senior policy fellow at the European Council on Foreign Relations. His weekly column for World Politics Review, Diplomatic Fallout <<http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/authors/541/richard-gowan>>, appears every Monday.

Ultimately, Rice's form of big-power politics at the U.N. was always likely to create frictions. Yet she has restored credibility to her job.



Susan Rice

How is Russia viewed in the EU and the United States

The hard-line approach taken by the Russian authorities following the December 2011 parliamentary election has led to growing consternation within the international community, while the return of Vladimir Putin to the post of President of the Russian Federation in May 2012 has generated largely negative evaluations of Russia's political trajectory.

But how is the Russian Federation viewed in a broader context as an actor within the international system? Does Russia play a positive or negative role on the international stage and is Russia viewed as a strategic partner or a strategic competitor by other actors, including the European Union and the United States? A new report published by the Finnish Institute of International Affairs presents a symbiosis of opinions and analysis from

European and US researchers and practitioners dealing with these questions. The report is authored by Sean P. Roberts, who works as a researcher in FIIA's The EU's Eastern Neighbourhood and Russia research programme.

To view and download the publication, please visit [http://www.fiaa.fi/en/publication/344/<http://www.fiaa.fi/en/publication/344/russia as an international actor/?utm_source=julkaisutiedote&utm_medium=s%C3%A4hk%C3%B6posti&utm_campaign=FIIA+Report+37>](http://www.fiaa.fi/en/publication/344/<http://www.fiaa.fi/en/publication/344/russia%20as%20an%20international%20actor/?utm_source=julkaisutiedote&utm_medium=s%C3%A4hk%C3%B6posti&utm_campaign=FIIA+Report+37>).

For more information, please contact the author: sean.roberts@fiaa.fi <<mailto:sean.roberts@fiaa.fi>>
Tel. +358 9 4327756
<http://www.fiaa.fi/en/expert/148/>

Youth Economic Forum

Dear colleagues, we invite You to participate in Fifth Youth Economic Forum in Petrozavodsk (Russia), 14-15 of November 2013. Our Forum is organized for young scientists, PhD students and University students by Institute of economics, Karelian Research Center, Russian Academy of Sciences and financed by Russian Fund of Fundamental Researches and Government of Republic of Karelia. This year our Forum is devoted to issues of *International economic integration*. There will be some sections according to:

- Economic integration as an aspect of globalization of the world economy;
- The formation of regional integration structures;
- Eurasian economic integration;
- Euroregion as a form of international integration;
- Russia and the WTO: the first results of the integration process;

- Russian business in the international division of labor;
- Inter-regional integration and national economic space of Russia;
- Cross-border cooperation of the regions and municipalities;
- International integration and innovative development;
- Social and legal aspects of economic integration;
- Migration in the development of the integration process;
- Integration for sustainable development and the transition to a "green economy".

Additional information is in attached file (attached in e-mail) and you can visit our web site: <http://econforum.ru/>

PhD Egor Mikhel
Director's assistant for
International communications,
Institute of economics KarRC RAS
Petrozavodsk, Russia

NATO—articles and speeches

WALL STREET JOURNAL - Published 2 June 2013

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887323855804578508894129031084.html>

NATO PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY ? Speech as delivered on 17 May 2013

http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/opinions_100598.htm

BUCHAREST UNIVERSITY ? Speech delivered on 24 May 2013

http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/opinions_100806.htm

Please take the time
to join Nexus on
[facebook](#)