



THE PIR CENTER PUBLISHES A RUSSIAN JOURNAL ON
INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

The 80 issues of *Yaderny Kontrol* are in the past. Twelve years of history, 567 articles, 59 interviews, and a total of 346 authors. “Not many things, but well”—*Non multa, sed multum*—was its motto. Indeed, we have managed to do a lot well in the past few years. The most important success has been attaining authority in the eyes of our readers. *Yaderny Kontrol* was read in 35 Russian cities and 86 other cities throughout the globe.

Beginning in 2007, into uncharted territory! We are launching *Security Index*.

So is this a new journal or an old one?

Well, of course it is a new journal! What could be simpler than looking at the cover: there is a new name there. Is it really that similar to *Yaderny Kontrol* (nuclear control)? Moreover, we are now publishing a *Russian journal on international security*. In other words, the scope of the issues covered has been broadened. The main focus used to be the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction (WMD) and means of their delivery; while questions of WMD nonproliferation will continue to occupy a serious amount of *journalistic space* (consistent with the place the issue occupies in current discussions of international security as a whole), it will share that space with other issues, such as combating international terrorism; protecting critical infrastructure; energy security (including oil and gas as well as nuclear energy); military-technical cooperation; dual use exports and export control; information security, advanced telecommunications, and the new role of the Internet; demographic security and the problem of migration; environmental security and global climate change; biosecurity and the fight against infectious diseases; the struggle for water resources; as well as education and the knowledge economy as the main strategic trump card in the new century...

Not only are the issues the journal will examine expanding, but also their geography. While the majority of the articles and materials in the earlier journal were *about* Russia, the new one will look at what a variety of issues mean *for* Russia. I plan to delve into such regions as the Middle East and Iran, Central Asia and the Caspian, and East Asia particularly closely. Certainly, those regions that have traditionally received the journal’s extra attention—Europe and the United States—will continue to do so. But in setting editorial policy, I am interested in all information related to threats and challenges to Russian security, even those originating in the most distant locations; or, on the other hand, in new options opening up for Russia, for its geopolitical and economic growth, and here we could discuss the Persian Gulf and the Gulf of Guinea with equal enthusiasm. Finally, the journal will not limit itself to terrestrial geography: the problems of outer space—both the possibility of military conflict there as well as the prospects for its peaceful use—will also find a place in the pages of *Security Index*.



Not only is the geography of our interests enlarging, but also the geography of our readership. The issue you hold in your hands has also been received by readers in 54 Russian cities and 92 cities outside of Russia. Furthermore, the international edition, published in English, will for the first time in the history of the periodical share the same format as the Russian edition and will be published with the same frequency, three times per year (spring, summer/fall, and winter). Our audience in Russia and North America has traditionally been broad, but now the journal is rapidly and robustly expanding its readership in Western Europe, Central Asia, South Asia, East Asia, the Middle East, and the Persian (Arab) Gulf.

Security Index is becoming a full-fledged *international* publication. Its headquarters in Moscow, *Security Index* has opened representative offices in Geneva, Switzerland, and Monterey, California, in the United States. My daily electronic correspondence with our authors and correspondents comes from addressees in Baku and Novosibirsk, Nizhniy Novgorod and Bishkek, Vienna and Vladivostok, London and St. Petersburg, Stockholm, Tyumen, Riyadh, Washington, and Tokyo... I found the idea that we might examine the world through the eyes of experts in Moscow alone inadmissible. My aim is to provide you a *chorus of expert voices*: a real *polyphony* from throughout today's world, examining the world—and the world order—of tomorrow.

Well, of course it is an old journal! What could be simpler than looking at the cover: it says there that it is the first issue in 2007, but the 81st since the journal began to be published. Could the 81st issue really be an indicator of a *new* journal? This idea informs the first article in this issue, by Chief of the General Staff of the Russian Armed Forces **Yury Baluyevsky**—certainly, the first article in our journal this year, but also the 568th article since establishing a journal in November 1994. This article does not just recall the earlier articles in our journal on issues related to Russia's decisions regarding its military doctrine, but also previous articles in our journal by Baluyevsky himself.

