
7. US policy towards the Caspian region: can the wish-list be realized?

Amy Jaffe

I. Introduction: the underpinning of US policy towards the Caspian

When the Soviet Union began to collapse in 1991, the US reaction to the possibility that the states of the Caspian Basin would become independent was muted, if not non-existent. US policy makers concerned themselves primarily with the fate of Moscow and its political leadership in a programme that was dubbed 'Russia first' by practitioners.¹ To the extent that the countries of Central Asia and the Caucasus received any notice at all, it was mainly to make sure that nuclear or other major weaponry previously under the control of the Soviet regime was destroyed or returned to Russia. Experts argued that the USA needed to be careful not to give the impression of siding with these new states in their efforts to achieve independence from Russia. The goal of this logic was to avoid the impression that a cordon sanitaire was being created around Russia in order to isolate it from Europe.² Some thinkers took it a step farther and argued that universal self-determination was 'not an American constitutional principle' and that, even taking into account the benefits of democratic change, the USA's interest in stability would be threatened by any violent disintegration of the Soviet Union. The breakaway republics and Moscow should find arrangements that were acceptable to both sides and leave the USA out of it.³

This lukewarm start in US policy on the Caspian region countries was to give way to growing involvement in the years following the breakup of the Soviet Union. During this process the region attained a surprising salience in the US foreign policy hierarchy of concerns. Although the Caspian region is both geographically remote and of only derivative importance to the USA's key strategic concerns, US diplomatic effort in the region has been extraordinarily active, starting with official visits, first by the leaders of the region to the USA and then by the US Secretary of State to the region.⁴ There have also been several

¹ Barnes, J., 'US interests in the Caspian Basin: getting beyond the hype', Baker Institute Working Paper, 1997, available at URL <<http://www.bakerinstitute.org>>. Barnes served on the US Department of State policy planning staff at the time of the breakup of the former Soviet Union.

² Simes, D. K., 'America and the post-Soviet republics', *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 71, no. 2 (1992).

³ Allison, G. and Blackwell, R., 'America's stake in the Soviet future', *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 70, no. 2 (1991).

⁴ Central Asian and Caucasus leaders visited the White House as follows: President Islam Karimov of Uzbekistan in 1996; President Eduard Shevardnadze of Georgia in 1997; President Heidar Aliyev of Azerbaijan in 1997; President Nursultan Nazarbayev of Kazakhstan in 1997; and President Saparmurat

landmark addresses by key officials of the US Administration regarding the 'importance' of Central Asia and the Caucasus to the USA. Perhaps most significant, however, was the appointment of a 'special envoy' to the region.⁵ This post, by virtue of its existence, kept Caspian issues on a higher track than might otherwise have been feasible for a remote region which had no significant trade relationship with the USA and which posed no significant threat of major war and no significant immediate threat to regional or international peace and stability.

The region has also received attention from the US military, which has pushed for Western military cooperation with it to be increased under the general umbrella of NATO's Partnership for Peace (PFP) programme. The PFP programme was designed to 'improve practical military cooperation and common capabilities' and 'to enable joint operations with NATO peacekeeping and humanitarian missions', among other functions.⁶ On the practical level this has meant US military training programmes in the region under the Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) programme and the Foreign Military Financing (FMF) programme, and border security activities. In 1997, as part of a well-publicized joint military exercise in the region, the US Army's elite 82nd Airborne Division sent 500 paratroopers parachuting into the territory, including an Uzbek-born marine. Finally, between 1992 and 1999 the USA provided the region with approximately \$1.9 billion under the Freedom Support Act, which promotes democratization and market reforms, improved health care and housing.⁷

The reason why the countries of the Caspian Basin have received such attention from the USA is often described as singularly clear—oil wealth. Secretary of State Madeleine Albright in an address before the Senate Appropriations Committee's Foreign Operations Subcommittee noted that it was 'strongly' in the US national interest to assist these 'strategically located' and 'energy-rich' countries.⁸ Other US diplomats speaking on US goals for the region also cite energy security and diversification of supply outside the choke points of the Strait of Hormuz on the Persian Gulf and Turkey's Bosphorus and opening up

Niyazov of Turkmenistan in 1998. US Secretary of State Madeleine Albright toured the region in early 2000, holding press conferences and meeting leaders there. The texts of relevant press conferences are available at URL <<http://www.state.gov>>.

⁵ The Clinton Administration in 1994 established a special inter-agency working group to focus on Caspian policy. In May 1998, the US Trade and Development Agency, the US Export-Import Bank and the Overseas Private Investment Corp. announced the formation of the Caspian Finance Center in Ankara to facilitate the development of energy and other infrastructure projects in the Caspian region. Then in July 1998 President Clinton appointed Ambassador Richard Morningstar to the new position of Special Advisor to the President and Secretary of State for Caspian Basin Energy Diplomacy. For further detail see White House Fact Sheet, URL <<http://www.usis.it/file9911/alia/99111705.htm>>.

⁶ Strobe Talbott, Richard Morningstar and John Wolfe have made several addresses on this subject at various conferences and universities. The most notable was Talbott's speech 'A farewell to Flashman: American policy in the Caucasus and Central Asia' delivered at Johns Hopkins University on 21 July 1997. The texts of these speeches are available at URL <<http://www.state.gov>>.

