

## ENVIRONMENTAL SECURITY POLICIES OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION

 Toğrul İSMAYIL<sup>a</sup>

 Ali NECEFOĞLU<sup>b</sup>

### Abstract

Since the earliest times of history, humanity has been known to be fighting an existential war against nature. Although man's struggle against his natural environment has not caused severe damage to nature for centuries, human-induced natural environmental degradation has begun to be seen with modernization, the effect of which was experienced to a great extent in the 20th century. With both population growth and technological developments, humanity has achieved significant gains in its struggle for survival against nature, but these gains have turned against humanity itself with the irreversible deterioration of nature. This degradation, which started with environmental pollution in the past and resulted in climate changes today, has been taken care of by modern states, which have significant power in the governance of people. These modern states, which previously had a security perspective through their relations, have started to take steps as environmental problems harm their legitimacy and citizens. States had to come together to solve this common problem no matter how different they were in government type and ideology. Since the day it left the Soviet Union, the Russian Federation has not refrained from taking national steps toward the global environmental security regime. Although like many states, the fight against environmental problems has made mistakes and shortcomings, it has cooperated internationally for various reasons. The most important reason is that the Russian Federation is at the top of the list of states polluting nature. But apart from this, environmental security has been the area of interest of the Kremlin administration due to its geopolitical and geostrategic interests in the international system. Therefore, it has set targets on environmental security in documents such as foreign policy and security concepts adopted since the early 1990s. This study aims to examine the national and international environmental policies of the Russian Federation on global climate change. For this reason, firstly, a brief introduction to the subject of environmental security will be made, and the documents containing the political and security perspective of the Russian Federation will be discussed in the next section. In the last part, it will try to summarize what kind of international contribution and cooperation the Russian Federation has made in solving environmental problems.

**Keywords:** Russia, UNFCCC, Paris Climate Agreement, environment, security.



<sup>a</sup> Prof. Dr., Ankara Üniversitesi, Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi (görevlendirmeli), Ankara/Türkiye, togrul65@hotmail.com

<sup>b</sup> Arş. Gör., Kafkas Üniversitesi, İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi, Kars/Türkiye, alinecefoglu@hotmail.com

## RUSYA FEDERASYONU'NUN ÇEVRESEL GÜVENLİK POLİTİKALARI

### Öz

Tarihin ilk zamanlarından beri, insanlığın doğa karşısında bir varoluş savaşı verdiği bilinegelmektedir. İnsanın kendi doğal çevresine karşı verdiği mücadele yüzyıllar boyunca doğaya ciddi zararlar vermemiş olsa da 20. yüzyılda etkisi büyük oranda yaşanan modernleşmeyle birlikte insan kaynaklı doğal çevre bozulmaları görülmeye başlanmıştır. Gerek nüfus artışı gerekse teknolojik gelişmelerle birlikte, insanlık doğaya karşı verdiği hayatta kalma mücadelesinde önemli kazanımlar elde etmiş, fakat bu kazanımlar doğanın geri dönülemez şekilde bozulmasıyla insanlığın kendi aleyhine dönmüştür. Geçmişte çevresel kirlenmeyle sınırlı olan, yeni binyılda iklim değışiklikleriyle sonuçlanan bu bozulma, günümüzde insanlığın yönetilmesinde önemli güce sahip olan modern devletlerin dikkatini çekmeye başlamıştır. Önceleri kendi aralarındaki ilişkiler üzerinden güvenlik perspektifine sahip olan bu modern devletler, çevresel sorunlarının kendi meşruiyetlerine ve vatandaşlarına zarar vermesiyle birlikte bu konuda adımlar atmaya başlamışlardır. Yönetim biçimi ve ideoloji bakımından ne kadar farklı olsalar da devletler bu ortak sorunu çözmede bir araya gelmek zorunda kalmışlardır. Rusya Federasyonu da Sovyetler Birliđi'nde ayrıldığı gündünden itibaren küresel çevresel güvenlik rejimine yönelik ulusal ve uluslararası adımlar atmaktan geri durmamıştır. Her ne kadar birçok devlet gibi, çevre sorunlarıyla mücadele eksikler ve yanlışlar yapmış olsa da çeşitli sebeplerden dolayı uluslararası iş birliğinde bulunmuştur. Bunun en önemli sebebi, Rusya Federasyonu'nun doğayı kirleten devletler sıralamasında üstlerde bulunması kabul edilmektedir. Fakat bu sebepten başka çevresel güvenlik, Kremlin yönetiminin uluslararası sistemdeki jeopolitik ve jeostratejik çıkarları sebebiyle onun ilgi alanında olmuştur. Bu yüzden, 1990'ların başından itibaren kabul ettiği dış politika, güvenlik konseptleri gibi belgelerinde çevresel güvenlik konusunda hedefler belirlemiştir. Bu çalışmada, küresel iklim değışikliği konusunda, Rusya Federasyonu'nun ulusal çevre politikalarının ve bunun dış politikasına yansımalarının incelenmesi hedeflenmektedir. Bu sebeple, öncelikle çevresel güvenlik konusuna kısa bir giriş yapılırken, sonraki bölümde Rusya Federasyonu'nun politik ve güvenlik perspektifini içeren belgeler ele alınacaktır. Son bölümde ise, Rusya Federasyonu'nun çevre sorunlarının çözümünde küresel çevresel güvenlik rejimine ne gibi katkılar sağladığı özetlenmeye çalışılacaktır.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Rusya, BMİDÇS, Paris İklim Anlaşması, çevre, güvenlik.



## ПОЛИТИКА ЭКОЛОГИЧЕСКОЙ БЕЗОПАСНОСТИ РОССИЙСКОЙ ФЕДЕРАЦИИ

### Аннотация

Экзистенциальное противостояние человека и природы идет с древнейших времен. Несмотря на то, что на протяжении столетий оно не наносило комплексного ущерба окружающей среде, деградация экосферы из-за увеличения антропогенной нагрузки, возросшая в эпоху технологической модернизации, стала уже весьма отчетливо ощущаться и осознаваться в XX веке. Ввиду роста населения и развития технологий человечество добилось огромных успехов в покорении природы, но эти достижения обернулись комплексной деградацией окружающей среды. Противостояние деградации, которое началась с загрязнения природы в прошлом и приводит к изменению климата сегодня, является одной из основных проблем современных

государств, обладающих значительной властью в управлении людьми. Ранее использовавшие международные отношения лишь для создания себе гарантий безопасности, современные государства вынуждены предпринимать шаги на изменение и улучшение экологической обстановки, поскольку проблемы окружающей среды затрагивают интересы простых граждан, а нерешенность их способно ударить по законности и легитимности властей. Поэтому государства должны были объединиться для решения этой общей проблемы, какими бы разными они ни были по стилю и форме правления, а также идеологии. Со дня выхода из состава Советского Союза Российская Федерация не уклонялась от национальных и международных шагов по созданию режима глобальной экологической безопасности. Хотя, как и во многих государствах, борьба с экологическими проблемами имеет свои просчеты и недостатки, ее международное сотрудничество было мотивировано характерными исключительно для нее факторами. Самая главная причина заключается в том, что Российская Федерация находится на первом месте в списке государств, загрязняющих природу. Но и помимо этого, экологическая безопасность была особой сферой интересов кремлевской администрации из-за ее связи с геополитическими и геостратегическими интересами в международной системе. Поэтому цели по экологической безопасности были декларированы в таких документах, как внешняя политика и концепции безопасности, принятые с начала 1990-х годов. Настоящее исследование направлено на изучение национальной и международной экологической политики Российской Федерации в отношении глобального изменения климата. По этой причине, в работе сделано краткое введение в предмет экологической безопасности, а также проанализированы документы, содержащие политическую перспективу и безопасность Российской Федерации. Исследование пытается определить, какой международный вклад в решение экологических проблем внесла Российская Федерация в решение экологических проблем.

