CHATHAM HOUSE

The Royal Institute of
International Affairs

Russian Influence Abroad: Non-state Actors and Propaganda

John Lough

Russia and Eurasia Programme, Chatham House

Orysia Lutsevych

Russia and Eurasia Programme, Chatham House

Peter Pomerantsev

Independent media producer

Stanislav Secrieru

Polish Institute of International Affairs

Anton Shekhovtsov

Institute of Human Sciences, Vienna

24 October 2014

This is a summary of the event held at Chatham House on 24 October 2014, which took place in two sessions. In the first session, Orysia Lutsevych, Stanislav Secrieru, Anton Shekhovtsov and a roundtable of experts discussed the Russian government's use of non-state actors in the post-Soviet space to achieve its foreign policy goals. In the second session, Peter Pomerantsev. John Lough and fellow experts talked about the concept of 'information war', the success of Russian lobbying in the 'near' and 'far' abroad, and measures necessary to combat it.

From Russian World to Russian War: Non-State Actors as a Foreign Policy Tool in Russia's Neighbourhood

Foreign policy goals

Russia's main foreign policy goals in its neighbourhood can be summarized as follows: to become a centre of gravity; to maintain these countries in its sphere of influence while expanding the reach and influence of the 'Russian World' (*Russkiy Mir*) and Eurasian Union; and to contain democracy and solidify a Russian style of governance.

Russia's aim to project the 'Russian model' on to this neighbourhood raises questions of what the Russian model is. Russia struggled with ideological emptiness in the early 2000s. Arguably, the Kremlin continues to lack ideology but plays with narratives. It played with sovereign democracy and tried out political orthodoxy, but failed in these. Within Putin's circle of *siloviki* there is variation: Vladimir Yakunin is an orthodox nationalist, while Sergey Ivanov and Igor Sechin are simply anti-West. Some members of the political elite, such as Dmitry Rogozin, define Russia as the 'true Europe', continuing Europe's 19th-century traditions of geopolitical spheres of influence and social conservatism. The EU is deemed to have betrayed this concept, and therefore constitutes a 'degenerate Europe'.

The discussion then moved to the Kremlin's use of 'Eurasian' ideas, which tie into the Russian World concept that has been expanded from an internal search for Russian identity in the 2000s to a foreign policy imperative since 2012. The concept is underpinned by conservative Eurasianism, which is based on Russian language and culture, shared history and heritage (from Kievan Rus to Soviet), orthodoxy and conservative values, and, most recently, economic integration through the Eurasian Economic Union (EEU). The Russian World also has flexible geography: Russia defends the rights and interests of 30 million (ethnic) Russians, claims responsibility for 300 million Russian-speakers, and even embraces people who feel *culturally* close to Russia.

Aleksandr Dugin, the idologue of this concept, argues that the Russian World posits Eurasianism as an alternative to the Western Civilization project. He argues that:

- Liberal and Western values are foreign to Eastern Christian civilization;
- There are higher values than liberty and democracy, and they should not prevail over the interests of the state;
- Russia's mission is to defend traditional conservative values (including family and orthodoxy);
- The US is a common enemy;
- The Eurasian state should extend from post-Warsaw Pact countries through the post-USSR to Manchuria, Mongolia and Tibet.

The common Western enemy narrative is currently being used to great effect: in Russia people are better mobilized 'against' something than 'for' a cause. It remains to be seen to what extent the common enemy approach will continue to be effective in the face of economic slowdown, but the practice of using foreign policy battles to mask the domestic economic problems has been proved to be an effective technique in the past, going back to Nikita Khrushchev. In practical terms, the economic slowdown will not affect many of the activities backed by the Kremlin. Their funding does not come from the national budget: they are more likely financed through money laundering.

Russia's foreign policy goals in the neighbourhood are dictated by Moscow's understanding of the region as a competitive zero-sum game, and its approach to civil society in foreign policy was fundamentally changed by the colour revolutions (from 2003). The Kremlin learnt a lesson from the US, and wants to use non-governmental organizations (NGOs) as instruments in foreign policy. Soft power is important; however, in Russia, soft power is understood as the power of coercion rather than of attraction. Influence gained by manipulation and creation of false threats and artificial enemies may work in the short term and serve tactical purposes, but in the long term its is hardly a viable strategy. Rhetorically, the Russian World is inflating, but in fact it is shrinking.

