Kimberly Marten is Chair of the Political Science Department at Barnard College, Columbia University. She is a Faculty Member of Columbia’s Harriman Institute for Russian and East-Central European Studies and of the Saltzman Institute of War and Peace Studies. She is a member of the Council on Foreign Relations, the International Institute for Strategic Studies, and the Chicago Council on Global Affairs Foreign Policy Experts Panel. Her current research focuses on Russian foreign and security policy. Marten has analyzed Russia’s use of the Wagner Group private military company and its intelligence agencies and the politics of warlords. Her books include, *Engaging the Enemy: Organization Theory and Soviet Military Innovation* (Princeton, 1993), which received the Marshall Shulman Prize, *Weapons, Culture, and Self-Interest: Soviet Defense Managers in the New Russia* (Columbia, 1997), and *Enforcing the Peace: Learning from the Imperial Past* (Columbia, 2004).

► “Russ-Afrique? Russia, France, and the Central African Republic”—France has been among the European countries most friendly to Russia in recent years. Yet Moscow is targeting Paris for geopolitical competition in the Central African Republic, a violent, poverty-stricken country with ties to France where neither the USSR nor Russia ever played much of a role. What explains Russian actions?

Şener Aktürk is Associate Professor at Koç University, Istanbul. He is a scholar of comparative politics with a focus on ethnicity, religion, and nationalism, especially in Germany, Russia, and Turkey. He has published on identity politics in Afghanistan, Algeria, Austria, Greece, Iran, Israel, Pakistan, and Central Asia. His book, *Regimes of Ethnicity and Nationhood in Germany, Russia, and Turkey* (Cambridge University Press, 2012), received the 2013 Joseph Rothschild book prize. Among other topics, he published on the removal of the ethnicity category from Russian internal passports, Russia’s transformation into an assimilationist nation-state, and the unipolar structure of national and local, political and informational power in Russia, in journals such as *Post-Soviet Affairs*, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, *Osteuropa*, and *World Politics*.

► “Five Faces of Russian Soft Power”—The pro-Russian political networks around the world are analyzed with a specific focus on Europe and the Middle East. A conceptual/taxonomic contribution is provided by identifying five kinds of groupings that espouse pro-Russian geopolitical policy positions: far left political networks, far right political networks, Orthodox Christian networks, Russophone and Slavic networks, and (non-Orthodox and non-Slavic) ethnoreligious minority networks.
Arms Control” and an article on “The Emerging Great Power Politics and Regionalism: How to Structure Effective Regional Conflict Management” (Global Policy, June 2019).

► “The Limits of Statecraft: Comparing U.S. and Russian Views on the Achievable in Foreign Policy” — The United States and Russia have a long history of concerns with surprise leaps in each other’s ability to exercise power. Their permanent quest to improve the effectiveness of their statecraft has hampered their ability to negotiate agreements and resulted in the demise of key arms control regimes.

Panel 2: The West and the War in Eastern Ukraine (11:15 am)

Chair: Henry Hale, George Washington University
Discussant: Alina Polyakova, Brookings Institution

Volodymyr Dubovyk is Associate Professor of International Relations and Director of the Center for International Studies at Odessa’s Mechnikov National University. He has conducted research at the Kennan Institute, Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, and at the Center for International and Security Studies at the University of Maryland. Among his teaching and research interests are U.S. foreign policy, U.S.-Ukrainian relations, theory of international relations, Black Sea regional security, international conflict studies, and the foreign policy of Ukraine.

► “Ukraine and the United States: A Partnership in Action” — The amount of attention that Washington dedicates to Ukraine now is quite unprecedented in the quarter century of bilateral relations. From the Ukrainian side, the United States is seen as a critically important ally and partner. However, some problematic discrepancies exist between White House pronouncements and U.S. government policies.

Tetyana Malyarenko is Professor of International Security at the National University Odessa Law Academy and non-resident Research Fellow in the field of “frozen and unfrozen conflicts” at the Leibniz Institute for East and Southeast Studies in Regensburg, Germany. She specializes in the management of contemporary international security challenges, especially in the prevention, management, and settlement of social conflicts and state-building in deeply divided societies. Malyarenko leads a number of research projects directed at conflict settlement, promoting tolerance, peace-building, and the strengthening of the rule of law through cooperation between academia, the public sector, military officers, media, and civil society in Ukraine in general and in the Donbas region in particular. She was born in Donetsk.