⁷ For a detailed discussion of this involvement see Sokolsky, R. and Charlick-Paley, T., *NATO and Caspian Security: A Mission Too Far*, Report MR-1074-AF (RAND Corporation: Santa Monica, Calif., 1999).

⁸ Bhatti, R. and Bronson, R., 'NATO's mixed signals in the Caucasus and Central Asia', *Survival*, vol. 42, no. 3 (autumn 2000), pp. 129–45.

access to promising investment opportunities for US companies on a list that includes vaguer references to conflict resolution and state-building.⁹

There is evidence for this perception that the Caspian region is the focus of US diplomats seeking to help US companies lock up oil and gas assets. More than 30 US companies have invested billions of dollars in the region in hopes of 'striking it big'. Those same companies over the years have hired expensive lobbyists and specialists to enhance attention to issues relating to this business.¹⁰ The oil companies have had an easy time finding allies among the US foreign policy establishment, and the reason for this underscores the fact that other factors besides oil are at play. Oil men looking for a willing ear needed to look no farther than to former 'cold warriors' who still believed in the early 1990s that US foreign policy must focus first and foremost on countering any resurgence of Russian power. Part and parcel of this preventive attitude was to weaken Russia's influence on its southern flank by propping up the sovereignty and strength of Central Asian and Caucasus countries.¹¹

However, besides those who remained nervous about Russia's long-term intentions, there was also a plethora of policy advocates who feared the rising influence of China and Iran. Hence, planting the US flag in the Caspian Basin was viewed as a strategic countermeasure to contain the regional power of these two countries as well. In the case of Iran, US policy has been more explicit. US sanctions against Iran are designed to prevent energy companies from investing in pipelines that would carry Caspian oil or gas to international markets.¹² The US Government has worked behind the scenes with mixed success to thwart foreign companies from joining with the National Iranian Oil Company (NIOC) to construct energy export outlets via Iran.

Were US sanctions against Iran to be eased in the event of a rapprochement between Iran and the USA, the attractions of various Iranian export routes from the Caspian could be compelling.¹³ Ironically, the domestic political barriers to the US Government getting out quickly from under its slowly evolving Iran policy may be inadvertently fostering tension between the USA on the one hand and Kazakhstan and Turkmenistan on the other. These states, faced with the imperative to export oil as soon as possible, are already looking to Iran regard-

⁹ Federal News Service, 22 May 1997.

¹⁰ Speeches by Ambassador John Wolfe and his staff at various meetings attended by the author. See also texts available at URL <<http://www.state.gov>>.

¹¹ Morgan, D. and Ottoway, D., *Washington Post*, 6 July 1997. For a closer look at the intellectual underpinnings of this realist-school thinking see Brzezinski, Z., *The Grand Chessboard* (Basic Books: New York, 1997). A good critique of this school is provided by Harries, O., 'The dangers of expansive realism', *National Interest*, winter 1997/1998, pp. 3–7.

¹² The US Congress passed legislation, the Iran–Libya Sanctions Act (ILSA) of 1996, that would allow it to impose sanctions on third parties which invested in Iran's oil and gas industry. Other US laws restrict such investments by US companies to \$40 million. This policy is nicely described by Washington analyst Robert Ebel as 'ABI: anywhere but Iran'. See Ebel, R. E., Center for Strategic and International Studies, *Energy Choices in the Near Abroad: The Haves and Have-Nots Face the Future* (CSIS: Washington, DC, 1997); and Kemp, G., 'The Persian Gulf remains the strategic prize', *Survival*, vol. 40, no. 4 (winter 1998), pp. 132–49.

¹³ For economic comparisons and options see Soligo, R. and Jaffe, A. M., 'The economics of pipeline routes: the conundrum of oil exports from the Caspian Basin', Baker Institute Working Paper, Apr. 1998, available at URL <<http://www.bakerinstitute.org>>.

less of the US position, creating an embarrassing backdrop to their bilateral relations with Washington.

In the case of China US policy is more ambiguous. The USA has not opposed oil or gas pipeline routes from Kazakhstan to China and has even given consideration to providing credits to a US firm to participate. However, China is still viewed as a strategic competitor whose activities in the region can be cited as another reason why the USA should also have a presence.¹⁴

The vital interest of maintaining good relations with NATO ally Turkey also dictates that US policy makers give Caspian energy issues high priority. Turkey has actively lobbied the USA and its oil companies to help it find a solution to what it terms unacceptable shipping congestion through its environmentally sensitive Bosphorus, through which 1.2 million barrels a day (b/d) of oil are currently transported. A large rise in Caspian and Russian oil exports could potentially bring tanker traffic through the Bosphorus to dangerous levels, Turkey argues, endangering the population of Istanbul, which lies on the waterway.¹⁵ The matter is being investigated by several world bodies, including the International Maritime Organization (IMO), and Turkey has already sparred with Russia over the issue of accident insurance for tankers passing the Turkish Straits (the Bosphorus and Dardanelles). Russia argues that improved management and traffic control equipment would permit safe passage of projected oil exports through the Straits. Free passage through the waterway is guaranteed by the Convention Regarding the Regime of the Straits (the Montreux Convention) of 1936.¹⁶