In terms of human rights, it is believed that attack is the best defence. Western approaches are mimicked to push an alternative narrative. For example, reports are frequently published that portray serious human rights violations in the Baltic states and more recently in Ukraine. A special Information Group on Crimes Against Persons has been created. Such groups feed the narrative voiced by Konstantin Dolgov, special representative on human rights at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Partner organizations

One of the speakers noted that the Russian World has a diverse set of champions in the neighbourhood. The Kremlin saw from the domestic experience of nationalizing Russian civil society that these loyal groups are useful to amplify pro-government messages in the public space. These groups began to be set up by the state from 2005 onwards. These include Russian World (2007), the Foundation for Compatriots (2009) and the Gorchakov Foundation (2011). The Federal Agency for CIS, Compatriots Living Abroad and International Humanitarian Cooperation was established in 2008. After Putin returned to the presidency in 2012, even more energy was applied to the rhetoric of public diplomacy and soft power. The Federal Agency receives $78 million annually from the state budget, and the smaller agencies (Russian World, Compatriots, Gorchakov, etc.) receive $22 million between them. This funding is supplemented by the private sector, as major Russian corporations are on the boards of such bodies.

The work of these organizations often goes beyond Russia's 'neighbourhood' and in fact targets Western institutions. For example, the Russian World Foundation has donated to British universities. Some elements of society are particularly vulnerable to this: as EU countries experience a turn towards right-wing parties, right- and left-wing cooperation has increased in the European Parliament, and in France and Germany, because of their common antipathy to Western globalization, NATO and the US.

The Russian government has many partners, including a large number of GONGOs (government-organized non-governmental organizations). There are around 150 such groups that cooperate with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, in addition to many members of the Civic Chamber. This is a formal cooperation, as they are funded by presidential grants ($70 million per annum combined).

These groups include conservative think tanks and pro-Kremlin experts (Izborskiy Club, Foundation for Strategic Culture, Centre for Social Conservative Policy, Foundation for Research of Problems of

Democracy), human rights groups (Moscow Bureau of Human Rights), election observers (Commonwealth of Independent States-Election Monitoring Organization – CIS-EMO, Organization for Democracy and Rights of People), youth groups (Youth Sodruzhestvo, Russian Youth Association), Eurasianist integration groups (Internationalist Russia, Foundation for Support of Eurasian Integration, Eurasians-New Wave, Young Eurasia).

Moscow also uses orthodox groups. Some are groups affiliated with the Moscow Patriarchate (*Den' Kreshchenia Rusi*). Private sector orthodox oligarchs such as Konstantin Malofeev and Vladimir Yakunin (who chair the St Basil's Foundation and St Andrew's Foundation respectively) also run Russian World programmes with Patriarch Kirill.

Non-systemic groups are led by Sergey Kurginyan and Aleksandr Dugin, while Cossack networks are also utilized to promote Russian foreign policy aims. The Russian registry lists 740,000 cossacks.

Groups active abroad focus on promotion of Russian language, Eurasian integration and demonization of the EU association agreements, defending human rights of compatriots, promotion of Christianity and conservative values as the core of Eurasian civilization, and defence of the Russian interpretation of history – particularly Second World War history. They serve as echo chambers for the Kremlin narrative that European values are foreign, European integration means European occupation, and the association agreements are used to lure states into NATO. They also mobilize people on to the streets for protests to undermine sovereignty and stir tensions.

They target three main groups in Russia's neighbourhood: the youth, the media and the elite. When targeting the youth, the aim is to consolidate the pro-Russian youth and provide them with skills and access to Russian thinkers and standards of journalism and diplomacy. This is done through forums (Seleger International, Dialogue for the Future, Balkan, Caucasus and Baltic Dialogues, Slavic Integration Forum). These forums promote Russian views on history and current events. For example, the Youth Eurasia Forum in Vanadzor, organized by the Foundation of Eurasian Cooperation, featured Dugin's vision and a book by Veronika Krasheninnikova, '*Killing Democracy: CIA and Pentagon Operations in the Post-Soviet Period*' (Krasheninnikova now works for the RIA Novosti Centre for International Journalism and Investigation). Recently, a *Russia Today* journalist gave a lecture on 'Censorship as an instrument for media freedom'.