While adding new sections, I will nevertheless remain conservative: the majority of the sections in *Security Index* and the very structure of the issue itself are easily recognizable to readers of *Yaderny Kontrol*. Does the editor-in-chief really need to guide you, the reader, through the journal, or could you undertake this perusal completely independently? Perhaps, but particularly since with this issue the number of our readers will be increased by more than 2,000 experts, I will take you by the hand for several minutes so that we might trace the logic of the editorial board and editor-in-chief together.

Like *Yaderny Kontrol*, *Security Index* begins with exclusive interviews. We do this because this is a practical policy journal, as well as an academic publication. There has always been and always will be speech "straight from the horse's mouth!" "I cannot exclude the possibility that in the final years of his presidency George Bush, like Bill Clinton before him, will want his place in history to be marked by at least some success, even if it is only partial and preliminary, in finding a solution in the Middle East," said Academician **Yevgeny Primakov** in a conversation with PIR Center Senior Adviser Gennady Yevstafiev. His interview focuses attention on the most acute problems in the Middle East and Iran.

The Iranian problem is widely represented in this issue. Our second interviewee, Azerbaijani President **Ilham Aliiev**, is convinced that the uncontrolled development of the Iranian situation could have "catastrophic consequences" for his country and for the entire region: "Our main goals, in my opinion, must be alleviating tension and developing mechanisms that, on the one hand, calm world community concern about Iran's nuclear program and, on the other, allow Iran to exercise its legitimate right to develop peaceful nuclear energy," the Azerbaijani president believes. In the interview he also speaks in detail about his country's *nonaligned* status, which is particularly interesting to read in tandem with **Ekaterina Shadrina's** article on "The Great Caspian Caviar Game," about which there will be more below.

The topic of Iran also features in the *epistolary duel* between **Alexei Arbatov** and **Andrei Piontkovski**, an exchange of electronic letters made at my request, in which they attempt to find common ground in a discussion of Tehran's nuclear ambitions. Their e-mail correspondence refers to many facts, as well as emotions, but at the end of the day each of the two

experts maintains his opinion: one (Arbatov) that the Iranian situation should and must be decided via diplomacy, on the basis of international law, the other (Piontkovski) that a big stick is needed: "Well-wishers and lawyers for Iran can say that they are not completely convinced of the military nature of the Iranian nuclear program (up to the first nuclear explosion) as much as they like. What is important is that the governments of Israel and the United States, as well as the overwhelming majority of professional military experts, are convinced. And the leaders of Israel and the United States have already been quite clear that if diplomatic efforts fail they will prevent the further development of the Iranian nuclear program through the use of military force," writes the political scientist from his Washington office to Alexei Arbatov, in Moscow.

The topic of Iran, along with other questions involving various states' *perceptions* of nuclear threats and the principles of nuclear nonproliferation, are the subjects of a comprehensive article by the leading nonproliferation experts Dr. **William Potter** and Dr. **Scott Parrish** of the Center for Nonproliferation Studies at the Monterey Institute of International Studies.

Vyacheslav Nikonov, a Russian political scientist who heads the Russian Public Chamber's International Affairs Commission, also writes about political *perceptions* in his commentary. U.S.-Russian relations recently have fallen to an abysmal level. But how far might they yet fall? And should this worry Russia? Nikonov considers these questions, examining the two St. Petersburg meetings of July 2006: the G8 Summit and the bilateral Putin-Bush Summit.

The material provided by one of the most brilliant pens in contemporary American journalism, **David Hoffman**, allows us to learn some lessons from one of the most dramatic moments in bilateral relations: the coldest of the years in the late Cold War period. The author takes us back to September 26, 1983, when the early missile warning station Serpukhov-15 got a signal indicating a U.S. nuclear attack on the Soviet Union... Hoffman takes us into the offices of Andropov, Reagan, Marshal Nikolai Ogarkov, and George Shultz, using documents of the time that have not been published previously. But have we, today, learned the lessons of 1983?