Turkey's concern for the future of the Bosphorus Straits has led it to lobby for the construction of an oil pipeline that would extend from Baku in Azerbaijan to the Turkish Mediterranean port of Ceyhan. Since 1995, the US Government has assertively backed this route, not only to show support for Turkey but also because it believes that such a pipeline will enhance economic and political ties in the region and cement its independence from the undue influences of Russia and Iran.¹⁷ In October 1998 the US Administration helped choreograph the Ankara Declaration of support for the Baku–Ceyhan pipeline project by the Turkish President and other regional leaders, including the presidents of Georgia and Azerbaijan.¹⁸ This was followed by a high-profile signing ceremony of the pipeline initiative by the presidents of Turkey, the USA and certain Caspian Basin countries during the Summit Meeting of the Organization for

¹⁴ Most US authors discussing geopolitical competition in the Caspian region mention China on the list, among them Starr, S. F., 'Power failure: American policy in the Caspian', *National Interest*, spring 1997. For a good survey of China's moves see Xiaojie Xu, 'The oil and gas links between Central Asia and China: a geopolitical perspective', *OPEC Review*, Mar. 1999; and Christoffersen, G., 'China's intentions for Russian and Central Asian oil and gas', *NBR Analysis Series* (National Bureau of Asian Research), vol. 9, no. 2 (Mar. 1998).

¹⁵ Author's interviews with US State Department officials show this latter concern to be cited as more important than the others, although public pronouncements do not emphasize it. For a more detailed discussion of the problem of the Bosphorus see Soligo and Jaffe (note 13).

¹⁶ See also chapter 3, section IV and chapter 8, section III in this volume.

¹⁷ See note 10.

¹⁸ Signed on 29 Oct. 1998. The complete text is available on the US Department of Energy Internet site at URL <<http://energy.gov/HQPress/releases98/octpr/pr98161a.htm>>.

Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) in Istanbul in November 1999, which US President Bill Clinton attended. However, commercial and political barriers have so far blocked the development of the Baku–Ceyhan line, and this has raised questions about the effectiveness of US diplomacy in the region.¹⁹

II. Oil as a driving factor: myths and realities

Ironically, a key problem for the success of the Baku–Ceyhan line, and US policy towards the region with it, is the fact that not enough oil has been discovered yet to justify its construction.²⁰ Indeed, the scale of the oil potential of the region as a whole and the monumentally difficult logistics of developing it may argue against the deepening of US involvement in the region.

A new oil find in Kazakhstan at Kashagan was touted in mid-2000 as confirming that sceptics might be wrong about the potential of Caspian resources, but even if Kashagan's reserves are confirmed to be as large as an average field in Saudi Arabia the story does not end there. The Caspian will still not be the next Middle East.

There is no question that the oil reserves of the Caspian Basin are significant, but they do not come near to matching those of the Persian Gulf. The proven reserves of the Persian Gulf top 600 billion barrels (bbl), spread across eight different countries. Saudi Arabia's proven oil reserves alone are 269 bbl. There are also vast areas of the Persian Gulf that have still not been fully explored, such as Iraq's western desert and Kuwait's deeper strata.

By contrast, in Central Asia and the Caucasus, only three countries are thought to have major hydrocarbon deposits—Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan and Turkmenistan. Of the three, only Kazakhstan is expected to have Saudi-size billion-barrel oilfields. In fact, geologists predict that Kazakhstan is likely to hold up to 80 per cent of the region's future oil potential. Exploration in Azerbaijan and Turkmenistan so far has found proven riches in natural gas and condensate, but some geologists are doubtful that these two countries will turn out to be major players.²¹ According to geologists, future exploration may confirm that the Caspian region holds potentially 140 bbl of oil, but this figure remains speculative. The proven oil reserves of Central Asia and the Caucasus currently represent less than 3 per cent of world proven oil reserves. By comparison, the Middle East accounts for 55 per cent of the world's proven reserves.

Moreover, even if it turns out that geologists are too pessimistic about the promise of Kazakhstan's geology, the Caspian Basin still remains one of the most difficult oil prospecting terrains in the world. This will limit its geopolitical and commercial importance as a vital oil supply centre on the scale of

¹⁹ Fitchett, J., 'A resurgent Russian influence grips former Soviet Central Asia', *International Herald Tribune*, 9 July 2000.

²⁰ Aliriza, B., 'US Caspian pipeline policy: substance or spin?', Center for Strategic and International Studies, Washington, DC, Aug. 2000, available at URL <<http://www.csis.org/turkey/CEU000117.html>>. See also chapter 3, section 1 in this volume.

²¹ Talwani, M. and Belopolsky, A., 'Geology and petroleum potential of the Caspian Basin Sea Region', Baker Institute Working Paper, 1998, available at URL <<http://www.bakerinstitute.org>>.