**Ключевые слова:** Россия, РКИКООН, Парижское соглашение по климату, экология, безопасность.



## Introduction

Security studies has been accepted as a field that can be considered as the core of the International Relations discipline since its formation. By looking at the Interwar period, when the seeds of discipline were sown, and the “Cold War” period, when the discipline emerged with great controversy, it is seen that security concerns lie at the core of the discipline. However, examining the mainstream works carried out until the last decade of the previous century, it is understood that the focus was primarily on interstate security problems. In this period, when states were accepted as the main actors, there was a distinction between “high politics vs low politics.” According to this distinction, issues related to military security were classified as “high politics”, while issues such as the environment were classified as “low politics.”<sup>1</sup> This situation has begun to change since the 1990s. After the end of the so-called “Cold War”, which has shaped the world political

<sup>1</sup> Ronald B. Mitchell, “International environmental politics”, *International environmental politics* 2 (2013): 803.

system with its international institutions, expanding the idea of security to include economic and environmental aspects is becoming a crucial acceleration. In this acceleration, the Russian Federation is also among the key players in global climate change policies. Although it has rich energy resources that significantly affect the world's climate, the country that has been at the forefront of greenhouse gas emissions for many years is the world's leading fossil fuel exporter<sup>2</sup> (Gordeeva, 2014: 167).

For this reason, the Russian Federation, which had embodied environmental risks and opportunities and was the focus of international efforts to promote environmental protection in the country in the 1990s, has global importance in shaping climate policies. This study aims to examine the national and foreign climate policies of the Russian Federation against these efforts on global climate change. In this direction, the Russian Federation's participation in global climate regime that is a global framework that aims to regulate the interaction of human activities with the global climate system in order to mitigate global climate change, will be examined, considering that many factors are behind the involvement in global processes. In addition, it will be discussed that the national and international climate policies of the Russian Federation are shaped within the framework of three different security approaches: participatory, skeptical, unconcerned.

### **1) Environmental Security and Its Transformation**

In its simplest terms, security is the state of protecting against or being resistant to potential harm caused by others. Security beneficiaries can be individuals and social groups, as well as objects, ecosystems, or any other entity vulnerable to interference. From the early years of the Cold War, when the question of national security was in vogue, the question of security for super powers in "bipolarity" was how to respond to each other's challenge. This challenge included ideological, social and economic criteria as well as military. Yet, the security conceptualization could easily be narrowed down to the military level. Since the 1980s, with the decline of military-political security issues at the center of security concerns, the expectation of war among some state groups had been largely disappeared. In addition to this diminishing concern for military security, the increasing securitization of two issues traditionally thought of as low politics came to the fore: the international economy and the environment.<sup>3</sup>

As mentioned in the introduction, in the 1990s, with the globalization process, a new understanding of security, emphasizing the role of non-state actors and threats beyond state-centered security, began to replace the military-oriented and state-centered security understanding in the international system. Although the relationship between a state's existence and security continued in this period, existential threats were not limited to military threats. As threats are interpreted from a broader perspective, new security areas have been identified. At the same time, because the reference point of security has been moved beyond a state, individuals, communities, economies, or ecosystems have

---

<sup>2</sup> Yelena M. Gordeeva, "The Russian Federation and the international climate change regime", *Carbon & Climate Law Review* (2014): 167.

<sup>3</sup> Barry Buzan, "Rethinking security after the Cold War", *Cooperation and conflict* 32/1 (1997): 6-7.

---

emerged as new reference points. In this context, in addition to military security, it is possible to talk about social security, political security, environmental security, and economic security.<sup>4</sup>

Parallel to this transformation in security perspective, some international institutions have changed security discourses. For instance, the idea of security was discussed within the framework of human security in the 1994 Human Development Report of the United Nations. On the other hand, human security has been defined as protecting people from “threats such as disease, hunger, unemployment, crime, social conflict, political pressure, and environmental problems, regardless of whether they are from developed or underdeveloped countries.<sup>5</sup> In addition, this report, which provides a long list of threats to human security, has classified most of these threats under seven main categories: economic security, food security, health security, environmental security, personal security, community security, and political security.<sup>6</sup> Although the content of environmental security is narrow in the report<sup>7</sup>, the scope of the concept of the environmental security is quite wide; it is defined and studied in different ways in the literature. For Obi<sup>8</sup>, environmental security controls a set of ‘threats’ or conflicts arising from the interaction between man and nature. These controls can extract natural resources or convert them into food, goods, and services for subsistence or profit. Environmental security is deemed to be superior to military security by Renner.<sup>9</sup> As it aims to “guard or to restore,” environmental security is stated to be superior because it is “positive and inclusive.” For Porter<sup>10</sup>, it “involves eliminating any threat to the well-being of societies and their populations posed by an external power.” Elliott<sup>11</sup> also states that human security and environmental security sometimes overlap and sometimes differ. Yet she notes that environmental security has been increasingly detached from its potentially heterodox and critical roots in human security.

As mentioned above, the scope of environmental security is quite broad. Resource shortages, climate change, drought, and other ecological disasters, as well as all the problems they create, are covered by environmental security. Some ecological issues have global effects, and climate change, an environmental security problem, is a global problem that directly or indirectly affects all systems.<sup>12</sup> The first physical repercussions of global climate change are the melting of glaciers, rising sea levels, droughts, deserts, floods, and the spread of disease. These physical effects will lead to food insecurity, livelihood insecurity, increased social tension, less access to clean water, impaired human health,

---

<sup>4</sup> Barry Buzan, “New patterns of global security in the twenty-first century”, *International Affairs* 67/3 (1991): 431-451.

<sup>5</sup> “Human Development Report 1994 (1994)”, UNDP, erişim 06.10.2022, <https://hdr.undp.org/system/files/documents//hdr1994encompletenostatpdf.pdf>.

<sup>6</sup> “Human Development Report 1994.” 24-25.

<sup>7</sup> “Human Development Report 1994.” 28-30.

<sup>8</sup> Cyril Obi, “Globalised images of environmental security in Africa”, *Review of African Political Economy* 27/83 (2000): 50.

<sup>9</sup> Michael Renner, *National Security: The Economic and Environmental Dimensions* (Washington D.C.: Worldwatch Inst, 1989), 63.

<sup>10</sup> Gareth Porter, “Environmental security as a national security issue”, *Current History* 94/592 (1995): 218.

<sup>11</sup> Lorraine Elliott, “Human security/environmental security”, *Contemporary Politics* 21/1 (2015): 11.

<sup>12</sup> Jon Barnett, “Security and climate change”, *Global Environmental Change* 13/1 (2003): 7.

reduced physical security, increased poverty, and increased migration. Despite all these possibilities, if states, societies, and individuals do not implement the right strategies, it may lead to the emergence of violent conflicts.<sup>13</sup>

Global climate change has been included in the environmental security issue as it includes ecological threats and directly reflects its effects on the environment. Climate change may cause many environmental, social, political, economic, and societal hazards for people. These threats also lead to the emergence of traditional security threats that governments must tackle.<sup>14</sup> However, the issue of climate security is generally addressed by four different security approaches in terms of what/who should be the unit of analysis. The first of these security approaches is the traditional security discourse, which argues that nation-states should be taken as the unit of analysis. The second discourse is the standard security discourse, which argues that the international community should be considered. The third is human security, which argues that people should be studied. And finally, ecological security argues that the ecosystem should be taken as the unit of analysis.<sup>15</sup>

In the traditional understanding of security, which argues that nation-states should be taken as the unit of analysis, global climate change may contribute to a state's failure by weakening the elements of national power, or it may affect national security by causing violent conflicts. National power, a combination of many environmental factors such as geography and resource adequacy, can be damaged by global climate change. At the same time, with the effects of global climate change, states may fail to protect their citizens and provide essential services adequately. And it can be stated that the scarcity of resources caused by the effects of the changes will lead to conflicts.<sup>16</sup>

On the other hand, the standard security understanding argues that the international community should be taken as the unit of analysis and emerges as a concept corresponding to international cooperation aiming to create a worldwide security area.<sup>17</sup> With the increase of interdependence, states are deprived of the ability to solve problems alone,<sup>18</sup> and collective solution of common issues in interstate relations becomes mandatory. Since the effects of climate change, a global crisis, are felt worldwide, ensuring greenhouse gas reduction by developing international mechanisms in this area and cooperation strategies has a vital function.<sup>19</sup>

The human security approach deals with individual security in two dimensions: the absence of fear of violence or conflict and the lack of poverty. The first dimension

<sup>13</sup> Dan Smith & Janani Vivekananda, *A Climate of Conflict: The Links between Climate Change, Peace and War* (London: International Alert, 2007), 3.

<sup>14</sup> Ole Magnus Theisen, Nils Petter Gleditsch & Halvard Buhaug, "Is climate change a driver of armed conflict?", *Climatic Change* 117/3 (2013): 614.

<sup>15</sup> Matt McDonald, "Discourses of climate security", *Political Geography* 33 (2013): 44.

