

NATO Enlargement and Problems: the Guarantee of Russian Security

Final Report

Prof. Ph. Dr. Iouri M. Pavlov

Moscow State University

Philosophical Faculty,

Chairperson of World Political Process

President of Moscow Philosophical Society

**Member of Expert Commission of Foreign Policy Committee of
State Duma**

Phone: +7 (095) 939-18-49

Fax: +7 (095) 939-22-08

E-mail: 1tm@mail.ru; mpz@rambler.ru

Methodology of research

Many events occurred in XX century - wars, revolutions, conflicts, inconsistencies, and impacts. There was a lot of changes in the world - in its ontology.

The changed of an ontological picture of the world requires its best gnoseology study. The transformation of a world into wholeness needs cognition of its basic tendencies. There were not these new tendencies in old world. The maintenance from their study can create very offensive collision for all humankind. The world needs estimation of all events. At last, the humankind wants new ways of control of processes of world's transformation into integrity. There is a problem if old safety control methods could work in conditions all of contracting space.

Analyzing the problems, we shall be guided by a methodology system – structural, normative, realistic, global approach. It is connected with the lack of unified methodology of cognizing world political process. So, for example, the classic political realism makes a category of «power» of the state on of the foundation of this school. The realism by researching foreign relations considers that the state is the principled or most relevant figure and is the key unit of the analysis. The other participants of foreign relations have smaller significance; even such organizations as the United Nations do not play a considerable role on international arena. Backers of pluralism suppose that the government and non-governmental participants can override the will of central state power. The absence of unified methodology cumpers the solution of a problem. However all these approaches will be allowed in our research.

Taking into consideration all this we shall study activity:

- Of international organizations: the United Nations, Security Council, etc.
- The governmental organizations of old new NATO countries.
- Opinion of Russian government, parliament.
- The civil society.

- MASS MEDIA.
- The outstanding public, states, military leaders.
- Military-industrial complex of Russia and west countries.

We shall refer also to a stand of a number of eastern countries.

Humanity is on the turning point. One way to peaceful coexistence, mutual understanding, collaboration, freedom, democracy. Another way - to confrontation, strengthening of struggle. NATO can fulfill very important role in this case. If NATO does not take into consideration the position of Russia, if it will be excluded from solution of the most important problems, it will cause very negative result.

The future world depends in very big scale on decisions, which will be adopted by NATO. NATO member countries must know that reaction of Russia can be positive and negative. If Russia wants guaranteed its safety, Russia must know the future decisions of that Alliance.

Therefore for us very important to imagine the future decisions of NATO headquarter, and approach of various countries.

NEW WORLD ORDER AND ACTIVITY OF NATO

In the reshaped new global order the NATO aims to extend affected area by extension of NATO operational zone. Naturally, the extension of any military unit should be valued in Russia. The events in y Yugoslavia have attracted attention to the essence of happening events. In political and military space of Europe Russia always took a significant place. The extension of the NATO reduces this space and puts Russia on an edge transforming in minor in Europe.

There is a problem if Russia stay as competitor or it can turn into a partner. The destiny of the world depends on the problem's solution. The consequences of this solution can be rather disastrous. There are politicians, which can anticipate it. Within the "Cold war", there were paths of escaping of the most composite crisis condition, as it seems not paradoxical. They were reached by concessions,

compromises, arrangements. Yes, Russia now is not so strong country as earlier. It is possible to degrade it. As Brzezinsky spoke «Russia - defeated power» after 70 years of communism it has lost the struggle. It is not necessary to support illusion about greatness of Russia.

The establishing ACT Russia - NATO was the large invoking in the field of creation of confidence, it removed the certain problems in Russia - NATO relations.

Yugoslavia events attracted Russian attention to the essence of occurring events.

Powerful military force approach to boundaries of any state is always undesirable. First of all it strikes the all complex of the international arrangements about a limitation of arms and first of all for the Agreements about OSCE. Some western figures suppose, that now position of Russia is those that it should accept the actions of West. However the business is much more difficult. West has not taken in consideration those privileges and advantages, which one can reach. Certainly safety control and repeatability's of Europe is the extremely considerable factor in modern development. However military units never were steady, there were always destructive tendencies.

For a long time there was an idea that conflict in the world is decreased, but as our calculations show in XXI century it will increase.

Would be naive to think that the extension of the NATO encompasses only Western Europe, Russia and USA. It concerns also lot of other countries. In the period of a bipolar world a number of countries was under a nuclear «umbrella» of USA and the other under the «umbrella» of USSR. After abolishment of USSR such countries as India and Pakistan got nuclear weapon and it is necessary to tell, that absence of a bipolar world and transition to unpopular, as it seems paradoxical, will increase the extension of nuclear weapon.