Africa or Latin America. No solution is in sight to the crippling dearth of drilling rigs and other necessary equipment. Eight years of effort have not eased this shortage. Currently only two semi-submersible rigs operate in the Caspian Sea, in contrast to 90 or so in Britain's North Sea. Without more drilling rigs and production platforms, the oilfields of the Caspian cannot hope to reach their optimum production potential in the coming years. Already, analysts are saying that the Kashagan find, regardless of its size, may not be able to reach optimum production rates until 2015.²²

The Caspian region is far from major supply centres for exploratory equipment, and the shortage of modern drilling platforms and other related supplies is worse than almost anywhere else in the world because the region is landlocked and has to rely on extremely limited supply routes, such as the Volga River, for bringing in necessary equipment. Despite huge demand for equipment, there are only two assembly yards equipped for manufacturing or refurbishing offshore drilling rigs for the region: one at Astrakhan in Russia along the northern Caspian and one in Primorsk, near Baku. Such constraints severely limit the amount of drilling that can take place in the region at any one time. They also mean that oil well completions take considerably longer—in some cases up to two years as compared with two or three months in many other oil provinces in other parts of the world. Kashagan's first well, for example, took a year longer to drill than planned.

Obstacles to drilling mean that, while Kazakhstan's resources may be geologically exciting, the region's output could remain constrained for years to come just because several wells cannot be drilled simultaneously. Exploration and production consultants Wood Mackenzie project that oil production could rise to 3.4 million b/d by 2010, up from 900 000 in the late 1990s, with the increases coming primarily from Kazakhstan and to a lesser extent Azerbaijan, but even this assumes that obstacles to drilling and export routing will be eased over time. This rate of production may not justify several large export pipelines to the West. Increased exports to the Black Sea littoral states such as Bulgaria, Romania, Turkey and Ukraine could be expected to handle at least one-third to half of the expected volume, for example, allowing producers to maximize profits by cutting transport costs to more distant buyers.²³

The problem of the transport of oil from the Caspian region to consumers beyond the Black Sea remains to be tackled. Since Caspian hydrocarbon resources are both landlocked and located at a great distance from the world's major energy-consuming regions, the region's producers cannot simply ship oil by tanker from domestic ports to international sea-lanes as is done from the Persian Gulf. Instead, the Central Asian and Caucasus states must rely on expensive pipelines built through neighbouring countries as the chief means of transport.

²² Author's interviews with shareholders of the Kashagan field, 19 Sep. and 3 Oct. 2000.

²³ For more detailed discussion see Soligo and Jaffe (note 13); and Jaffe, A. M. and Manning, R., 'The myth of the Caspian "Great Game": the real geopolitics of energy', *Survival*, vol. 40, no. 4 (winter 1998/99), pp. 112–29.

So far, Caspian oil producers have dabbled with a variety of export routes, mostly unsatisfactorily. BP is transporting some limited volumes of oil from the Chirag field in Azerbaijan through a refurbished pipeline from Baku to the Georgian port of Supsa on the Black Sea. BP would like to enhance the size of this line eventually but is being pressed by the US and Turkish governments to favour the longer, more expensive Baku–Ceyhan route. As mentioned above, the US efforts in favour of Baku–Ceyhan are designed to enhance energy security by moving oil supplies away from critical choke points and to re-establish economic cooperation in the region. The USA would also like to eliminate any risk of conflict between Russia and Turkey over congestion on the Bosphorus.

For its part, Russia claims that it is aware of Turkey's concerns and is working diligently to open new export routes for its own oil from its own northernmost ports.²⁴ Routing from Russia's oilfields to the Adriatic is still an economically viable possibility. Neither the US Government nor Turkey has adequately explained why international oil company proposals for shorter, more economic bypasses of the Bosphorus across Turkish territory are unacceptable. Land rights might be one issue, but ultimately the focus on the Baku–Ceyhan route, which is the most expensive of all proposed, has sidetracked pursuit of other Turkish alternatives that might be favoured by oil company investors.

The potential of alternative routes through Russia remains a huge 'wild card' in the debate over Caspian oil exports. A resurgence of Russian concern with and influence in Central Asia and the Caucasus under the new government of President Vladimir Putin has raised the prospects that increased exports may soon flow as Moscow steps out of the way and removes the kind of obstacles it imposed on transport out of the region in the early 1990s.²⁵ However, BP's experience with one Russian oil export route, called the Northern Route, provides an instructive glimpse of potential problems. The line, which extended from Baku through Grozny and Tikhoretsk to the Russian Black Sea port of Novorossiysk, was supposed to carry 120 000 b/d of newly produced oil from Azerbaijan. Ultimately, however, the safety of the line could not be secured. It was not just that security at Grozny could not be ensured because of Russia's armed conflict with Chechnya: routine pilfering from the line by local residents along its extended route meant that BP was unable to maintain the pumping pressure needed to keep commercial flows going, regardless of the state of war or peace along with route.²⁶

In his early days as Russian President, Putin referred to the need for international cooperation in the development of the Caspian resources, thus encouraging optimism in the West. Russia also recently increased Kazakhstan's oil export quota to 15 million tonnes for 2000, up from a previously specified annual volume of 9.5 million tonnes. Transneft is also reportedly inviting Caspian neighbours to use a new line to Makhachkala on the western shore of

²⁴ Fitchett (note 19).

²⁵ Fitchett (note 19).