Moldova

In Moldova, the use of non-state actors is part of the attempt to obscure the extent of Russia's power in the country. It was noted that the effects are difficult to measure, and it is hard to link action and effect or trace financial links and establish who the players are. The scope of non-state actors operating in Russian foreign policy interests is very wide in Moldova: it includes political parties, NGOs, local mass media, local authorities, priests, pop stars and others. Mapping this phenomenon, Moldovan intelligence agencies have identified more than 100 anti-Moldovan organizations. These strategies have a long history in Moldova, having been used by both tsarist Russia and in the USSR.

In order to exert political influence in Moldova, the Russian government has links with political parties. This is helped by the fact that in the Moldovan political system, most parties are 'parties of personalities' rather than 'programme parties', allowing the Kremlin to pursue its agenda more freely. Its main objective is to have as many allies as possible in the Moldovan parliament and impede Moldova's move towards the EU.

The Russian Federation has had links to Moldova's Communist Party (PKRM) since 2009, when Russia provided financial backing and other support (such as a photo opportunity with Patriarch Kirill) for party leader Vladimir Voronin on his visit to Russia in 2011. The ultimate aim was to undermine the government – the PKRM submitted several motions of no confidence in that period. From 2014 the Russian embassy in Moldova became dissatisfied with the PKRM: it tried, unsuccessfully, to mobilize the radical wing within the party and force an internal coup.

Instead, Russia has recently invested in Moldova's Socialist Party (PSRM). Russia has sponsored anti-EU propaganda for PSRM and Russian officials such as Sergey Mironov of *Spravedlivaya Rossiya* (A Just Russia party) attended the PSRM conference in September 2014 and advocated an anti-EU agenda. Meanwhile, the popular Russian singer Iosef Kobzon performed at a concert organized by the PSRM in support of EEU- integration. The party list contains two members who are former ambassadors to the Russian Federation.

The panel also noted the role of the church, which has been actively involved in campaigns to prevent signature of an anti-discrimination law and to prevent inroads of pro-EU parties. The League of Russian Youth and Motherland – Eurasian Union (tied to Rogozin) promote Russia by distributing St George's ribbons, organizing Christmas concerts and generally spreading Russia's political message.

Internet penetration in Moldova is growing, and the Kremlin is taking advantage of this by targeting the internet audience. The League of Russian Youth, for example, has created two websites. This helps to disseminate the Russian interpretation of world affairs, a goal that is supported by television. Local public channels are part of this process. In some regions, Eurasian Union advertisements are aired for free, whereas pro-EU adverts have to be paid for. The Moldovan government has recently been criticized for censoring Russian TV.

False legitimacy

The discussion then moved to the use of international mechanisms to legitimize the events in Crimea. The presence of international observers at the Crimea referendum in March 2014 allowed the Russian government to present the vote as having strong legitimacy. However, the observers themselves were far-right European representatives and representatives for pro-Russia branches of Western left-wing organizations.

After the 2003–04 colour revolutions the Kremlin understood the power of independent electoral monitoring commissions such as those sent by the OSCE to mobilize people against fraudulent elections. The Russian government realized that they needed their own version. The CIS observer mission had been created under Vladimir Rushailo, but it was too clearly a branch of Russian foreign policy to afford any legitimacy to elections it observed.

The idea for an alternative came from the far-right Russian politician and political scientist Aleksey Kochetkov (who had previously participated in the attempted coup of 1993), who created CIS-EMO. After 2003–04 this organization was given the green light to establish itself as an NGO and widen its mandate. Under Kochetkov, CIS-EMO pioneered the idea of inviting international observers from far-right and left-wing Western organizations to monitor elections in post-Soviet states. This was done partly through Kochetkov's own personal networks in various countries. He established links with Mateusz Piskorski (Polish People's Party), a proponent of pan-Slavic nationalism and the founder, in 2007, of the think tank European Centre for Geopolitical Analysis. Kochetkov also established a relationship with Luc Michel, a supporter of National Bolshevism and supporter of the ideas of Jean-François Thiriart, who wanted the

creation of a Euro-Soviet empire against the US. Michel's organization, the Eurasian Observatory for Democracy & Elections (founded in Brussels and Chisinau in 2006) also cooperates with CIS-EMO. Their first joint missions were to Transnistria, Abkhazia, South Ossetia and Nagorno-Karabakh.