<sup>16</sup> Matt McDonald, "Climate change and security: towards ecological security?", *International Theory* 10/2 (2018): 154.

<sup>17</sup> Hugh C. Dyer, "Environmental security as a universal value: implications for international theory", in *The Environment and International Relations* (Washington D.C.: Routledge, 2005), 34.

<sup>18</sup> Jeroen Warner, "Global environmental security: an emerging 'concept of control'?", in *Political Ecology: Science, Myth and Power* (London: Arnold, 2000), 261.

<sup>19</sup> Peter M. Haas, "The capacity of international institutions to manage Bhopal-like problems", *Epistemic Communities, Constructivism, and International Environmental Politics* (2015): 75.

considers human security as protecting the person from all types of violence threatening his life. In the second dimension, human security is handled as meeting the needs of people to lead a dignified life. Individuals' primary sources of insecurity are environmental threats affecting both dimensions of human security. The measures taken against climate change, one of the greatest environmental threats for individuals, are directed at the welfare of the people rather than a state in the human security approach.<sup>20</sup>

The ecological approach, which takes human and state-centeredness as the focal points of its criticism, suggests the following. Humanity's negative impact on the environment should be questioned, and mankind should learn to live in harmony with nature instead of controlling it. Thus, human beings are seen as an essential part of ecosystems and species, and ecosystems should be preserved for their own sake, not for their value to humans.<sup>21</sup> Some principles must be taken with international responsibility and cooperation to solve the global climate change problem within the ecological security framework. These are prohibiting ecological damage, taking sustainable development as a basis, exchanging information globally, carrying out environmental activities not only with states but also with the participation of individuals, resolving international disputes, and preventing transboundary ecological damage.<sup>22</sup> In summary, the idea emphasized here is that in the fight against global climate change, the interests of all environmental systems, including human beings, are taken into account, rather than only the interests of a state or the international community, or human beings.

As mentioned, different views are put forward by different security perspectives in the face of the environmental effects of global climate change and the situations caused by these effects. But not all of these policies are independent of environmental security. In other words, global climate change causes environmental threats directly or indirectly for individuals, states, and ecosystems. Therefore, environmental security is linked to national, human, and ecological security.

In the following sections, the concepts, doctrines and documents approved by the Russian Federation in the country on environmental security will be examined, as well as the participation of the Russian State in the international arena to solve global environmental problems. For a more detailed and unique study on this subject, Melek Sayın's master's thesis titled Environmental Security Practices in the Foreign Policy of the Russian Federation (2020)<sup>23</sup> can be examined.

## **2) Environmental Security Understanding of the Russian Federation in Official Documents**

By looking at the national policies of the Russian Federation on global environmental problems, it is possible to say that its domestic ecological policies have been in parallel with their foreign geopolitical policies. However, it can be said that these

<sup>20</sup> McDonald, "Discourses of climate security", 46.

<sup>21</sup> Nicole Detraz, "Environmental security and gender: Necessary shifts in an evolving debate", *Security Studies* 18/2 (2009): 351.

<sup>22</sup> Alexandre S. Timoshenko, "Ecological Security: Global Change Paradigm", *Colo. J. Int'l Env'tl. L. & Pol'y* 1 (1990): 127.

<sup>23</sup> Melek Sayın, "Rusya Federasyonu Dış Politikasında Çevresel Güvenlik Uygulamaları" (Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam Üniversitesi, 2020).

policies have contributed to the global initiative towards environmental problems. The first environmental laws put into effect by the Federation, established with the dissolution of the Soviet Union, are primarily related to the protection of some natural resources. For example, the Decree of May 5, 1992 (*Указ*)<sup>24</sup> was on the conservation and rational use of natural resources in Russian territorial waters and continental shelf, while the Decree of November 30, 1992,<sup>25</sup> was on a ban on the sale of precious and rare earth metals. Likewise, the Decree of December 16, 1993,<sup>26</sup> was about land use and conservation, while the Decree of December 23, 1993,<sup>27</sup> was on the protection of forests. In the 1990s, the most crucial Decree on environmental issues of the Russian Federation was the Decree of February 4, 1994.<sup>28</sup> This Decree lists the objectives under four headings to protect the environment and ensure sustainable development. In the Decree, the first three titles, “ensuring environmentally friendly sustainable development in the market economy,” “protecting the human environment,” and “rehabilitating the ecologically degraded places in the country”, focus on environmental problems in the country. In the fourth chapter, titled “participation in the solution of global environmental problems,” the steps to be taken by the state in terms of global environmental problems are mentioned. The following main areas of activity are targeted to develop international cooperation in the protection, conservation, and restoration of the world ecosystem: protection of biodiversity; protection of the ozone layer; prevention of anthropogenic climate change; protection of forests and afforestation; development and improvement of the system of specially protected natural areas; ensuring the safe destruction of chemical and nuclear weapons; solution of interstate environmental problems.

Likewise, there are parts related to environmental security in the concepts related to foreign policy and national security published since the establishment of the Russian Federation. For example, environmental issues were covered in the last chapter of “Foreign Policy Concept of The Russian Federation (1993),”<sup>29</sup> approved by President Boris Yeltsin in 1993. In this Concept, there is the goal of solving the state’s environmental problems, which was restructured by leaving the Soviet Union and accepted as the legacy of the USSR by using international ties that were created started over. The top priority in this area had been the development of multilateral and bilateral interaction with the rest of the world to facilitate the mitigation of environmental disasters in Russia. The steps to

<sup>24</sup> “Ob okhrane prirodnnykh resursov territorialnykh vod, kontinentalnogo shel’fa i ekonomicheskoi zony Rossiiskoi Federatsii (1992)”, Ekologicheskie Razdel Saita GPNTB Rossii, erişim 06.10.2022, [https://ecology.gpntb.ru/usefullinks/oficialdoc/zakonrf/zakons\\_ukaz/zakons\\_257/](https://ecology.gpntb.ru/usefullinks/oficialdoc/zakonrf/zakons_ukaz/zakons_257/).

<sup>25</sup> “O vidakh produktsii (rabot, uslug) i otkhodov proizvodstva, svobodnaia realizatsiia kotorykh zapreshchena (1992)”, Ekologicheskie Razdel Saita GPNTB Rossii, erişim 06.10.2022, [https://ecology.gpntb.ru/usefullinks/oficialdoc/zakonrf/zakons\\_ukaz/zakons\\_256/](https://ecology.gpntb.ru/usefullinks/oficialdoc/zakonrf/zakons_ukaz/zakons_256/).

<sup>26</sup> “Ob usilenii gosudarstvennogo kontrolya za ispol’zovaniem i okhranoi zemel’ pri provedenii zemel’noi reform (1993)”, Ekologicheskie Razdel Saita GPNTB Rossii, erişim 06.10.2022, [https://ecology.gpntb.ru/usefullinks/oficialdoc/zakonrf/zakons\\_ukaz/zakons\\_259/](https://ecology.gpntb.ru/usefullinks/oficialdoc/zakonrf/zakons_ukaz/zakons_259/).

<sup>27</sup> “O stavke otchislenii (sbora) na vosproizvodstvo, okhranu i zashchitu lesov (1993)”, Ekologicheskie Razdel Saita GPNTB Rossii, erişim 06.10.2022, [https://ecology.gpntb.ru/usefullinks/oficialdoc/zakonrf/zakons\\_ukaz/zakons\\_260/](https://ecology.gpntb.ru/usefullinks/oficialdoc/zakonrf/zakons_ukaz/zakons_260/).

<sup>28</sup> “O gosudarstvennoi strategii Rossiiskoi Federatsiipo okhrane okruzhaiushchei sredyi obespecheniiu ustoichivogo razvitiia”, Ekologicheskie Razdel Saita GPNTB Rossii (1994), erişim 06.10.2022, [https://ecology.gpntb.ru/usefullinks/oficialdoc/zakonrf/zakons\\_ukaz/zakons\\_262/](https://ecology.gpntb.ru/usefullinks/oficialdoc/zakonrf/zakons_ukaz/zakons_262/).