The extension of the NATO on East has imparted already to random consequence: strategic space of Russia, India and China is piled. It is not union, not the unit - this is cooperation. The Ruth NATO extension will force Russian

government to limit partnership with NATO. We can tell, if Russia has state policy it has capabilities to hinder this extension. There IS rather acute problem - what their will is a price of the NATO extension? - Clear, that for the solution of maintenance of repeatability and safety it will be a little - as the historical experience testifies, without finding of comprehension with Russia the most important problems of safety control cannot be resolved. In-group of countries is large abettor force for achievement of their purposes ready to use extreme measures. These forces invoke for a deployment of nuclear weapons in their countries that naturally should cause response of Russia. As a response measure on the NATO extension Russia can offer its own concept of safety control. It is necessary to consider, that in-group of European countries there is a lot of NATO adherent. In case of adaptation of the idea of safety on OSCE base the number of its supporters will sharply increase.

From abolishment of the Warsaw Treaty Organization, there was a problem whether the antipode WTO political-military alliance of the NATO is intended? It is necessary to tell that this political-military alliance is key originating factor of military-technical competing «West - East» destruction. The base of this union was sober estimation of mutual external threats but conventional concerns military, designers and producers of weapons.

By One word - concerns MCK.

On the first view it seems that this great «the gear of cold war», no doubt, lost main reference points of conventional military safety - WTO and USSR, nowadays has lost also other reference points of development and as a consequent motives in a name which one it was created.

However it not so! Let us analyze what had happened to NATO after USSR abolishment. Let us begin the analysis from countries of East Europe, which is included in WTO. The proposal of NATO extension under the slogan of repeatability export in 1993 has found broad response in these countries. At first, it was perceived as a favorable capability to get in privileged club Europe - EU, to reach the same high level of welfare as in these countries. Many supposed, that

inclusion in NATO would insure the path to EU. Secondly, earlier there was a steady estimation that closed collaboration with the West, itself can decide many inconsistency, will raise culture standards, create repeatability, increase democratic tendencies, guarantees the personal right and etc. Thirdly, for a long time in countries of the region had been blowing a myth of aggressiveness of the Soviet Union concerning these countries. This threat was so widely advocated that at the end has resulted in a definite aftertreatment of a fascism in these countries. Nobody has offered any alternative. The proposals without alternatives have received support in East Europe. All those who try to criticize this process was introduced in a role of restraining legitimate interests of safety of east European countries. During a long time, was advocated an idea that interplay with USSR has only negative results. Undoubtedly they were, but there were a lot of positive moments.

Unfortunately, new members of NATO and look toward to enter countries in every possible way blow up the anti Russian hysteria, kill the confidence, which one was piled in Europe for the last 50 years.

July 8 1997 NATO has invited reforming countries to enter the alliance Poland, Czech Republic and Hungary. To the Madrid solution have preceded hard and long negotiations. This decision creates strong resistance of Russian government. This resistance was overcome by participating of Russia in solving all the problems connected with the safety in Europe. This rule is captured in Establishing Act NATO Russia.

In Russia do not understand why in the beginning of present century NATO plays such a big role in world community. When in 1980-1990 stopped confrontation between units and in 1991 the Warsaw Treaty Organization dismissed in Russia waiting for the same for NATO.

However, in West there were many backer of its maintenance. USA has found out that the unit is necessary for military and political influencing in Europe, which became is weighted upon the American military advantage. The NATO is necessary for implementation of the geopolitical plans of West in Middle East and in Southern hemisphere.

Maintenance national security of Russia

Among numerous problems of maintenance of national safety of Russia preventing act of war on the part of any aggressor have prime value?

It is impossible to decide this problem by a diplomatic way directing on disarming. It is connected with the development of military engineering and upbuilding of different kinds of arms does not serve of primary military hazard threatening to mankind but it is a consequent of a main inconsistency of habitability of the human society - inconsistency between increased requirements of rising mankind with a capability of their satisfaction by resources of the planet.

This inconsistency has spawned attendant:

- Inconsistency between the states in strife for planet resource.
- Necessity to waist resources for arms to protect the concerns of country and full disarming policy with the purpose of saving resources for satisfaction of increasing needs of the society.
 - The inconsistency between necessity of creation of economic mechanisms ensuring production, saving and distribution of material benefits on principles saving of resources, development in practice economic mechanism and manufacturing orbs grounded on principles of wastefulness of resources..
 - Inconsistency between saving of material benefits as a result of activity of manufacturing orb and independent distribution their financial sphere.
 - Inconsistency between public way of production and appropriation of results by smallgroup of the owners of production factor and group who control manufacturing and finance-distributive orb.

These inconsistencies provoke tension in relationships between states and units, which will increase because of overpopulation, absence of the not populated territories suitable for man existence, exhausting of irreplaceable natural resources and destruction of environment.

Russia, which during 70 years (up to 90-th years) adhered to save policy in

habitability of the society, has managed to keep resources and territories ensuring very large strategic advantage before developed countries. These countries, were guided wasteful policy have exhausted the resources and ream the manufacturing orb at the expense of natural resources and low-paid manpower of the underdeveloped states.

It times to correct the concept of advance and power of the state. As advance it is necessary to consider those achievements in habitability of the society, which allow to fit requirements at minimum consumption of resources and keep habitat of the man.