► “Connecting Human Rights and Conflict Resolution in Eastern Ukraine” — Protecting human rights in the gray zone of armed conflict is challenging. International organizations and NGOs face a stark choice between engagement and non-engagement with the “competent” authorities in the Donbas (DPR and LPR).

Volodymyr Kulyk is Head Research Fellow at the Institute of Political and Ethnic Studies at the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine in Kyiv. He has taught at Columbia, Stanford, Yale, Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, and Ukrainian Catholic University and has had research fellowships at Harvard, Stanford, University College London, University of Alberta, and the Woodrow Wilson Center. His research fields include the politics of language, memory and identity, nationalism, ideology, and discourse and mass media in contemporary Ukraine. He is the author of Revisiting a Success Story: Implementation of the Recommendations of the OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities to Ukraine, 1994-2001 (Centre for OSCE Research, 2002) and Dyskurs ukraińskikh medii: identychnosti, ideolohiї, vladni stosunky (The Ukrainian Media Discourse: Identities, Ideologies, Power Relations) (Krytyka, 2010). He guest edited a special issue of the International Journal of the Sociology of Language entitled “Languages and Language Ideologies in Ukraine.”
“Western Scholarship on the Conflict in the Donbas and Beyond: Naming, Framing, Implications” — This study examines English-language academic journal articles dealing with the Donbas conflict and/or the recent geopolitical dynamics between Ukraine, Russia, and the West. It focuses on how the authors name the conflict, how they frame it, and what implications their analyses have for Western policy toward Ukraine and Russia.

Mariya Omelicheva is Professor of National Security Strategy at the National War College of the National Defense University. Her disciplinary background is in the fields of international relations, foreign policy analysis, and comparative politics. Her research focuses on a variety of transnational phenomena, such as democracy and autocracy promotion, counterterrorism and security assistance, Islamic radicalization, and the nexus of trafficking and terrorism. Her regional expertise includes Russia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, and Georgia. Her current project is on the terrorism-trafficking nexus in Eurasia and utilizes GIS-enabled methods (along with other advanced tools) for visualizing and analyzing the intersections of these spheres.

“Washington’s Security Assistance to Kyiv: Improving Long-Term Returns on Military Investments in Ukraine” — The state of the Ukrainian military has considerably improved thanks to U.S. support. Despite notable achievements, U.S. security assistance to Ukraine has been plagued by the same set of problems that have limited its impact in other parts of the world, namely lack of earnest engagement and bona fide assessment of (Ukraine’s) progress.

Panel 3A: Great Power Politics and Economics in Greater Central Asia (1:45 pm)

Chair: Eric McGlinchey, George Mason University
Discussant: Pavel Baev, Peace Research Institute Oslo (PRIO)

Nargis Kassenova is Senior Fellow at the Davis Center for Russian and Eurasian Studies at Harvard University. She is Associate Professor in the Department of International Relations and Regional Studies, and Director of the Central Asian Studies Center (CASC) and the China and Central Asia Studies Center (CCASC), at KIMEP University, Almaty, Kazakhstan. She is a Member of the Advisory Group of EU Central Asia Monitoring (EUCAM), the Academic Council of the European Neighbourhood Council (ENC), the Advisory Board of SenECA (Strengthening and Energizing EU-Central Asia Relations) project, and the Advisory Board of the Open Society Foundations (OSF) Eurasia Program. Her expertise is in Eurasian politics and geopolitics, Kazakhstan’s foreign policy, governance in Eurasia, Islam, and state-society relations. Her current project involves China’s Belt and Road Initiative in Central Asia.

“The EU Connectivity Strategy and Central Asia: Connect or Disconnect?” — The EU connectivity strategy can be seen as Europe’s response to China’s Belt and Road Initiative and as a new attempt to transform Eurasia through “standard setting.” Instead of the reforms aspired for in the 1990s, the new approach places good governance at center-stage. However, the gap between the standards outlined and the reality on the ground is so large that desired connectivity might dissipate in a series of policy implementation disconnects.