<sup>29</sup> Andrew Melville, *Russian Foreign Policy in Transition: Concepts and Realities* (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2005), 62-63.

be taken for this were listed as adjusting environmental standards to meet international norms, developing and carrying out a rational environmental policy, and mobilizing financial resources to solve any problem. In this Concept, a wide-ranging partnership in environmental protection has generally been seen as one of the components of international security and stability. Similar to this Foreign Policy Concept (1993), the National Security Concept<sup>30</sup> signed in 1997 mentions that the Russian Federation should take many environmental measures to protect and improve public health. In this Concept, the priority ways to ensure environmental security are listed as follows: using natural resources rationally and promoting ecological culture; raising safety standards in toxic industries, preventing radioactive contamination of the environment, minimizing the consequences of radiation accidents and disasters; ensuring that scrapped weapons, especially nuclear weapons, are stored in an ecologically safe manner; to ensure that chemical weapons stocks are stored and disposed of following the environment and health. The addition of environmental factors in this national security document, in which military factors are a premise, is essential in calculating environmental threats among the threats to the country's security.

At the early beginning of 2000, after the resignation of Boris Yeltsin, Vladimir Putin took the chair by acting as President. Soon after, he signed the new Foreign Policy Concept<sup>31</sup> and National Security Concept<sup>32</sup> on January 10, 2000. The basis of sharp transformations to be experienced in the foreign policy understanding of the Russian Federation was laid with these documents.<sup>33</sup> Since the policies regarding the formation of Russia's new relations with the world (primarily the West), proposed by the 1993 concept, were not realized, in these two concepts signed by the new President Putin, a distanced attitude towards the West was displayed. Contrary to the concepts of the 1990s, environmental security was not sufficiently addressed in the Foreign Policy Concept (2000) and National Security Concept (2000). The unipolar global system formed under the domination of the USA, the weakening role of the United Nations Security Council and the expansionary policy of NATO were perceived as threats in these Concepts. Instead, in the Foreign Policy Concept prepared against the ongoing unipolar system, there is no subsection on the environment but a short paragraph on environmental security: "Taking into account the growing threat of global natural and man-made disasters, the Russian Federation favors an expansion of international cooperation to ensure environmental security, including with the use of state-of-the-art technologies, in the interests of the entire global community."<sup>34</sup> In the National Security Concept 2000, although there is no sub-section related to the environment, similar steps to be taken regarding environmental security in the National Security Concept in 1997 are listed: rational use of natural resources and increasing environmental awareness of the population; toxic

---

<sup>30</sup> "National Security Concept of the Russian Federation", *Medzinárodné Otázky* 9/3 (2000): 99–118. erişim 06.10.2022, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/44963336>.

<sup>31</sup> Melville, *Russian Foreign Policy in Transition*, 89-104.

<sup>32</sup> Melville, *Russian Foreign Policy in Transition*, 105-128.

<sup>33</sup> Margot Light, "In search of an identity: Russian foreign policy and the end of ideology", *Journal of Communist Studies and Transition Politics* 19/3 (2003): 51.

<sup>34</sup> Melville, *Russian Foreign Policy in Transition*, 96.

industrial and consumer wastes; preventing radioactive pollution of the environment; ensuring the environmentally safe storage and use of nuclear weapons; secure storage and destruction of chemical weapons stockpiles; etc.

With the new President, the first important document that the Russian Federation put into effect regarding the environment was the Ecological Doctrine (2002),<sup>35</sup> which was adopted in 2002. This Doctrine, which forms the basis of the state's environmental policy, demonstrates the official attitude towards ensuring the country's sustainable development and, in the medium term (until 2010), the country's environmental protection principles, essential priorities, ways, and means. Ecological Doctrine (2002) consists of five main parts. In the introduction of the Doctrine, the main factors of environmental degradation at the global level are introduced (such as growth in consumption of natural resources, an increase in the population of the planet, degradation of the main components of the biosphere, depletion of the Earth's ozone layer, etc.). In the first chapter, General Provisions, it is added that this Doctrine also takes into account the recommendations of the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, held in Rio de Janeiro in 1992, and subsequent international forums on the environment and sustainable development. In the following sections, the strategic aims and objectives, main aspects and fields of state policy activity, and the ways of implementing state policy are explained in detail. In the last part of the Doctrine, the steps aimed at taking into account the interests of the Russian Federation in international cooperation against environmental problems are mentioned: participation of the Russian Federation in consolidating the efforts of the world community to preserve the environment; promoting the greening of the provisions of existing and planned international treaties; active participation in international environmental organizations; preemptive impact on the process of globalization through the active participation of the Russian Federation in international negotiations.

The Foreign Policy Concept (2008),<sup>36</sup> approved by Dmitry Medvedev shortly before the war with Georgia, also claims to complement and develop the Foreign Policy Concept (2000). In this Concept, the discourse on the increasing importance of environmental factors, the recognition of environmental pollution among global threats, and the counting of economic and environmental cooperation among the priorities in solving global problems are essential in terms of the Kremlin's relevance in this regard. The section titled "Priorities of the Russian Federation in the Solution of Global Problems" of this five-part Concept mentioned that the Russian Federation is in favor of expanding international cooperation to ensure environmental security and counter climate changes on the planet in the interest of the entire world community. Priorities in this topic include increased interaction with all governments of the world in the field of environmental protection to further develop science-based approaches to nature conservation and ensure the

---

<sup>35</sup> "Rasporiazheniem Pravitel-stva Rossiiskoi Federatsii ot 31 avgusta 2002 g", Legal Office FAOLEX – Food and Agriculture Organization of the United States, erişim 06.10.2022, <http://extwprlegs1.fao.org/docs/pdf/rus46915.pdf>.

<sup>36</sup> "The Foreign Policy Concept of the Russian Federation (2008)", Permanent Mission of the Russian Federation to the European Union, 12, erişim 06.10.2022, [https://russiaeu.ru/userfiles/file/foreign\\_policy\\_concept\\_english.pdf](https://russiaeu.ru/userfiles/file/foreign_policy_concept_english.pdf).

---

sustainable development of present and future generations. The document called “National Security Strategy of the Russian Federation to 2020”,<sup>37</sup> which was put into effect in 2009 and consisted of 8 chapters and 122 articles, also defines the strategic interests and national priorities of the Russian Federation. However, there are no significant differences from the previous security concept. In the eighth and last title, the main strategic objective is protecting and restoring natural systems, eliminating the environmental consequences of global climate change, and increasing economic activities concerning environmental security, which is mentioned in four articles.

However, while we focus on the national policies of the Russian Federation on global climate change, the Climate Doctrine (2009)<sup>38</sup> has an important place. In the Doctrine, the issue of climate change has been defined as one of the most important international problems. It has been stated that climate change will inevitably affect the lives of people, flora, and fauna in all regions of the planet. In some countries, it will become a tangible threat to the population’s well-being and sustainable development. In this context, the Russian Federation defined climate change as one of the long-term security factors. It emphasized the national and international dimensions of the issue by placing the global climate change problem among its national and foreign policy priorities. In short, this Doctrine is a system of views on the state’s climate policy’s aim, principles, content, and ways. It mentions analyzing the results of studies on climate change in the Russian Federation and the effects of these changes on various sectors of the economy, population, and environment. The strategic aim of climate policy is expressed in the following words in the document: “The strategic goal of climate policy is to achieve secure and sustainable development of the Russian Federation, including institutional, economic, environmental and social as well as demographic aspects of development in the context of changing climate and emerging challenges.” In addition, the basic principles of climate change are listed as follows:

- the global context of the Russian Federation’s interests in climate change and its impacts
- the priority of national interests in the implementation and development of climate policy
- clarity of climate policy and transparency of information
- recognition of the need for local and international equal partnership actions of the Russian Federation in the framework of international research programs and projects on climate change
- prudent planning and implementation of measures to protect people, the economy, and the state from the adverse effects of climate change
- comprehensive assessment of *potential losses and benefits* related to climate

---

<sup>37</sup> “National Security Strategy of the Russian Federation to 2020 (2009)”, MepoForum.sk – Fórum pre medzinárodnú politiku, erişim 06.10.2022, <http://mepoforum.sk/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/NDS-RF-2009-en.pdf>.

<sup>38</sup> “Climate Doctrine of the Russian Federation (2009)”, En.Kremlin.ru – President of Russia, erişim 06.10.2022, <http://en.kremlin.ru/supplement/4822>.

---

change

As summarized in the last section, it has been emphasized that climate change, especially the melting of the glaciers and the opening of the Arctic Sea to transportation, has positive features in the Russian Federation. It is also emphasized that it focuses on ensuring the safety of people, the economy and the state from its adverse effects.