While CIS-EMO never pushed the polls to favour one or another specific candidate, it did legitimize referendums and demonstrate that they were 'European' elections – a claim backed up by Piskorski and Michel both being EU citizens. CIS-EMO was also able to discredit the democratic process in Estonia by highlighting the flaws in the process. Thus, while not supporting a specific candidate *per se*, they still supported the Kremlin's foreign policy. Recently, CIS-EMO has clashed with the European Centre for Geopolitical Analysis, on account of their competing financially for the same Kremlin funding.

In 2010 a new group appeared – the Civic Control Association. It organizes electoral missions in post-Soviet states and works direct with Polish and Belgian organizations, cutting out CIS-EMO's role. The Civic Control Association in Russia organized the Crimean monitoring mission. From contacts in Belgian and Polish organizations they created lists of political monitors; these were then given to the Crimean parliament, which issued invitation letters to observers. During the Crimea referendum, Rossiya 24 showed clips of international observers, including politicians, coming to observe the voting; Luc Michel was even captioned 'OSCE mission head'. Thus, Russia evidently still cares about presenting these events as legitimate. Those engaged in election monitoring, such as Piskorski, are also often invited to appear as 'Western experts' on Voice of Russia and Russia Today, therefore their involvement in furthering Kremlin foreign policy aims goes beyond electoral monitoring.

Crimea and Novorossiya

In Crimea and Novorossiya, Russia tested the grounds for separatism and was playing on tensions among Ukrainians, Russians and Tatars. The Russian Community of Crimea (led by Sergey Tsekov) and the Crimean Cossack Union 2008 were actively sponsored by the Cooperation Agency, the Luzhkov Moscow Sevastopol Foundation and Moscow House in Crimea since 2008.

Since 2008, the youth movement run by Tsekov has been encouraged to demonstrate against NATO; in 2010 the movement staged a performance that symbolically destroyed the border between the Russian Federation and Ukraine. Tsekov also orchestrated a series of events that pro-Russian media amplified. It was Tsekov who staged the coup and installed Sergey Aksyonov (from the Russian Unity party with only four Crimean MPs) as the new prime minister to launch the annexation operation.

Novorossiya had its own 'spin doctors' – in the form of political technologists, Eurasianists and the Orthodox Church. They provided ideology, human and financial resources, moral support and solidarity. The survival of Novorossiya was presented as an existential issue for the entire Holy Russia.

To stir the Russian Spring against Kyiv, Dugin instructed the self-proclaimed leadership. The Izborskiy Club held a meeting in Donetsk to discuss how to build a new state of Novorossiya. Malofeev lent resources to Igor Girkin ('Strelkov') and Alekandr Borodai, who used to work in his company Marshall Capital. The St Basil's Foundation signed a memorandum of cooperation with the Donetsk People's Republic (DNR) and provided humanitarian assistance. Freedom fighters were recruited via Dugin, Limov, Russian Volunteers, the Russian Imperial Movement, Veterans and Cossacks.

The cultural building blocks were provided to create a national identity for Novorossiya: a history and national anthem were written; and works such as S.N. Plekhanov's book *Novorossiya: Rising from the Ashes* and a film, 'The Truth', were produced. There are currently about 10 information projects,

including the English-language *Novorossiya Today*. Most are hosted under the .su domain (originally assigned to the Soviet Union). They accuse Kyiv of atrocities and fascism, feeding into Kremlin-controlled virtual reality.

The civil society world has changed: Western NGOs no longer enjoy a monopoly of influence. Russia is reaching out to young people, to journalists, and to elites to promote its own integration projects – and to convince them to join the Russian World. The strength of these projects lies in their backing by Moscow's administrative resources, their united agenda and their media outreach, which creates an impression of strong presence in the public space.

They are weakened by the fact that their agenda does not reflect the interests of the target population; Russia's negative image impedes cooperation, and the attraction of the Russian model is dubious. Their emphasis on language as the defining marker of values and outlook is incorrect; only 11% of Russian-speaking Ukrainians ally themselves with Russian cultural tradition.

It was suggested that in order to combat this arm of Russian foreign policy, it is necessary to have transparency, use terminology correctly, introduce a good ethnic policy, and make sure that these groups and projects are seen for what they are. Moldova needs to change its legislation on funding at the local level. It was also argued that the role of the Orthodox Church in Ukraine should be curtailed – priests allegedly harbour military groups and use church premises for the military. It was recommended that pro-Western civil society, which does have a presence in Russia's neighbourhood, should be encouraged.

