



A Clash of Values and Norms? EU-Russia Energy Security Discourses

22.09.2017. | 2

- > 1. Setting Context of the EU-Russia Energy Security Discourse
- >
- > 2. Theoretical and Methodological Considerations
- >
- > 3. Western Oriented Russian IR scholars
Institutional (global energy governance) setting vs geopolitical setting
- >
- > 4. Eurasian Geostrategists and Neoeurasianists
Institutional (global energy governance) setting vs geopolitical setting
- >
- > 5. Conclusion





EU-Russia energy security discourses – 2 settings:

*A clash of norms, values and principles in
 a traditional geopolitical setting?*

Convergence of norms, values and principles in a global governance setting?



a



What are the differences in the
 normative positions of the groups of
 authors in institutional and
 geopolitical settings?



Theoretical and Methodological Considerations

**Norms - a standard of appropriate behavior for
actors with a given identity**

M. Finnemore & K. Sikkink, 1998

**Securitization theory, : concept of security
is analyzed as social construction of
threats**

by means of a speech act

B. Buzan, O. Wæver, J. de Wilde, 1998

A speech act theory - J. Austin, 1962

“X counts as Y in context C”;

J. Searle, 1969



university of
groningen



Institutional setting (global energy governance) - energy debates between multiple actors (international energy organizations, NGOs, TNCs, national energy companies and individuals)

Geopolitical setting – energy debates in the context of balance of power theory, state-centric.

Energy security - securing energy supply on behalf of the EU and securing energy demand on behalf of the Russian Federation.



Russian Scholars on EU-Russia Energy Security Discourse

Discursive positions	Settings	
	institutional (global energy governance) setting	geopolitical setting
1) Western oriented Russian IR scholars (liberal/market approach, interdependence, “common values” and “common house”)	a	b
1) Eurasian geostrategists and Neoeurasianists (supporting energy diversification (leads to securitization))	c	d

› What are the normative positions of each group (same or different)

- in the institutional setting? (a, c)

- in the geopolitical setting? (b, d)

What is the relationship between two settings within one group?



- › **Western oriented Russian IR scholars on EU-Russia Energy Security Discourse**
- › *methodologically integrated* -
- › How institutional discourse relates to/impacts geopolitical discourse and vice versa within this group of authors





Findings within a Group of Western oriented Russian Scholars

- › ***a*** dominates ***b***, *i.e.* an institutional setting is normatively more significant than a geopolitical setting.
- › $a \neq b$ - Eurasian ideology and energy diversification issue are absent from the energy security discourse by Western oriented Russian IR scholars
- › *Focus on legal and institutional aspects of the EU-Russian energy discourse, fair rules of competition, transparency in business, energy market, fair energy prices, etc.*



Russian academic contribution to the development of international energy diplomacy

- › Stanislav Zhiznin coined the term “energy diplomacy” in 1976.
- › Russia’s loss of its super power status, external and internal threats to Russia’s energy security- a geopolitical discourse strongly impacts the global energy governance
- › *Energy Diplomacy: Russia and the World, 2006*



Russian scholars who are *methodologically isolated*

Publish mostly in Russian

Focus on a geopolitics of energy, applying a clearly state centric position; balance of power theory, realism, neorealist interpretation of hegemony, etc

Energeticheskaya Politika, # 5, 2015 - Geopolitics and New Energy Civilization

Y. Shafranik, V. Bushuev, A. Mastepanov, K. Simonov, I. Pominova, V. Kulpina, V. Pervukhin, S. Dmitriyev, V. Golubev, N. Isain, etc.

[Potential «energy civilization» and geopolitics; Gas geopolitics: has the energy and political partnership of Russia and Europe failed?; The prerequisites for building general interstate gas markets; Turning towards the East in the light of anti-Russian sanctions in the energy sector; Geopolitical context of national energy strategies, etc.](#)

All leading Eurasianist theorists eventually became followers of the geopolitical school
(A. Sergunin, 2016)



Findings within a group of *Eurasian Geostrategists and Neoeurasianists*

- › Geopolitical setting is normatively more significant than an institutional setting
- › **c≠d** is that the Eurasian ideology and energy diversification issue are clearly present in the energy security discourse
- › *Democratic Eurasianists* do not envision a special civilizational energy mission for Russia (unlike Neoeurasianists) - focus on energy interests, energy markets, fair energy prices, threats to the energy security, the most economically viable gas transit routes, etc.
- › Energy security discourse clearly defined by the geopolitical setting rather than institutional



General Conclusion

Constitutive (prioritized) norms and principles in a geopolitical setting:

- sovereignty, power vertical, preference of bilateralism, energy superpower, unique civilizational mission, trust in the supreme power and independence from any other power, pragmatism, importance of the national tradition and historical past

Constitutive norms and principles in an institutional setting:

- transparency, predictability, reliability of supply, trust, the rule of law, free and fair competition, strategic partnership, equality, consensual democracy, market liberalization approach, interdependence, “common European house”



General Conclusion



- > Geopolitically framed debate - suspended cooperation, polarization, politicization of energy relations and conflict
- > A clash of norms, principles and values
- > Institutionally framed debate - development of energy cooperation
- > Similar norms, principles and values, and conflicts are restricted to competing commercial interests.



QUESTIONS?

THANK YOU!