In addition, there has been increasing discourse on environmental security in the government documents adopted in the following years. For example, the document named “Principles of the State policy in the area of environmental development of the Russian Federation for the period up to the year 2030” (2012)<sup>39</sup> was the first strategic document in the Russian Federation. This document aims to balance economic development interests and environmental protection. Moreover, in the Foreign Policy Concept (2013)<sup>40</sup>, the expressions repeated in the previous papers are included: “Along with military power, such important factors of influence of states on international politics as economic, legal, scientific, technical, environmental, demographic and informational are brought to the fore.” In this Concept, under the title of “Priorities of the Russian Federation in the decision Global Challenges”, articles on how to ensure environmental security are included in the sub-title of “International economic and environmental cooperation”. This Foreign Policy Concept (2013), like the Foreign Policy Concept (2008), claimed that the Russian Federation was in favor of expanding international cooperation to ensure its environmental security and address climate change on the planet in the interests of the global community. The Foreign Policy Concept (2016)<sup>41</sup> also touched upon the environment under similar titles to the Foreign Policy Concept (2013), in addition to the Paris Climate Agreement adopted within the scope of the 1992 UNFCCC. Finally, Vladimir Putin, who declared the “Year of the Ecology”<sup>42</sup> in the country in 2017, approved the Decree “Strategy of Environmental Security until 2025”<sup>43</sup> for this purpose. This document, which can be considered as the second strategy document of the Russian Federation on environmental security, has a more comprehensive content than the Decree “Principles of the State policy in the area of environmental development of the Russian Federation for the period up to the year 2030” (2012).

### 3) Involvement of the Russian Federation in International Environmental Regimes

Global warming and climate change, which are among the problems that states cannot solve alone, require interstate cooperation. These problems can lead to severe consequences if measures are not taken. Global warming, the most common

<sup>39</sup> “Utverzhdeny osnovy gosudarstvennoi politiki v oblasti ekologicheskogo razvitiia Rossii na period do 2030 goda (2012)”, Kremlin.Ru, erişim 06.10.2022, <http://kremlin.ru/events/president/news/15177>.

<sup>40</sup> “Kontseptsiia vneshnei politiki Rossiiskoi Federatsii (2013)”, Zakony, Kodeksy Inormativno-Pravovye Aktyrossiiskoi Federatsii, Erişim Tarihi: 06.10.2022, <https://legalacts.ru/doc/kontseptsiya-vneshnei-politiki-rossiiskoi-federatsii-utv-prezidentom>.

<sup>41</sup> “Kontseptsii vneshnei politiki Rossiiskoi Federatsii (2016)”, Kremlin.Ru, erişim 06.10.2022, <http://www.kremlin.ru/acts/bank/41451>.

<sup>42</sup> Thomas Nilsen, “2017 To Be Putin’s Year of Ecology”, The Independent Barents Observer (2016), erişim 25.10.2020, <https://thebarentsobserver.com/ru/node/280>.

<sup>43</sup> “O Strategii ekologicheskoi bezopasnosti Rossiiskoi Federatsii na period do 2025 goda (2017)”, Kremlin.Ru, erişim 06.10.2022, <http://kremlin.ru/acts/bank/41879>.

environmental problem today, is caused by the excessive release of harmful greenhouse gases into the atmosphere and leads to climate change. The Swedish chemist Svante Arrhenius put forward pioneering studies on this subject in 1896. Arrhenius drew attention to the possibility of climate change if carbon dioxide gases emitted into the atmosphere continue.<sup>44</sup> At the global level, climate change was first brought to the agenda with the 1988 Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). In this panel, scientific data and the possible effects of climate change were discussed, and politicians were informed about what strategies could be developed against them.<sup>45</sup> The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) is one of the most important regulations related to climate change. This Convention, which was opened for signature at the Rio Conference in 1992, is an essential step in establishing a regime for climate change. It aims to prevent human interference in the climate system by reducing human-induced greenhouse gas emissions globally.<sup>46</sup> The UNFCCC's highest decision-making body is the Conference of the Parties (COP). The first conference was held in Berlin in 1995. At this conference, it was emphasized that necessary measures should be taken to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels in 2000. This process, which did not have legally binding targets and started in Berlin, continued with adopting the Kyoto Protocol at the 3rd Conference of the Parties held in Kyoto, Japan, in 1997.<sup>47</sup> Some necessary steps have been taken, which can also be called post-Kyoto Protocol arrangements and can be considered preparations for the 2015 Paris Climate Agreement. These include the 2007 Bali Action Plan, the 2009 Copenhagen Consensus, the 2010 Cancun Agreements, the 2011 Durban Platform, and the 2012 Doha Climate Gateway.<sup>48</sup> At the Paris Climate Summit, also known as the 21st Conference of the Parties, a historic global agreement was reached after various unsuccessful negotiations. The Paris Agreement is of such a nature that it will profoundly affect societies, economies, and the environment on a global, regional and local scale. In the Protocol, it has been accepted that all parties take responsibility for emission reduction. Unlike Kyoto, the global temperature target was determined, and it was decided to keep the world's warming below 2 C° as much as possible.<sup>49</sup>

After mentioning the basic steps such as UNFCCC, Kyoto Protocol, and Paris Climate Agreement for a better understanding of international cooperation in the solution of global environmental problems, the position of the Russian Federation can be more easily mentioned due to its legacy of environmental issues inherited from the USSR, and as the

<sup>44</sup> Jesse H. Ausube, "Historical note", In *Changing Climate: Report of the Carbon Dioxide Assessment Committee* (Washington D.C.: National Academy Press, 1983), 488.

<sup>45</sup> Bernd Siebenhüner, "The changing role of nation states in international environmental assessments-the case of the IPCC", *Global Environmental Change* 13/2 (2003): 113.

<sup>46</sup> E. Lisa F. Schipper, "Conceptual history of adaptation in the UNFCCC process", *Review of European Community & International Environmental Law* 15/1 (2006): 82.

<sup>47</sup> Peter Newell, & Matthew Paterson, "From Geneva to Kyoto: The second conference of the parties to the UN framework convention on climate change", *Environmental Politics* 5/4 (1996): 729.

<sup>48</sup> Marinella Davide, "The Doha Climate Gateway: A First Key-Point Assessment", *Review of Environment, Energy and Economics* (2012), erişim 25.10.2022, [https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/Delivery.cfm/SSRN\\_ID2189448\\_code1809440.pdf](https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/Delivery.cfm/SSRN_ID2189448_code1809440.pdf).

<sup>49</sup> Sushanta Kumar Mahapatra & Keshab Chandra Ratha, "The 21st Conference of the Parties Climate Summit in Paris: a slippery slope", *Journal of International Development* 28/6 (2016): 991.

largest country in the world in terms of area. The Russian Federation, like the Soviet Union from which it emerged, is still a significant contributor to global and environmental degradation. In this respect, it is considered one of the key players in international climate change policies. In addition, the Russian Federation, which is among the countries emitting the most greenhouse gases, causes concern, especially in neighboring countries, due to the transboundary air and water pollution it causes.<sup>50</sup> As a major supplier of hydrocarbons for world energy consumption, the country significantly influences the world's climate. Since it is the world's leading exporter of fossil fuels, it has been at the forefront of greenhouse gas emissions for many years.<sup>51</sup> Therefore, the climate policies of the Russian Federation have an important place in the world.

UNFCCC was signed by the Russian Federation on June 13 1992, and ratified on December 28 1994. In this direction, the Russian state has undertaken the essential obligations of the Convention. UNFCCC was signed by the Russian Federation on June 13 1992, and ratified on December 28 1994. In this direction, the Russian state has undertaken the essential obligations of the Convention.<sup>52</sup> The Russian Federation is among the "Annex-I countries in the process of transition to a market economy" in the UNFCCC. Annex-I parties to the Convention are obliged to develop policies to reduce their greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels and take measures to limit them.<sup>53</sup> In the 1990s, multilateral agreements were seen by the Russian Federation as a means of cooperation. Russia did not hesitate about this Convention due to its collapsed economy and decreasing greenhouse gas emissions after the USSR. It happened because this Convention is seen as a means of integration with the West. In this respect, the signing of multilateral environmental agreements in the state's interests has been considered the most logical move because integration into the international community is necessary for the stability of the state. Thus, the Russian Federation's attitude towards this Convention has been shaped by national security and common security approaches. While the national security approach puts the State in the center, and the common security approach places the international community in the center.