²⁶ Author's interviews with oil company executives involved in the BP consortium, 19 Sep., 3 Oct. and 12 Nov. 2000.

the Caspian in Dagestan.²⁷ Given its geographical position, exporting through Russia is the most viable option for Kazakhstan because it obviates the need to cross the Caspian Sea or follow a wide span of its coastline before connecting to existing or proposed pipeline export facilities in third countries.

It is hoped that Russia will be able to deliver on its promise to support a new export system from Kazakhstan that will extend from the large Western-run Tengiz oil field through Russia to Novorossiysk. Initially that pipeline, run by the Caspian Pipeline Consortium (CPC), which involves Kazakh, Russian and US oil company shareholders, will carry 28 million tonnes of oil per year from Kazakhstan and Russia. It is expected to be in operation by late 2001.²⁸

However, the limited ability of the Russian military to protect and operate such lines is highlighted by Moscow's less than successful military operations in Chechnya and its inability to protect public facilities inside Russia.²⁹ Serious questions remain as to whether Russia has the capability to fill the vacuum of power that has prompted the rise of non-state actors and the slide into instability that now plagues parts of the region. Moscow's troubles raise important strategic questions for all those involved in the Caspian region. Increasingly, Central Asian leaders like President Islam Karimov of Uzbekistan are looking to Russia for help in controlling an upsurge in Islamic militancy and illegal running of drugs and arms across the region.³⁰ Neither the USA nor any of its fellow NATO members, including Turkey, can put ground forces into the region even approaching the size and capability of Russia's army. NATO's will to do so is also increasingly questioned inside the Caspian region. Russia's willingness to take on religious groups in Tajikistan and Chechnya adds credibility to any security arrangements that it might offer. In the spring of 2000, news reports surfaced that the Central Asian republics were discussing the possibility of opening a joint anti-terrorism centre in Moscow.³¹ The discussions came at the same time as Secretary of State Albright was touring Central Asia and expressing her dissatisfaction with human rights abuses and political repression in the region.³² The US emphasis on these themes and on economic transparency was not well received by local regimes, who prefer Russia's more 'practical' military approach to the region's social problems.³³

According to diplomatic sources, the USA has begun trying to establish a regional body—to include Georgia and Turkey—to maintain security for oil

²⁷ Fitchett (note 19); and 'In the Caspian, it's all pipelines and no oil', *Petroleum Intelligence Weekly*, 11 Sep. 2000, p. 3.

²⁸ 'In the Caspian, it's all pipelines and no oil' (note 27); 'PIW Kazakh discovery eclipses Azeri pipeline progress', 9 Oct. 2000, p. 3, also in *Petroleum Intelligence Weekly* (Energy Intelligence Group, New York, various issues); and author's interviews with shareholders for the various pipelines between Aug. and Nov. 2000. On the membership of the CPC see chapter 3, section I in this volume.

²⁹ On the decline of the Russian military see Pipes, R., 'Is Russia still an enemy?', *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 76, no. 5 (Sep./Oct. 1997).

³⁰ Fitchett (note 19).

³¹ Fitchett (note 19).

³² The texts of Secretary of State Albright's speeches and press conferences are available at URL <<http://www.state.gov>>.

³³ Author's interviews with regional diplomats on 3 Aug. and 15 Nov. 2000.

pipeline routes, presumably bypassing Russia and Iran.³⁴ Among US strategic specialists, however, the extension of the PFP programme into Central Asia has raised new concerns. It has been argued in US policy circles that local conflicts could easily draw Russia and any Western-sponsored or Turkish-led body into an unwanted confrontation if these larger patrons were to support different sides.³⁵ Russia's military support to and presence in Abkhazia in Georgia is one case in point.³⁶ Turkey's previous support of the Azeri war effort in Karabakh and Russia's support of Armenia is another. Thus, it seems advisable for all concerned to re-evaluate strategic priorities and see where common ground exists. There is no point in routing oil expensively all the way to Ceyhan in order to prevent a conflict between Russia and Turkey while at the same time creating the underpinnings for such conflict in protecting that same pipeline.

III. Natural gas: equal export troubles for US policy

The export of natural gas from the Caspian Basin is facing no less complex and difficult problems than the oil pipeline routes. In 1999 the US Government backed efforts to establish the Trans-Caspian Gas Pipeline (TCGP). This \$2 billion line would carry up to 30 billion cubic metres (bcm) of natural gas per year from Turkmenistan to Azerbaijan under the Caspian Sea to Georgia and Turkey. Several private energy companies have looked at the feasibility of the project, including a grouping of Bechtel, General Electric and the Royal Dutch/Shell Group. While technically feasible, the project still faces stiff competition from other, better-organized, cost-effective competitors, including BP's Shah Deniz gas field in Azerbaijan and a \$3.2 billion Russian-Italian-Turkish project called Blue Stream which would bring Russian gas to Turkey via a 750 mile-long pipeline beneath the Black Sea. Moreover, political tensions between Azerbaijan and Turkmenistan make negotiation of the final plans for the TCGP extremely difficult. Iran and Russia also have pre-existing 'take or pay' gas agreements with Turkey that take precedence over proposed projects and involve pipeline infrastructure that already exists.³⁷

US rhetoric continues to support the TCGP project but its competitors were gaining momentum in late 2000. Blue Stream, which partners Russia's state gas monopoly Gazprom with Italy's ENI, has announced that it has arranged \$1.7 billion in credits and expects an additional \$660 million from the Japan Bank for International Cooperation and Japan's Ministry of International Trade and Industry (MITI).³⁸

³⁴ Author's interviews at the US Department of State on 3 Aug. 2000.