Vladimir Popov is a Research Director at the Dialogue of Civilizations Research Institute in Berlin. He is a Principal Researcher at the Central Economics and Mathematics Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Professor Emeritus at the New Economic School in Moscow, and Adjunct Research Professor at the Institute of European and Russian Studies at Carleton University, Ottawa. In 2009-2015 he worked at DESA, UN, as a Senior Economic Affairs Officer and Inter-regional Adviser. He has published extensively on world economy and development issues and is the author of ten books and
hundreds of articles, including in the Journal of Comparative Economics, World Development, Comparative Economic Studies, Cambridge Journal of Economics, and New Left Review. Popov’s most recent books are Mixed Fortunes: An Economic History of China, Russia, and the West (Oxford University Press, 2014; also published in Chinese), Mapping the New World Order (Edward Elgar, 2018; co-edited with Piotr Dutkiewicz), and Macroeconomic Policies in Countries of the Global South (Nova Publishers, 2019; co-edited with Anis Chowdhury).

► “Go East or Go West? Geographical Structure of Trade in Central Asia” — This analysis considers how to explain the changes in the geographical structure of foreign trade in Central Asia and whether the governments of those countries should promote trade with East Asia, the Eurasian Economic Union, Europe, or other regions.

Ekaterina Stepanova is Lead Researcher and Head of the Peace and Conflict Studies Unit at the National Research Institute of the World Economy & International Relations (IMEMO), Moscow. She publishes on armed conflicts, terrorism, human security, peace processes, peace-building, political economy of conflicts, and is the author of 10 books, including “Terrorism in Asymmetrical Conflict” (Oxford University Press, 2008). Her latest articles are “Humanitarian Challenges, Humanitarian Support and Human Protection in Armed Conflicts” (IMEMO, 2018) and “Addressing Terrorism, Violent Extremism and Radicalization: Perspectives from Russia and the United States” (IMEMO, 2017). She is an Editor-in-Chief of the IMEMO journal Pathways to Peace and Security, author of articles in International Spectator, Politique etrangere, Washington Quarterly, International Affairs, Washington Quarterly, Perspectives on Terrorism, and Member of the Editorial Boards of Global Governance, Global Responsibility to Protect, and Terrorism and Political Violence. She is also a Member of the Global Peace Index (GPI) methodology panel, Joint US-Russia Expert Group on Afghanistan, and a contact point for the UN Counterterrorism Committee Executive Directorate’s (CTED) Global Research Network.

► “Russia's Role in Peace Negotiations on Afghanistan” — What has turned Russia from a marginal post-Soviet player on Afghanistan into a pro-active diplomatic actor that arranged regional peace consultations and has hosted non-governmental intra-Afghan dialogue? How does Moscow’s new mediation on Afghanistan fit into its broader foreign policy patterns, including growing regionalisation of Russia’s approach and the conundrum in Russia-US relations?

Panel 3B: Confronting the Challenge(s) of Russia’s Cross-Domain Coercion: Insights from a 3D Architecture of Analyses (1:45 pm)

Chair: Kimberly Marten, Barnard College, Columbia University
Discussant: Andrew Barnes, Kent State University

Stephan De Spiegeleire is Senior Scientist at the Hague Centre for Strategic Studies (HCSS). He worked for RAND Corporation for nearly ten years, interrupted by stints at Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik and the WEU’s Institute for Security Studies. He started out as a Soviet specialist but has since branched out into several fields of international security and defense policy. De Spiegeleire’s current work at HCSS focuses on strategic defense management, security resilience, network-centrism, capabilities-based planning, and the transformation of defense planning. He is particularly active in HCSS’s security foresight efforts to inform national and European security policy planning in the broader sense. He also teaches at Webster University in Leiden.

► “Mapping and Contending with Russia’s Assertiveness” — New datasets and tools give us a better insight into the amplitude, fluctuations, modalities, targets, and implications of Russia’s (also comparatively speaking)
increased assertiveness. This analysis presents some new evidence on this topic and teases out some policy implications for Western decision-makers.