The Russian Federation signed the Kyoto Protocol, also expressed as the concrete version of the UNFCCC, on March 11, 1999, and ratified it on November 18, 2004. The Russian Federation played a critical role in this process, where the approval of the countries responsible for 55 percent of global greenhouse gas emissions was needed for the Kyoto Protocol to enter into force. The treaty could not enter into force without the Russian Federation, which accounts for 17% of the total emissions, as one of the largest polluters, the United States, withdrew from the treaty in 2001. After a long internal debate and bargaining with other pro-Kyoto parties, the Russian Federation ratified the Kyoto

<sup>50</sup> Galina Semenova, "Global environmental problems in Russia", *E3S Web of Conferences*, 157, (2020): 1.

<sup>51</sup> L. P. Gossen & L. M. Velichkina, "Environmental problems of the oil-and-gas industry", *Petroleum Chemistry* 46/2 (2006): 68.

<sup>52</sup> Stavros Afionis & Ioannis Chatzopoulos, "Russia's role in UNFCCC negotiations since the exit of the United States in 2001", *International Environmental Agreements: Politics, Law and Economics* 10/1 (2010): 46-47.

<sup>53</sup> "United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change", United Nations (1992): 23, erişim 25.10.2022, <https://unfccc.int/resource/docs/convkp/conveng.pdf>.

Protocol in 2004.<sup>54</sup>

When we look at the internal discussions on the signing of the Protocol, we see three main storylines.<sup>55</sup>

**a) Storyline I: a political pact with only benefits to Russian Federation**

According to this group, the Protocol would benefit the Russian Federation because it contained few obligations. It was also thought that exceeding the initial commitment period target was unrealistic and that modernizing the industry through Joint Implementation, one of the flexibility mechanisms, would support economic growth in the long run. Also, another important argument for the ratification of the Protocol concerned foreign policy benefits. It was emphasized how the entry into force of the Kyoto regime would make the Russian Federation a “civilized” country in the international arena and even increase its image as an “environmental leader”. Also, another argument was that rejecting the Agreement could lead to losing confidence in the international community. Leading figures in this group are State Duma Deputy, Chairman of the Ecology Committee Vladimir Gratchev, President of Roshydromet Alexander Bedritsky, climate policy experts such as Viktor Danilov-Danylian, and representatives of the then electricity monopoly RAO UES Rossii.

**b) Storyline II: threats to and conspiracy against Russian Federation**

Those in this group who opposed ratification believed that the Russian Federation’s emission levels would exceed the Kyoto limits during the first commitment period (2008-12). If the Russian Federation signed this Protocol, a conspiracy to slow economic growth, it would either have to limit its economic growth or purchase additional emissions allowances to increase its emissions allowances. They also opposed those who aimed to trade emissions, considering that it was not possible to exceed 1990 levels. This group also questioned whether there would be sufficient benefit from the Kyoto mechanisms, as the US, the expected primary recipient of Russian appropriations, has withdrawn, and there is no other ‘guaranteed’ recipient. In addition, it was feared that domestic industrial actors would rush to sell Russian quotas for short-term benefits, thus removing the future gap for economic growth. It was even said that one of the purposes of this Protocol was to gain access for foreigners to the natural resources of the Russian Federation. Thus, it was thought that this Protocol would increase control over the Russian Federation. In addition, the environmental motivations of the EU as a supporter of the Kyoto regime were questioned. Among the prominent figures in this group were the President’s economic adviser Andrey Illarionov, some high-ranking politicians such as Prime Minister Mikhail Fradkov and various State Duma deputies.

**c) Storyline III: ineffective pact without scientific basis**

Another group opposed to the Protocol criticized the document as “lacking scientific basis”. Since this Protocol will not adequately limit greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere, it is considered that it does not have a positive

<sup>54</sup> Anna Korppoo, Nina Tynkkynen & Geir Hønneland, *Russia and the politics of international environmental regimes: Environmental encounters or foreign policy?* (Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing, 2015), 23.

<sup>55</sup> Korppoo, Tynkkynen & Hønneland, *Russia and the politics of international environmental regimes*, 27-30.

environmental impact in solving the problem of climate change. Possible benefits of climate change were mentioned. Putin made his famous joke at the 2003 World Conference on Climate Change in Moscow: “If the climate gets warmer in Russia, then we wouldn’t need to spend so much money on fur hats.” The members of this discussion group stated that it should be recognized as an “ecological donor”, referring to the Russian Federation’s forests and the carbon it absorbs from the atmosphere. It has even been claimed that compensation should be paid to the Russian Federation for this ecological service. Since the Russian Federation played an essential role in the Protocol’s entry into force, it was argued that Moscow should demand more ‘privileges’. The leading figures in this debate are some Duma deputies and academics, Yuri Izrael and Kirill Kondratev.

Japan, Canada, and the Russian Federation also did not participate in the second commitment period (2013-20), as neither the United States, China, nor leading emerging economies such as India gave the green light for the second commitment period (2013-20). The main criticism of the Russian Federation towards the Protocol is that it does not reduce emissions to all significant greenhouse gas emitters. In his speech in Durban, Alexander Bedritsky recalled the data indicating that China and the USA, neither legally required to reduce emissions, are responsible for 41% of global greenhouse gases. Therefore, in the Russian Federation’s perspective, the Kyoto Protocol in its current form (i.e. without the involvement of significant emitters) neither solves global warming problems, ensures global warming at 2 C°, nor provides environmental integrity. For this reason, the Russian Federation has vehemently argued that the international climate change regime needs a comprehensive, integrated agreement that will include all developed and developing countries, especially the main emitters of greenhouse gases.<sup>56</sup>

Under these conditions, only the EU and some small developed countries remained in the second commitment period. In addition, internal discussions on the Russian Federation’s participation in the second commitment period continued, advocating the realization of accession as it involves economic benefits without burdensome commitments and non-participation due to low coverage and lack of economic benefits. However, this has been less than the international interest in the Russian Federation’s ratification of the Protocol.<sup>57</sup> When we look at the internal discussions of the Russian Federation regarding the Kyoto Protocol, we see that detailed benefit-loss analyzes have been made. While focusing on economic losses in terms of casualties, foreign policy and economic benefits are emphasized in the benefits discourse. Environmental concerns are, of course, officially recognized as a reason for participation. Still, there is almost no emphasis in internal discussions on environmental concerns (with the partial exception of the third storyline). Generally, global cooperation against climate change is considered a positive-sum game because it benefits everyone. However, the effects of climate change are seen more as a zero-sum game by the Russian Federation. This view also explains its attitude towards climate regimes. As can be seen, the fate of the Kyoto Protocol largely depended on the decision of the Russian Federation to ratify it. In this respect, reaching a

<sup>56</sup> Andrzej Turkowski, “№ 027: Russia’s International Climate Policy”, *Polski Instytut Spraw Międzynarodowych - The Polish Institute of International Affairs* 27 (2012): 5.

<sup>57</sup> Korppoo, Tynkkynen & Hønneland, *Russia and the politics of international environmental regimes*, 31-32.

new international climate agreement without its decision is not an option.<sup>58</sup>

The Paris Climate Agreement (2016) is the last point reached in the climate regime, with national contribution targets that impose emission limitation obligations for all countries and allow emission reductions at the parties' discretion. Although the discussions within the Russian Federation on the Paris Agreement continued, the Agreement was ratified in 2019. Prime Minister Dmitry Medvedev announced that he had approved it because the climate change that is taking place could endanger the safety of people living in permafrost regions that cover two-thirds of the country, as well as key sectors such as agriculture. Under the agreement, the Russian Federation has pledged to reduce emissions to 25 to 30 percent of 1990 levels by 2030. But as of 2017, Russian Federation's emissions are 32 percent lower than in 1990. The non-governmental organization, The Climate Action Tracker, included Russian Federation among the five "critically inadequate" countries for the Paris Climate Accords.<sup>59</sup> In a statement released from an Arctic Forum held in the northern Russian city of Arkhangelsk, Putin claimed that icebergs had been melting for decades and argued that global warming was not humanity's fault.<sup>60</sup> In addition, in a session within the scope of Russia Energy Week, Vladimir Putin expressed that he was not affected by the speech of 16-year-old climate activist Greta Thunberg, who attracted attention with her speech at the UN Climate Summit. He continued: "No one has explained to Greta that the modern world is complex and different and ... people in Africa or in many Asian countries want to live at the same wealth level as in Sweden."<sup>61</sup>

To summarize, the Russian Federation has a global impact due to its natural resources and the environmental pollution it causes. Especially in the 1990s, the Russian Federation has been the focus of international efforts to promote environmental protection in the country. It signed almost all major international environmental and natural resource agreements during this period. It participated, although only sometimes very actively, in all significant environmental policy processes at the global level. However, as in other countries, participation in environmental processes is not only for environmental reasons. Because environmental agreements are not only environmental agreements, they also include international relations, geopolitics, resource struggles, scientific debates, trade issues and domestic policy struggles. The participating countries' foreign policy and diplomatic traditions inevitably define negotiation styles in international environmental policies. International and domestic policy objectives mutually constitute the state's position against the global regime. Therefore, the state's participation in international environmental regimes is not just a matter of environmental

---

<sup>58</sup> Gordeeva, "The Russian Federation and the International Climate Change Regime", 167.