It turns out that a *new great game* is not only unfolding in Central Asia. The Caspian states have already felt the influence of the new geopolitical fissures and games. But if the struggle for one type of black gold—oil—has already been much described, the fight for another black gold—caviar—has only received fragmentary accounts. Astrakhan native **Ekaterina Shadrina** has taken on the issue of the *caviar games* in the Caspian. Her article provides many *tasty* details, for instance: in 2006 Iranian exports of caviar to the United States increased markedly; she also writes about what may happen to the caviar market if the European Union institutes sanctions against Iran. But the most important issue addressed in the article is how to ensure environmental security while defending Russia's economic interests in the Caspian.

Army General Yury Baluyevsky prepared what might truly be called a programmatic article for the first issue of our journal. What is Russia's role, given the current "security index" in this rapidly globalizing world? And how should we react to the behavior of the faltering, but still undoubted, superpower—the United States? General Baluyevsky sees alarming parallels to the *Titanic*: "The danger for Russia and the other passengers on the world *Titanic* is that nobody is asking them which direction they want to sail," he writes.

Yet one more of Baluyevsky's main theses is: "I am against placing Russia in opposition to Europe and Asia (Eurasia), but I am also against the imposition of European civilization on Russia, since I am certain that if Russia wants to have a successful future, it must remain Russia. Russia is not Europe, not Asia, and not even Eurasia. I'd like to emphasize, it is Russia!"

Thus, Russia is not Europe... I do not doubt that with these words the chief of the Russian General Staff has initiated a debate that will be continued on the pages of upcoming issues of our journal.

The problems of globalization and the new world order that is taking shape are also reflected in various other materials in this issue, including the interview of the Indian ambassador to Russia, Mr. **Kanwal Sibal**, as well as in the review of Thomas Friedman's *The World Is Flat*, writ-



ten by the prominent Russian analyst and one of the heads of Russian Microsoft, **Mikhail Yakushev**.

In our interview, Swiss Defense Minister **Samuel Schmid** acknowledges that the tradition of neutrality will not help his country avoid the current global threats, terrorism first and foremost. Developing this topic further, Institute for World Economy and International Relations of the Russian Academy of Sciences (IMEMO RAN) and Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) expert (and member of the *Security Index* editorial board) **Ekaterina Stepanova** considers methods to combat Islamist terrorism on the global, as well as the regional and local levels, in detail. Her research particularly focuses on the onset of the *jihadi* movement in the Middle East and Central Asia.

Last, but not least, I would like to present a new section of the journal: the **iSi Index** (pronounced “I-see”), a comprehensive **index of international security** expressed in numerical terms. In this section we will be using a methodology developed by the PIR Center over the course of a year. At present *iSi* is undergoing review both in Russia and in several academic institutes abroad. We at the PIR Center are convinced that with the aid of this index we will be able to ascertain the main global trends in international security. As you can already see from the increase indicated on the journal’s cover, *iSi* grew from July to August (that is, the world became a bit safer during the month), but then a significant drop occurred in October—the international security situation was aggravated. Why? You can read about this in two reviews of world events that accompany the *iSi* Index. Both cover one and the same period: the four months from July through October 2006. But feel the difference! One and the same time period is evaluated by *Russian liberal* **Yury Fedorov** and *Russian conservative* **Dmitry Evstafiev**. Not just their analysis of events, but their very prioritization of events from the point of view of Russian interests is completely different.

In addition to the objective indicators of the index and the very subjective evaluations of our two experts, we have also added the comments of 10 members of the PIR Center **International Expert Group**: what do they think about our *security barometer*? They do trust its indicators? To what degree do the *global security* indicators coincide with developments on their continents and in their regions? The group includes experts from countries ranging from Brazil to China, India to Kazakhstan, and Russia to Saudi Arabia, among others. It is likely no accident that they each feel the “global security temperature” that we are measuring in a different way.

We at the PIR Center are attentively tracking world reaction to the indicators in our *iSi* index. The most interesting result will not be the indicators for one particular month or another, so much as the global security trends that are revealed.

This is an ambitious goal. But would it really be interesting otherwise? 🤖

Vladimir Orlov