Media and Public Relations

Crafting the message

In the lobbying world, there is a fundamental difference of approach in the Western and Russian understanding of lobbying. Western lobbyists believe that it is a case of convincing people through the strength of one's arguments. Russian lobbyists tend to see money as a more crucial factor in convincing them, and tend to believe that everyone is for sale. They use multiple instruments for this purpose.

It was noted that there is clearly a high level of Russian activity in the lobbying sphere. However, success depends not on the level of activity, but on the quality of the message. Until Putin returned to the Kremlin in 2012, this activity was relatively successful. Western businesses and states gave Russia the benefit of the doubt for years. For example, in 2008 Putin was able to prevent NATO from offering a Membership Action Plan to Ukraine and Georgia.

While Russian credibility is therefore weak in the 'far abroad', it must be kept in mind that the effective targeting of resources also contributes to the success of a message; in the 'near abroad', Russia has a strong message and applies huge resources, and therefore achieves greater success. They are based on larger traditional networks compared with networks in the West. In Kyrgyzstan, for example, Russians were able to activate networks and they understood the way of doing business, leading to greater influence over the 'strategic community'.

The discussion also focused on the role of the business community. In the 'far abroad', Russian lobbying has had a significant impact on business communities in France, Germany and Italy, where it speaks up for Russian interests and against sanctions. This is a source of support for the Russian Federation, which has powerful advocates for keeping business links going. Whether from ignorance or expediency, there is a tendency to brush aside politics. In Germany, France and Italy, commercial links with Russia are

stronger and more developed than is the case in Britain. Russian penetration into the City of London is often exaggerated. According to recent Open Europe analysis, the amount of Russian capital in London is minimal. The City is not hostage to Russian capital, and would not go under without it. However, there is significant Russian influence in the legal community, which has led to the 'instrumentalization' of English courts.

Today, lobbying in the 'far abroad' is being undermined by Russian actions in Ukraine. Germany, particularly, has experienced a hardening of anti-Russian elements in discussion of how to handle Russia. Angela Merkel overruled the business community when it came to sanctions, delivering the message that some things are more important than money. Russian interests are well represented in other European countries such as Hungary, Slovakia, Bulgaria, Serbia and Greece, where old networks remain, there are a number of good business links and, in addition, Russia can use some gas leverage. By contrast, there is little penetration in Romania; however, Russian influence is still perceptible, as shown in the debates on shale gas.

The list of Valdai conference attendees this year contained a number of right-wing political figures from across Europe. This demonstrates the attractiveness of conservative values across Europe, not just in the Russian World. Conservative thinking is attractive to European countries at the moment. Anti-Americanism is also an effective approach in many European countries. This worked in the past, for example in forging an alliance between Putin, Jacques Chirac and Gerhard Schröder against military involvement in Iraq in 2003. The Valdai Club continues to promote this message.

There is currently a tendency to explain Russia's policy as the result of 'Versailles syndrome' in the wake of the break-up of the Soviet Union and consequent NATO expansion. Sergei Karaganov recently called the rules of this post-Cold War order 'Versailles politics in velvet gloves'. This, in combination with the idea that the situation in Ukraine is complicated rather than black and white, and that its geopolitical alignment is a matter for discussion with Russia, contributes to this Versailles discourse. This may be evidence of an internal re-examination under way in some places. One important victory of the Russian lobby in the EU has often gone unacknowledged: it has collectively been accepted that there is no military solution to the problem in Ukraine. This acceptance is crucial to Russia pursuing its agenda in Ukraine.

Furthermore, the Kremlin does not always have to deploy huge resources to convince people to believe its message. In some Central European states, such as Poland, the older generation – i.e. those who lived under communist rule – is disappearing. One of the participants suggested that members of the new generation do not understand the methods that were traditionally used in the Cold War era, and are therefore susceptible to their techniques. The Kremlin does not need to try so hard to enlist support for its agenda from this demographic.

In some countries, Russian interests have resonance because of cultural links, for example in Serbia. Belgrade has thus far skilfully managed to balance Russian interests with negotiations on entry into the EU. Pro-Russian networks are evidently active in Vienna, where Putin was greeted enthusiastically in June 2014, and close Austrian–Russian bilateral ties were espoused. There is clearly country-by-country variation on this issue. When the issue of EU sanctions extension comes up again next year (July 2015), it will be proof of where EU countries stand on Russia.