³⁵ Sokolsky and Charlick-Paley (note 7); Bhatti and Bronson (note 8); and Jaffe, A. M. and Manning, R., 'The shocks of a world of cheap oil', *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 79, no. 1 (Jan./Feb. 2000), p. 16.

³⁶ Pipes (note 29).

³⁷ Joseph, I., 'Caspian gas exports: stranded reserves in a unique position', Baker Institute Working Paper 1998, available at URL <<http://www.bakerinstitute.org>>.

³⁸ Aliriza (note 20).

IV. US strategic interests: what is at stake?

All this begs the strategic question: What is truly at stake for the USA? If the answer is oil and natural gas, this resource prize hardly seems worth the risks and costs of intervention in a messy, tangled patchwork of ethnic conflict. Even in the event of greater flows than expected from Kazakhstan's Kashagan field, the region's output is still likely to be less than 5 per cent of world oil demand by 2010.³⁹ The region is also very distant from the heart of Europe (unlike the Balkans), and this raises questions about the costs to NATO of instability there. Other types of trade with the Caspian region are also relatively limited in comparison with other regions, again raising questions about the Caspian region's strategic economic importance, especially when viewed against the promising and less difficult markets of Asia and the Indian subcontinent, for example. In this regard NATO's economic interests might diverge somewhat from those of Turkey, which is a more prominent trading partner with the Caspian region.⁴⁰ For Turkey, which has strong cultural links to the Caspian Basin countries, the region remains an important nearby source of energy supplies as well as a major market for its goods and services.

For Russia, the experience of the breakup of the Soviet Union has demonstrated to some extent that the region and its poverty were more of a drain on its resources than an asset.⁴¹ Russia itself also has vastly superior energy resources but cannot muster the finance, technology and logistics to exploit them.⁴² It hardly needs the extra barrels in Kazakhstan. That leaves only the prize of preventing Central Asia from competing with it for international markets, and the responsibilities that would go with blocking Central Asia from earning revenues to sustain itself seem far more costly than letting the region have a minute share of international markets.

The Caspian Basin region's problems of arms proliferation, Islamic militancy and drug trafficking may be more pressing for NATO ally Turkey and for Russia itself, and this is a serious, if corollary, interest for the West. Turkey in particular has suffered from instability and terrorist groups operating along its border areas and must consider the fate of this region in its strategic calculus. However, the question must be asked whether such concerns and the humanitarian considerations that accompany them would not be better handled through multilateral cooperation than through strategic competition.

Given its experience in Chechnya, Russia should have serious reservations about whether it can police the region by itself. There is no question that many influential politicians and military leaders would like to regain not only the full mantle of superpower status but also Russia's historical empire. However,

³⁹ For further detail see Soligo and Jaffe (note 13).

⁴⁰ Bhatti and Bronson (note 8).

⁴¹ Kortunov, A., 'Russia and Central Asia: evolution of mutual perceptions, policies and interdependence', Baker Institute Working Paper, 1998, available at URL <<http://www.bakerinstitute.org>>. See also Olcott, M., 'The Caspian's false promise', *Foreign Policy*, no. 111 (summer 1998), pp. 95–113.

⁴² Rutland, P., *Lost Opportunities: Energy and Politics in Russia*, NBR Policy Analysis Series (National Bureau of Asian Research: Seattle, Wash., 1997).

Russia's world-power status derived in large measure from its military prowess and its nuclear arsenal.⁴³ At present, its generals must face the reality that the country's armed forces are destitute and their morale low. The Russian Army can no longer brandish unlimited manpower, nor is there money to rebuild or maintain large, well-equipped forces.⁴⁴ Similarly, funds to finance a modernized arsenal of new-generation military technologies are lacking. This raises questions about whether there is a gap between any Russian ambitions in the Caspian and Russian capabilities.⁴⁵

For the USA, notwithstanding the 1997 Central Asian Battalion (CentrasBat) exercise which brought US paratroopers parachuting into Uzbekistan, it remains to be seen if policy makers could realistically rally public support for a major operation in a region that most Americans cannot point out on a map and where the vital interests at stake, apart from a small volume of oil, will be hard to articulate convincingly. It took years for US policy makers to clear the idea of intervening in conflicts in the Balkans, which are distinctly closer to the heart of Europe and NATO—literally and figuratively—than the Caucasus, let alone Central Asia. A large and effective US military presence in Central Asia would be not only costly but also politically difficult to 'sell' at home. US civilian and military assistance to the region remains notably minimal. Without the expenditure of vast resources and extensive guarantees, talk of containing Russia in Central Asia and the Caucasus will be counterproductive.