<sup>59</sup> Alec Luhn, "Russia Ratifies Paris Climate Accord-but Targets Are 'Critically Insufficient,'" *The Telegraph* (2019), erişim 25.10.2022, <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2019/09/23/russia-ratifies-paris-climate-accord-targets-critically-insufficient/>.

<sup>60</sup> "Russian President Vladimir Putin Says Humans Not Responsible for Climate Change", *France 24* (2017), erişim 25.10.2022, <https://www.france24.com/en/20170331-russian-president-vladimir-putin-says-humans-not-responsible-climate-change>.

<sup>61</sup> Vladimir Soldatkin & Dmitry Zhdannikov, "Putin: I Don't Share Excitement about Greta Thunberg's U.N. Speech", *Reuters*, (2019), erişim 25.10.2022, <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-russia-putin-thunberg-idUSKBN1WH1FM>.

concerns.<sup>62</sup> From this point of view, one of the reasons the Kyoto Protocol was signed by the Russian Federation in 2004 was its desire to get support from the EU for its membership in the World Trade Organization (WTO). WTO membership has been important for Putin, who aims to attract more foreign investment to the country and provide advantages for Russian companies in global trade. As a result, after the Russian Federation signed the Kyoto Protocol, the EU announced its support for Moscow's entry into the WTO.<sup>63</sup>

### Conclusion

Climate change is one of the biggest global problems. Among the largest exporters of nuclear technology, oil, and fossil fuels, the Russian Federation also occupies the first place in greenhouse gas emissions. For this reason, it has a crucial role in climate policies with its significant hydrocarbon resources and natural riches. However, the UNFCCC, the first comprehensive initiative on climate change, was approved by the Russian Federation early. The primary reason for this was that the UNFCCC (1992) was not binding. In addition, during the economic crisis after the collapse of the USSR, greenhouse gas emissions decreased significantly. By the time of the Kyoto Protocol (1997), the approval of the Russian Federation became more critical, as the countries responsible for 55% of global greenhouse gas emissions were required for the Protocol to enter into force. This situation caused internal discussions for a long time in the Russian Federation about whether the Protocol should be signed or not and benefit and harm analyses made.

On the one hand, possible economic and foreign policy benefits were evaluated, and different groups focused on financial losses. The Protocol was approved by the Russian Federation in 2004, as the benefits outweighed the result of these discussions, where environmental concerns were seldom encountered. The support for the WTO membership of the Russian Federation, which wants to gain advantages in global trade, is a reason for this approval. After the signing of the Protocol by the Russian State, the EU announced that it supported Moscow's entry into the WTO. In the post-Kyoto Protocol process, the Paris Climate Agreement has begun to discuss which is more comprehensive and imposes responsibilities on all states. The Russian Federation, which put on the agenda to be accepted as an ecological donor due to the forests it previously owned, could not fulfil the guarantees it gave on greenhouse gas reduction, although it signed this agreement. Apart from this, Vladimir Putin's attitude towards climate change also affects the State's climate policies. Putin stated that global warming is not a human error and that if it happens, it will not lead to such harmful consequences for a northern country like the Russian Federation.

By signing the UNFCCC, the Russian Federation, whose multilateral agreements are essential for the state's continuity, has acted within the framework of traditional security and common security understanding. On the subject of the Kyoto Protocol, the emphasis on global cooperation and internationalism against climate change are within the

---

<sup>62</sup> Korppoo, Tynkkynen & Hønneland, *Russia and the politics of international environmental regimes*, 3.

<sup>63</sup> Guy Chazan, "EU Backs Russia's WTO Entry as Moscow Supports Kyoto Pact", *Wall Street Journal* (2004), erişim 25.10.2022, <https://www.wsj.com/articles/SB108514021459817981>.

framework of a common security understanding. There are traces of the traditional security understanding that puts the state at the center of the internal discussions on the Kyoto Protocol. The Paris Climate Agreement, emphasizing that its position should be taken into account at the maximum level and agreeing on some articles, is again a state-centered security approach. In this regard, during both Medvedev and Putin eras, climate change policies have been shaped within the framework of national security.



**Beyanname:**

- 1. Etik Kurul İzni:** Etik Kurul İzni gerekmemektedir.
- 2. Katkı Oranı Beyanı:** Yazarlar, makaleye eşit oranda katkı sağlamış olduklarını beyan etmektedirler.
- 3. Çıkar Çatışması Beyanı:** Yazarlar, herhangi bir çıkar çatışması olmadığını beyan etmektedirler.

**Declarations:**

- 1. Ethics approval:** Not applicable.
- 2. Author contribution:** The authors declare they have contributed equally to the article.
- 3. Competing interests:** The authors declare no competing interests.



**BIBLIOGRAPHY**

- Afionis, Stavros, & Ioannis Chatzopoulos. "Russia's role in UNFCCC negotiations since the exit of the United States in 2001." *International Environmental Agreements: Politics, Law and Economics* 10/1 (2010): 45-63.
- Ausübe, Jesse H. "Historical note." In *Changing Climate: Report of the Carbon Dioxide Assessment Committee* (Washington D.C.: National Academy Press, 1983), 487-491.
- Barnett, Jon. "Security and climate change." *Global Environmental Change* 13/1 (2003): 7-17.
- Buzan, Barry. "Rethinking security after the Cold War." *Cooperation and conflict* 32/1 (1997): 5-28.
- Buzan, Barry. "New patterns of global security in the twenty-first century." *International affairs* 67/3 (1991): 439-451.
- Chazan, Guy. "EU Backs Russia's WTO Entry As Moscow Supports Kyoto Pact." *Wall Street Journal* (2004). Erişim 25.10.2022. <https://www.wsj.com/articles/SB108514021459817981>.
- "Climate Doctrine of the Russian Federation (2009)." En.Kremlin.ru – President of Russia. Erişim 06.10.2022, <http://en.kremlin.ru/supplement/4822>.
- Davide, Marinella. "The Doha Climate Gateway: a First Key-Point Assessment." *Review of Environment. Energy and Economics* (2012). Erişim 25.10.2022. [https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/Delivery.cfm/SSRN\\_ID2189448\\_code1809440.pdf](https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/Delivery.cfm/SSRN_ID2189448_code1809440.pdf).
- Detraz, Nicole. "Environmental security and gender: Necessary shifts in an evolving debate." *Security Studies* 18/2 (2009): 345-369.
- Dyer, Hugh C. "Environmental security as a universal value: implications for international theory." In *The Environment and International Relations*. Washington D.C.: Routledge, 2005: 34-53.