Information warfare

The discussion then moved to the uses of the information space, where warfare is increasingly being conducted. This kind of warfare is embodied in the Russian concept of *informatsionnaia voina*, which

translates as 'information war' but goes beyond this: it refers not to PR or propaganda, but to the weaponization of information, as frequently discussed by Dmitrii Kiselev, the head of Russia's official state-owned news agency (*Rossiia Segodnia*, made up of RIA Novosti and Voice of Russia). The heads of the Russian general staff have been writing about information war since 2008. It involves use of information for purposes of reflexive control, demoralizing the enemy, dividing and conquering, and paralysing opponents.

Several examples illustrate the power of this tactic. First, after MH17 was shot down, the Russian media churned out dozens of versions of possible events. This included the story that MH17 had been shot down accidentally by Ukrainian forces aiming at Putin's plane. This was not done out of ignorance, but was instead a cynical exercise in confusion that aimed to distort the media space and introduce uncertainty into the Western narrative.

It was also suggested that Russia uses the tactic of demoralization on its small neighbours. For example, Russian officials talk about invading Estonia. This is then reported by Western journalists, and, as a result, Western investment in Estonia plummets and the country's economy is damaged, leading to significant demoralization. In addition, 'trolls' are used in order to drain their opponents' psyche. This is the least significant form of information warfare; it involves continuous commenting and accusations online that require constant moderation. It is a way of 'keeping the infantry busy' – a decoy manoeuvre – and aims to wear down the other side.

Rossiia Segodnia continues to carry out Soviet-type *disinformatsiia* (disinformation), routinely using 'old-school' active measures to create fictionalized versions of events. Typically, a conspiracy theory will be reported, perhaps citing a fake twitter account. After a few days, having been exposed as a fake, the story will be taken down, sometimes with an apology and the implication that there was a genuine misunderstanding. However, the false information has already been released and has entered the narrative of an event.

The participants noted that, in normal circumstances, propaganda is the use of information to promote a cause, and is used by both sides. To this extent, information war in some form or other has accompanied every conflict throughout the ages. However, the Russian military is taking these techniques, focusing them, and funding them with administrative resources running into the billions of dollars. This has led to a qualitative shift in the level of disinformation. Western governments and societies do not have the analytical or institutional capacity to compete with Russia, and need to develop tools to deliver this.

It was suggested that coordination of the message exists at the top level, and that there is a direct link between Aleksei Gromov, deputy chief of staff of the presidential administration in Russia, and people in media channels – who are informed what to do. However, mapping this link is problematic, as even establishment members who used to understand the connection no longer do. One expert compared the level of coordination to the world of a reality TV show, in which everyone has defined roles that they have to play, but within that role, improvisation is possible.

The coordination was demonstrated when, for example, RIA Novosti tried to foment unrest in Kharkiv by publishing a story about the attempted latinization of the alphabet by Kyiv. The timing of the Mariupol' advance, on the other hand, coincided with Putin giving a speech about Novorossiya. The humanitarian convoy to Ukraine was also a stunning tactic. It worked as a diversion of action, and was impressively executed. This demonstrates clear use of *mnogokhodovka*: a multifaceted, coordinated approach.

The participants also debated some concrete actions that could be taken to combat the Kremlin-backed disinformation campaigns that currently distort the media space:

- Introduce more transparency of information. This has to be done academically as well, through a 'rinsing' of the system for what is information, what is disinformation and what is journalism. Introduce neutral parties, such as media ombudsmen and anti-propaganda experts, at newspapers and other media channels to filter out the ridiculous.
- Conduct information campaigns to combat disinformation. Create new versions of Cold War-era myth-busters that work both in the West and the region. Broadcast to the Russian Federation.
- There is a tendency of Western journalists to report everything the Russians say – a mentality of 'if they say it, it must be important' – that should be combated. When analysing Russia, one should bear in mind the difference between real ideology and articulated ideology: in the West we are failing to listen to the way in which the Kremlin really works. Currently, there is information that is not being used, and the countries that have this information, such as the Baltic states, need support.
- Stop focusing on motivation – why the Kremlin acts as it does – and instead deal with the consequences. We have to decide what we want, not try to work out what the Kremlin wants.