Recommendations that the USA should proactively counter Russia in the Caspian Basin now while Russia is weak may, ironically, only serve to increase the likelihood of a Russian effort to re-assert itself there by fuelling popular support that might otherwise have been missing.⁴⁶ Suggestions that Uzbekistan could serve as the USA's regional military surrogate are even more unwise.⁴⁷ Religious, ethnic and other cultural factors still influence the stability of Central Asia and the Caucasus and threaten relations between neighbours. Increasing arms shipments to indigenous players in the region would risk escalating stubborn and simmering tensions. Moreover, history shows that US efforts to develop such surrogates in other countries can produce questionable results. Surrogates tend to have their own, rather than their masters', interests in mind as they gain military strength. The horrendous blow-back from US covert support to Afghan rebels against the USSR in the 1980s is a dramatic case in point.

⁴³ Pipes (note 29). Richard Starr of the Hoover Institute has estimated that high-technology investment represents 40% of Russia's military budget. He argues that US cooperation with Russia is necessary to prevent Russia from coping with economic failure by resorting to military force as a means to assert itself because he claims that the 'emotional demands' of the elite and older generations inside Russia are pulling away from a pro-Western alignment and integration into the world economy and back towards a military posture and alignment with countries isolated from the West.

⁴⁴ Dick, C. J., *Russian Military Reform: Status and Prospects* (Conflict Studies Research Centre: Canberra, June 1998).

⁴⁵ Pipes (note 29).

⁴⁶ Chufrin, G. and Saunders, H., 'The politics of conflict prevention in Russia and the near abroad', *Washington Quarterly*, vol. 20, no. 4 (1997).

⁴⁷ Starr, S. F., 'Making Eurasia stable', *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 75, no. 1 (Jan./Feb. 1996), pp. 80–92.

V. Russia and the USA: a cooperative framework?

The choices left open to both Russia and the USA suggest that the USA should put Moscow's relationship with the region on its broader bilateral agenda. Neither country is likely to succeed in excluding the other from the region. A more realistic stance is therefore needed by both.

The US agenda should be to shape Russia's role on its southern flank in such a way as to enhance those interests which Russia, Turkey and the USA share. They are surprisingly numerous—to name a few, regional stability, economic development, trade, and a reduction of human suffering and ethnic warfare.⁴⁸

Its experience in Chechnya and Tajikistan should have demonstrated the costs to Russia of simmering discontent and instability on its borders. The USA's experience in the Balkans should make it similarly cautious about single-handedly tackling similar problems in a more remote and difficult terrain. Neither country benefits from having powerful non-state actors launching terrorist attacks inside its territory. For both, the lessons of the former Yugoslavia underscore the dangers of allowing rampant ethnic separatism in the Caucasus and Central Asia to stimulate political devolution in neighbouring states such as Russia and China or on the Indian subcontinent.⁴⁹

Options for cooperation between the USA and Russia do exist. The 1990 Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (the CFE Treaty) is an excellent starting point. Joint peacekeeping operations in Bosnia and Herzegovina and Kosovo have created other positive precedents. Old habits may die hard but ultimately the presence of hard-to-control armed factions in the fractious Caspian region is in no one's long-term interests. Cooperation in apprehending and limiting the reach of operational cells of the Taliban is of paramount importance to Russia, Turkey and the USA. If competition among major powers can be reduced, precedents exist for cooperation on conflict resolution in the region, especially between Armenia and Azerbaijan, supported either by the UN or by the OSCE. Finally, multinational humanitarian programmes which provide educational opportunities, jobs and medical assistance can lessen the appeal of radical leaders by providing an alternative window of hope for the populations of the region.

VI. US policy change expected

The change of leadership in the USA is bringing a review of US policies towards the Caspian region. Such a review is likely to focus its conclusions on several key points.

1. Both Central Asia and the Caucasus have unique problems and concerns and should not be an adjunct to US policy towards Russia.

⁴⁸ Chufirin and Saunders (note 46).

⁴⁹ Jaffe, A. M. and Olcott, M. B., 'The geopolitics of Caspian energy', eds E. Kalyuzhnova and D. Lynch, *The Euro-Asian World: A Period of Transition* (St Martin's Press: New York, 2000).

2. Conflict resolution is an important element in drafting a successful US policy towards the region.

3. Energy assets are not large enough on their own to justify giving the region a vital status in the analysis of the USA's broad strategic interests.

These conclusions will have several different effects on US policy. US attention to the region is likely to be downgraded in the coming years. A Pentagon review of US interests in the region has not supported contentions that these interests merit top priority comparable, for example, to interests in the Persian Gulf.⁵⁰ Under the new presidency of George W. Bush a reorganization of the offices responsible for the Caspian region may in fact strip away much of the separate bureaucratic attention it has been receiving and reduce the number of official visits and diplomatic tours the region enjoys.