**Dmitry Adamsky** is a Head of the BA Honors Track in Strategy and Decision Making at the School of Government, Diplomacy and Strategy at the IDC Herzliya University, Israel. His research interests include international security, cultural approach to IR, modern military thought, and American, Russian and Israeli national security policy. He has published on these topics in *Foreign Affairs, Security Studies, Journal of Strategic Studies, Problems of Post-Communism, Intelligence and National Security, Studies in Conflict and Terrorism*, and *Journal of Cold War History*. His books *Operation Kavkaz* and *The Culture of Military Innovation* (Stanford University Press) earned the annual (2006 and 2012) prizes for the best academic works on Israeli security. His recent book, *Russian Nuclear Orthodoxy* (Stanford University Press, 2019), is about religion, politics, and strategy in Russia.

► **“The Role of the Russian Orthodox Church in Moscow’s Syrian Campaign”** – Moscow’s diplomatic-military enterprise in Syria has been significantly touched by faith and church. Although the extent of the ecclesiastical impact is debatable, the campaign is a telling illustration of the nexus of religion and strategy in Russia today.

**Nikolai Sokov** is Senior Fellow at the Middlebury Institute of International Studies at Monterey (based in Vienna, Austria). He has worked at the Institute of U.S. and Canadian Studies, the Institute of World Economy and International Relations in Moscow, and the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union and later Russia where he participated in the START I and START II negotiations as well as in a number of summit and ministerial meetings. Sokov is the author or co-author of several monographs, including: “Delegitimizing Nuclear Weapons: Examining the Validity of Nuclear Deterrence” (Middlebury Institute, 2010) and “Reducing and Regulating Tactical (Nonstrategic) Nuclear Weapons in Europe” (Middlebury Institute, 2009). He is also co-author and co-editor of the first Russian-language college-level textbook on nuclear nonproliferation (*Yadernoe Nerasprostranenie*, Vol. I-II, PIR Center, 2nd edition 2002).

► **“The Elusive Russian Nuclear Threshold”** – In 2018, the role of nuclear weapons in Russia’s national security policy moved to the center of attention following the U.S. Nuclear Posture Review, which had an assumption that Russia had reduced the nuclear threshold under the “escalate to de-escalate” strategy. Different experts, however, hold quite different opinions about the role and scenarios under which the weapons might be used.

**Adam N. Stulberg** is Sam Nunn Professor & Chair at the Sam Nunn School of International Affairs, and Associate Director of the Strategic Energy Institute, at the Georgia Institute of Technology. His current research focuses on the geopolitics of oil and gas networks, energy security dilemmas and statecraft in Eurasia, Russia and gray zone conflicts, new approaches to strategic stability, nuclear (non)proliferation and the internationalization of the nuclear fuel cycle, technology, and implications of emerging technologies for strategic stability and international security. He served as a Political Consultant at RAND and Senior Research Associate at the Middlebury Institute of International Studies at Monterey. Dr. Stulberg has worked closely with former Senator Sam Nunn drafting policy recommendations and background studies on future directions for the U.S. Cooperative Threat Reduction Program and energy cooperation in Eurasia. He has authored and edited five books, and has published widely in leading journals. He is a two-time recipient of the International Affairs Graduate Student Association’s “Professor of the Year” award and has received the same honor from Sigma Iota Rho, the international affairs undergraduate honor society.
“Russia’s Response to Sanctions: Reciprocal, Asymmetrical, or Orthogonal?” — Western sanctions on Russia have failed demonstratively to secure Moscow’s formal compliance with stated objectives. The best bets—given cross-domain responses and divergent worldviews—may lie with either engaging Moscow on multilateral tactical applications of sanctions and inducements directed at third parties, or closing ranks with Western allies to offer dramatic gestures for re-setting the broader strategic agenda with Russia.

Panel 4A: Arms Control and Statecraft (3:45 pm)

Chair: Şener Aktürk, Koç University, Istanbul
Discussant: Adam Stulberg, Georgia Tech

Samuel Charap is Senior Political Scientist at RAND Corporation in Washington, DC. His research interests include the political economy and foreign policies of Russia and the former Soviet states, European and Eurasian regional security, and US-Russia deterrence, strategic stability, and arms control. From 2012 to 2017, he was a Senior Fellow for Russia and Eurasia at the International Institute for Strategic Studies. Charap has served at the U.S. Department of State as Senior Advisor to the undersecretary for Arms Control and International Security and on the Secretary’s Policy Planning Staff, covering Russia and Eurasia. From 2009-11, he was Director for Russia and Eurasia at the Center for American Progress. His book on the Ukraine crisis, co-authored with Timothy Colton, was published in January, Everyone Loses: The Ukraine Crisis and the Ruinous Contest for Post-Soviet Eurasia (Routledge, 2017).