- Elliott, Lorraine. "Human security/environmental security." *Contemporary Politics* 21/1 (2015): 11-24.
- Gordeeva, Yelena M. "The Russian Federation and the International Climate Change Regime." *Carbon & Climate Law Review* (2014): 167-174.
- Gossen, L. P. & L. M. Velichkina. "Environmental problems of the oil-and-gas industry." *Petroleum Chemistry* 46/2 (2006): 67-72.
- Haas, Peter M. "The capacity of international institutions to manage Bhopal-like problems." *Epistemic Communities, Constructivism, and International Environmental Politics* (2015): 75-94.
- "Human Development Report 1994 (1994)." UNDP. Erişim 06.10.2022. <https://hdr.undp.org/system/files/documents//hdr1994encompletenostatspdf.pdf>.
- "Kontseptsii vneshnei politiki Rossiiskoi Federatsii (2016)." Kremlin.Ru. Erişim 06.10.2022. <http://www.kremlin.ru/acts/bank/41451>.
- "Kontseptsii vneshnei politiki Rossiiskoi Federatsii (2013)." Zakony, Kodeksy Informativno-Pravovye Aktyrossiiskoi Federatsii. Erişim 06.10.2022. <https://legalacts.ru/doc/kontseptsija-vneshnei-politiki-rossiiskoi-federatsii-utv-prezidentom/>.
- Korppoo, Anna, Nina Tynkkynen, & Geir Hønneland. *Russia and the politics of international environmental regimes: Environmental encounters or foreign policy?* Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing, 2015.
- Light, Margot. "In search of an identity: Russian foreign policy and the end of ideology." *Journal of Communist Studies and Transition Politics* 19/3 (2003): 42-59.
- Luhn, Alec. "Russia Ratifies Paris Climate Accord-but Targets Are 'Critically Insufficient'." *The Telegraph* (2019). Erişim 25.10.2022. <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2019/09/23/russia-ratifies-paris-climate-accord-targets-critically-insufficient/>.
- Mahapatra, Sushanta Kumar, & Keshab Chandra Ratha. "The 21st Conference of the Parties Climate Summit in Paris: a slippery slope." *Journal of International Development* 28/6 (2016): 991-996.
- McDonald, Matt. "Climate change and security: towards ecological security?" *International Theory* 10/2 (2018): 153-180.
- McDonald, Matt. "Discourses of climate security." *Political Geography* 33 (2013): 42-51.
- Melville, Andrew. *Russian Foreign Policy in Transition: Concepts and Realities*. Budapest: Central European University Press, 2005.
- Mitchell, Ronald B. "International environmental politics." *International environmental politics* 2 (2013): 801-826.
- "National Security Concept of the Russian Federation." *Medzinárodné Otázky* 9/3 (2000): 99-118. Erişim 06.10.2022, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/44963336>.
- "National Security Strategy of the Russian Federation to 2020 (2009)." MepoForum.sk – Fórum pre medzinárodnú politiku. Erişim 06.10.2022. <http://mepoforum.sk/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/NDS-RF-2009-en.pdf>.
-

- Newell, Peter, & Matthew Paterson. "From Geneva to Kyoto: The second conference of the parties to the UN framework convention on climate change." *Environmental Politics* 5/4 (1996): 729-735.
- Nilsen, Thomas. "2017 To Be Putin's Year of Ecology." *The Independent Barents Observer* (2016). Erişim 25.10.2022. <https://thebarentsobserver.com/ru/node/280>.
- "O gosudarstvennoi strategii Rossiiskoi Federatsiipo okhrane okruzhaiushchei sredyi obespecheniu ustoichivogo razvitiia." *Ekologicheskie Razdel Saita GPNTB Rossii* (1994). Erişim 06.10.2022. [https://ecology.gpntb.ru/usefullinks/oficialdoc/zakonrf/zakons\\_ukaz/zakons\\_262/](https://ecology.gpntb.ru/usefullinks/oficialdoc/zakonrf/zakons_ukaz/zakons_262/).
- "O stavke otchislenii (sbora) na vosproizvodstvo, okhranu i zashchitu lesov." *Ekologicheskie Razdel Saita GPNTB Rossii* (1993). Erişim 06.10.2022. [https://ecology.gpntb.ru/usefullinks/oficialdoc/zakonrf/zakons\\_ukaz/zakons\\_260/](https://ecology.gpntb.ru/usefullinks/oficialdoc/zakonrf/zakons_ukaz/zakons_260/).
- "O Strategii ekologicheskoi bezopasnosti Rossiiskoi Federatsii na period do 2025 goda (2017)." *Kremlin.Ru*. Erişim 06.10.2022. <http://kremlin.ru/acts/bank/41879>.
- "O vidakh produktsii (rabot, uslug) i otkhodov proizvodstva, svobodnaia realizatsiia kotorykh zapreshchena." *Ekologicheskie Razdel Saita GPNTB Rossii* (1992). Erişim 06.10.2022. [https://ecology.gpntb.ru/usefullinks/oficialdoc/zakonrf/zakons\\_ukaz/zakons\\_256/](https://ecology.gpntb.ru/usefullinks/oficialdoc/zakonrf/zakons_ukaz/zakons_256/).
- "Ob okhrane prirodnikh resursov territorial-nykh vod, kontinental-nogo shel-fa i ekonomicheskoi zonyRossiiskoi Federatsii." *Ekologicheskie Razdel Saita GPNTB Rossii* (1992). Erişim 06.10.2022. [https://ecology.gpntb.ru/usefullinks/oficialdoc/zakonrf/zakons\\_ukaz/zakons\\_257/](https://ecology.gpntb.ru/usefullinks/oficialdoc/zakonrf/zakons_ukaz/zakons_257/).
- "Ob usilenii gosudarstvennogo kontrolya za ispol-zovaniem i okhranoi zemel- pri provedenii zemel-noi reformy." *Ekologicheskie Razdel Saita GPNTB Rossii* (1993). Erişim 06.10.2022. [https://ecology.gpntb.ru/usefullinks/oficialdoc/zakonrf/zakons\\_ukaz/zakons\\_259/](https://ecology.gpntb.ru/usefullinks/oficialdoc/zakonrf/zakons_ukaz/zakons_259/).
- Obi, Cyril. "Globalized images of environmental security in Africa." *Review of African Political Economy* 27/83 (2000): 47-62.
- Porter, Gareth. "Environmental security as a national security issue." *Current History* 94/592 (1995): 218-222.
- "Rasporiazheniem Pravitel-stva Rossiiskoi Federatsii ot 31 avgusta 2002 g." *Legal Office FAOLEX – Food and Agriculture Organization of the United States*. Erişim 06.10.2022. <http://extwprlegs1.fao.org/docs/pdf/rus46915.pdf>.
- Renner, Michael. *National Security: The Economic and Environmental Dimensions*. Washington D.C.: Worldwatch Inst, 1989.
- "Russian President Vladimir Putin Says Humans Not Responsible for Climate Change." *France 24* (2017). Erişim 25.10.2022. <https://www.france24.com/en/20170331-russian-president-vladimir-putin-says-humans-not-responsible-climate-change>.
- Sayın, Melek. "Rusya Federasyonu Dış Politikasında Çevresel Güvenlik Uygulamaları." *Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam Üniversitesi*, 2020.
- Schipper, E. Lisa F. "Conceptual history of adaptation in the UNFCCC process." *Review of European Community & International Environmental Law* 15/1 (2006): 82-92.
- Semenova, Galina. "Global environmental problems in Russia." *E3S Web of Conferences*, 157,

- (2020): 1.
- Siebenhüner, Bernd. "The changing role of nation states in international environmental assessments—the case of the IPCC." *Global Environmental Change* 13/2 (2003): 113-123.
- Smith, Dan & Janani Vivekananda. *A Climate of Conflict: The Links between Climate Change, Peace, and War*. London: International Alert, 2007.
- Soldatkin, Vladimir & Dmitry Zhdannikov. "Putin: I Don't Share Excitement about Greta Thunberg's UN Speech." Reuters (2019). Erişim 25.10.2022. <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-russia-putin-thunberg-idUSKBN1WH1FM>.
- "The Foreign Policy Concept of the Russian Federation (2008)." Permanent Mission of the Russian Federation to the European Union. Erişim 06.10.2022. [https://russiaeu.ru/userfiles/file/foreign\\_policy\\_concept\\_english.pdf](https://russiaeu.ru/userfiles/file/foreign_policy_concept_english.pdf).
- Theisen, Ole Magnus, Nils Petter Gleditsch, & Halvard Buhaug. "Is climate change a driver of armed conflict?" *Climatic Change* 117/3 (2013): 613-625.
- Timoshenko, Alexandre S. "Ecological Security: Global Change Paradigm." *Colo. J. Int'l Env'tl. L. & Pol'y* 1 (1990): 127-145.
- Turkowski, Andrzej. "№ 027: Russia's International Climate Policy." *Polski Instytut Spraw Międzynarodowych-The Polish Institute of International Affairs* 27 (2012): 1-8.
- "United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change." United Nations. (1992): 1-24. Erişim 25.10.2022. <https://unfccc.int/resource/docs/convkp/conveng.pdf>.
- "Utverzhdeny osnovy gosudarstvennoi politiki v oblasti ekologicheskogo razvitiia Rossii na period do 2030 goda (2012)." Kremlin.Ru. Erişim 06.10.2022. <http://kremlin.ru/events/president/news/15177>.
- Warner, Jeroen. "Global environmental security: an emerging 'concept of control'?" In *Political Ecology: Science, Myth and Power*. 247-265. London: Arnold, 2000.