Problems of human rights and corruption in Central Asia are being given a higher profile in US policy circles and could begin to weaken public support for the region's leaders, such as Turkmenistan's President Saparmurat Niyazov, in the USA. US National Security Adviser Condoleezza Rice believes that domestic reform is needed in the region before its countries can be strong enough to resist Russia's unwanted meddling.⁵¹

Western oil companies can be expected to continue to lobby the new US Administration to take a lower profile on questions of export routes and regional geo-politics in the coming years and to reverse the four-year-old plan to move 'early oil' through Iran by means of swap arrangements or by pipeline. The companies would like to see US diplomatic activity on the Eurasia energy corridor move closer in line to commercial realities and the economic and logistical practicalities of exporting oil profitably from the landlocked, distant area. The new presidency with its strong ties to the US petroleum industry will be more inclined to do this. The attraction of the Baku–Ceyhan route may also wane as the administration listens to the concerns of the US Armenian community, which backed the Republican election campaign. Such policies will, however, be tempered by Republican conservatives who concern themselves with big-power relations. A Republican administration will be less likely to indulge diplomatically any Russian military adventurism in its 'near abroad' and to deal more 'resolutely and decisively' with 'rogue elements'.⁵² Thus, if Iran's support for international terrorism becomes a policy problem for the new

⁵⁰ Author's conversations with Pentagon officials, 16 Nov. 2000.

⁵¹ Rice, C., 'Promoting the national interest', *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 79, no. 1 (Jan./Feb. 2000), pp. 45–62. She writes: 'The war [in Chechnya] is a reminder of the vulnerability of the small, new states around Russia and of America's interest in their independence. If they can become stronger, they will be less tempting to Russia. But much depends on the ability of these states to reform their economies and political systems—a process, to date, whose success is mixed at best'.

⁵² Rice (note 51) outlines a stronger initiative against 'rogue regimes' and international terrorism. While she does not mention the Taliban explicitly, the principles she espouses could clearly apply to Taliban-sponsored terrorism in Eurasia. The new US Trade Representative, Robert Zoellick, also refers to the benefits of coalitions in dealing more forcefully with such problems as 'dangerous powers' that threaten US interests in Eurasia. Zoellick, R., 'A Republican foreign policy', *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 79, no. 1 (Jan./Feb. 2000).

US leadership, any hopes of activating Iranian routes for oil produced by US companies will be dashed.⁵³

Any evolution of Iran's domestic politics in favour of the rule of law and the democratic principle is bound to create a better atmosphere for improved relations with the USA. However, the current deterioration of the Arab–Israeli dialogue and the negative public relations impact of the military activities of Iranian-supported groups like Hamas and Hizbollah can be expected to slow the process of normalization for the foreseeable future.

The big Western oil companies remain optimistic about the size of the assets that may be discovered in the region but are now more sanguine about the long-term, thorny bureaucratic issues and severe technical difficulties that will be entailed in bringing them to market. Economically viable line fill for a major oil pipeline out of the region is not expected until 2007 at the earliest and maybe even as late as 2015. Privately, ExxonMobil has made clear its lack of interest in committing export volumes to the uneconomic Baku–Ceyhan route and few, if any, other oil companies have substantial discoveries to offer it at the present juncture. BP Amoco's objections to the costly pipeline have been muted by its interest in exporting Shah Deniz gas to Turkey, which is trying to force the British oil giant to offer a small 500 000 b/d oil pipeline as a loss leader to any gas sales.

Few Western companies, if any, believe that it will be possible to exclude or bypass Russia in the process of identifying secure export routes. Rather, many of them are trying to improve their relations with Russia's Gazprom and other Russian parties that may help enhance their chances of monetizing assets. Several companies kindle hopes that Iranian–US relations will improve in the coming years, thus opening up the possibility of more economic export routes through Iran. Other companies would like to see a shorter and cheaper bypass of Turkey's Bosphorus Strait constructed only once it is seen definitively that the waterway cannot handle increasing oil tanker traffic.⁵⁴ It remains to be seen whether the change of administration will be enough to rein in quickly a massive US bureaucracy that has been committed to the Baku–Ceyhan line and accompanying anti-Russia, anti-Iran export policies for almost a decade.

VII. Conclusions

The states neighbouring the Caspian Basin—China, Iran, Russia and Turkey—all perceive a degree of interdependence with the fate of Central Asia and the Caucasus countries. This will be true even if the region's oil and gas bounty does not turn out to be as great as some now expect. While the greatly anticipated wealth of Caspian oil might prove a chimera, geopolitical interest in the region is likely to be sustained.

⁵³ This is the stated policy of the Bush foreign policy team. 'Changes in US policy toward Iran would require changes in Iranian behavior.' Rice (note 51).

⁵⁴ Author's conversations with Western oil company executives over the last 6 months of 2000.

For the USA, then, its national interests in the Caspian Basin are more derivative than fundamental. The region will be strategically tangential as long as its resources are accessible to competing interests. Apart from oil and gas which may not be plentiful enough to justify a major US commitment to the region, US interests should be viewed as case-specific and part of a wider focus on stability in China, Russia, Turkey and the Persian Gulf. On an international level, they are oriented towards ensuring that the region does not become a breeding ground for illicit trafficking in arms, controlled technologies and drugs or a centre of ethnic and religious separatism that could spread political devolution to China, Russia, Turkey or South Asia. Finally, US policy towards the region must take into account humanitarian concern about the basic human suffering that has come about with the collapse of the former Soviet Union and the breakdown in basic economic activity and delivery of social services previously provided by the Soviet system.