“Contemporary Russian Approaches to Deterrence” — The concept of “deterrence” in Western military strategy does not have a precise Russian equivalent. Russian strategists have elaborated their own understanding of it (sderzhivanie). Viewing Russia’s actions through the lens of their concept(s) can help us better understand the drivers of Moscow’s recent behavior.

Mark Kramer is Director of the Cold War studies program and Senior Fellow of the Davis Center for Russian and Eurasian Studies at Harvard University. He has taught at Harvard, Yale, and Brown Universities and was formerly an Academy Scholar in Harvard’s Academy of International and Area Studies and a Rhodes Scholar at Oxford University. Kramer is the author or editor of several books and has written nearly 200 articles on a variety of topics, often pertaining to Soviet and post-Soviet affairs. He has worked extensively in the archives in all the former Warsaw Pact countries and has been a consultant for numerous government agencies and international organizations.

“Nuclear Test Bans and U.S.-Russian Relations” — For more than 60 years, leaders in Washington and Moscow have sought to ban or at least limit the testing of nuclear explosives. Several treaties currently exist that are the direct result of those efforts. The most important of these treaties—the Limited Nuclear Test Ban Treaty and the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty—are not necessarily beneficial for U.S.-Russian relations. The reappraisal, revision, and—if necessary—abandonment of these treaties would have the paradoxical effect of introducing greater stability into the U.S.-Russian relationship and reducing the risk of nuclear war.

Polina Sinovets is Head of the Odessa Center for Nonproliferation (OdCNP) and also an Associate Professor in the Faculty of International Relations, Political Science and Sociology at Odessa’s Mechnikov National University, Ukraine. Her expertise is in nuclear history and policy, military history, Ukraine, and Russia. From 2004 to 2012 she was a Senior Research Associate at Ukraine’s National Institute for Strategic Studies. In 2006, she was a Fellow at the James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies, a Fellow at the NATO Defense College in Rome in 2015, and a Fulbright Scholar at the
James Martin Center for Nonproliferation in 2017 (in Washington, DC). She has published several dozen articles on nuclear deterrence, disarmament, missile defense, and nonproliferation in Ukrainian, Russian, and English.

► “Escalation for De-Escalation? Hazy Nuclear-Weapon ‘Red Lines’ Generate Russian Advantages”—It remains vague as to whether Russia’s military strategies contain an “escalation for de-escalation” procedure. Since the introduction of the concept in the early 2000s, it appears that Moscow keeps the specific conditions for when it can use nuclear weapons intentionally ambiguous in order to give itself the opportunity of being able to widely interpret the character of a conflict.

Pavel K. Baev is a Research Professor at the Peace Research Institute Oslo (PRIO). He is also a Senior Non-Resident Fellow at the Brookings Institution (Washington DC) and a Senior Research Associate at the Institut Français des Relations Internationales (IFRI, Paris). His research projects focus on Russian military reform and nuclear modernization, Russia’s policy in the Arctic, Russia’s role in the Middle East, its military intervention in Syria, and Russia-China relations. He writes a weekly column for the Eurasia Daily Monitor and partakes in the research project on “Understanding Russian Strategic Behavior” led by the George C. Marshall European center for Security Studies.

► “Befriending the White Whale: How to Neutralize Russia’s Military Build-Up in the Arctic”—Security comes first in Russian Arctic policy. Moscow’s attempts to cultivate cross-border ties, however, often hit the wall of secretive military preparations.

Panel 4B: Russia and Central/Eastern Europe (3:45 pm)

Chair: Volodymyr Dubovyk, Odesa Mechnikov National University
Discussant: William Hill, National War College

Arkady Moshes is Programme Director of the EU’s Eastern Neighbourhood and Russia Research Programme at the Finnish Institute of International Affairs (FIIA). His expertise is in Russia-EU relations and the internal and foreign policy of Ukraine and Belarus. Before moving to Finland in 2002, he was a researcher at the Institute of Europe of the Russian Academy of Sciences. Over 2008–15, he was an Associate Fellow in the Russia and Eurasia Programme at Chatham House and in 2016 a Visiting Scholar at IERES, Elliott School of International Relations, George Washington University. His most recent FIIA briefing paper is “The Belarusian paradox: A country of today versus a president of the past.”

► “All Quiet in Russian-Belarusian Relations”—The goal of Russia’s policy toward Belarus is not to promote further bilateral integration but to decrease the level of economic subsidies, while preserving a critical degree of Minsk’s dependence and loyalty.

Andrey Makarychev is Visiting Professor at the Johan Skytte Institute of Political Studies at the University of Tartu. Before he moved to Estonia, he was the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation Fellow at the Institute for East European Studies at the Free University of Berlin, as well as Professor of International Relations at the Linguistic University of Nizhny Novgorod in Russia. His research interests include Russian foreign policy discourses and international security and regionalism in the EU-Russia common neighborhood. He has worked for the Center for Security Studies & Conflict Research, ETH Zurich, and the Danish Institute for International Studies (DIIS), Copenhagen. He was a visiting fellow at several European and U.S. Research Institutes, among them the Copenhagen Peace Research Institute, Kennan Institute, George Mason University, and the JFK Institute for North American Studies. His projects have been...
supported by the Central European University in Budapest, IREX, McArthur Foundation, Open Society Institute, and the NATO Democratic Institutions Fellowship Program.

► “Estonia’s Right-Wing Turn and the Russophone Community: Implications for Moscow and Tallinn” — Especially controversial in Estonia’s March 2019 parliamentary election was the acceptance by the Center Party (Keskerakond), which for two decades was building major representation of the local Russophone community, of the right-wing, anti-Russia EKRE party. This foretells a probable internal split.

Alexandra Yatsyk is a coordinator of the Baltic-Black Sea region project at the Johan Skytte Institute of Political Studies at the University of Tartu, Estonia. Formerly, she ran the Kazan Center for Cultural Studies of Post-Socialism in Russia. Her areas of expertise are in post-Soviet nation building, sports and cultural mega-events, biopolitics, art politics, and refugee crises. Yatsyk is the author/co-author of Lotman’s Cultural Semiotics and the Political (Rowman & Littlefield International, 2017), Mega-Events in Post-Soviet Eurasia: Shifting Borderlines of Inclusion and Exclusion (Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), New and Old Vocabularies of International Relations After the Ukraine Crisis (Routledge, 2016), and Boris Nemtsov and Russian Politics: Power and Resistance (Ibidem Verlag & Columbia University, 2018).

► “Russia as a Boogeyman: The Case of Political Wars in Poland” — An examination is provided of the indirect impact of Russia on the political milieu in Poland in the 2019 European and Polish national elections. The “Russian threat” cluster of policy positions is addressed as well as the ensuing conspiracy theories regarding Poland’s domestic and international affairs and policy directions.

Mikhail Alexseev is the Bruce E. Porteus Professor of Political Science at San Diego State University. His areas of expertise are migration, ethnopolitical conflict, post-Soviet Russia, and Ukraine. He has been the principal investigator of a multi-year international research project on migration and ethnoreligious violence in the Russian Federation funded by the National Science Foundation, the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, and the National Council for Eurasian and East European Research. He is co-author with Sufian Zhemukhov of Mass Religious Ritual and Intergroup Tolerance: The Muslim Pilgrim’s Paradox (Cambridge 2017), author of Immigration Phobia and the Security Dilemma: Russia, Europe, and the United States (Cambridge University Press, 2006), and editor of A Federation Imperiled: Center-Periphery Conflict in Post-Soviet Russia (St. Martin’s Press, 1999).

► “Through Europe’s Gate, Out of Russia’s Net: How Visa-Free Travel to the EU Offsets Moscow’s Information Influence in Ukraine” — Public opinion surveys indicate that by the start of this year, among Ukrainian citizens who had used the visa-free travel to the EU (bezviz), support for Ukraine’s EU and NATO membership has strengthened, while support for membership in the Russia-Belarus “union” has weakened.