The power of the state is determined by a reserve of resources and territory permitting to provide satisfaction of needs of the society and protection of resources and territories from the invasion of an aggressor.

Therefore the presence of effective arms and means of counteraction of ideological, financial and economic and information aggression, should help from one hand liquidation of military hazard and preventing of any other kinds of aggressive operating against Russia, and, on the other hand ending of the arms race by means of maintenance of strategic equilibrium at a minimum level first of all of strategic arms. The dialectics of development of geopolitical situation does not eliminate a threat to security of Russia; the possible kinds can be sectioned into following categories:

Threat of applying of global nuclear-missile weapon.

1. Global nuclear war with applying of massive nuclear strikes.
2. Applying indispensable quantity of nuclear strikes for a defeat of administrative and military control centers of strategic value (decapitate shock).
3. Applying nuclear-missile attacks for liquidation of a potential of guaranteed retribution at a encounter attack (disarming shocks).
4. Unauthorized use of automatic weapon.

- Threat of applying of global high-performance weapon with a non-nuclear charge with high-precision guidance methods. This weapon should provide policy of decapitating and disarming shocks, but it does not remove a problem of

world catastrophe, so among destruction objectives can be power objects, among which there are also atomic power plants. No one can be sure that the applying of this weapon will not provoke a global nuclear war.

- The threat of creation world wide antimissile defense which will disturb military and strategic equilibrium and capability of enforcing global nuclear-missile war.

The creation of worldwide AMD predetermines implementation of policy of destruction all active nuclear potential and allows the owner of wide AMD to unleash global nuclear-missile war with applying of massive nuclear strikes.

General analysis of present threats and creation nowadays kinds of arms, capability of their further perfecting, make a conclusion that the humankind has entered such phase of the existence, when the development of arms has resulted in impossibility of wars because of hazard of abolishment life on planet and world catastrophe.

The above-indicated threats can be divide into three categories:

1. Geopolitical.

- Applying of global nuclear-missile weapon.
- Applying of global high-precision weapon.
- Creation world wide AMD.

2. Scale war with applying only of custom weapon.

3. Local war with applying only of custom weapon.

The presence of strategic nuclear-missile weapon should serves as a means of preventing of any military conflicting. Therefore, it is necessary to aim at that that policy of a encounter attack permitting to keep a potential have guaranteed retribution as.

However, threat of local wars with applying of nuclear weapon, apparently, will be exist for a long time. Therefore it is necessary to consider alongside with creation of a system of constraining of war with applying of strategic nuclear-

missile weapon and similar measures of counteraction to threats of any wars with applying of nuclear weapon, as a separate problem.

Question of USA national BMD system

In Russia understand, that many European politicians share fears of the Russian authorities that in case of realization of the plans to create in the USA national BMD system, the international system of strategic security will be undermined.

In this connection, a problem of change of priorities in Europe arises. So, on Russia's opinion, German politicians and executives aim to push aside France from cooperation with Russia, establishing privileged relationships with Moscow. At the first meeting with Putin federal chancellor of Germany Gerhard Schroder directly has declared that «Germany is interested in strategic partnership with Russia». Before this visit, the concept of «strategic partnership» used only in relationships between Germany and USA.

In Russia perfectly understand, that West does not speak with them using the same voice as with other countries. In Europe and USA now is especially precisely felt an edge between interests of the executives and politicians. The chiefs of such companies as Daimler-Chrysler in Germany, FIAT in Italy, British Airspace incite their politicians to closer cooperation with Russia. In general, it is necessary to say, that West yet has not clearly defined its attitude to Russia. In USA, appeals to conduct world policy without Russia (World without Russia) can be heard from time to time. European leaders consider that the line of conduct in relationships concerning Russia should be other - partnership of patience. The Clinton's administration obviously has overdone in relationships with Russia. Clinton himself has understood that, and tried to soften the line of conduct before his resign. His presidency will go down into history as the period of strong pressure on Russia; USA introduction into the sphere of influence of former USSR, all possible support to strengthen independence of former Soviet republics, NATO spreading

on East. It was the period of partial confrontation with Russia. However Clinton's name can go down into history of the Russian-American relationships, as follower of one of ideologists of fascist Germany Rosenberg, who posed a task to divide USSR into a lot of states and first of all to crack commonwealth of Russia and Ukraine.

Europe now lives in a zone of «comfortable security», created to it largely not by USA, but by Russia. Europe takes a rather conciliatory position in relationships to rather militant appeals of a number of countries of East Europe chiefs. For example, president of Poland appeals to nuclear weapons deployment on their territory. West forgets that it officially has recognized Russia as the USSR's assignee and ignores the numerous obligations of West implied from this circumstance. Russia gave up to the West the huge market of countries of East Europe. However, West speaks very much about human rights, about democracy, but it is respected neither in Baltic countries, nor in Ukraine.

The Europeans do not understand all complexity of the problem, with which Russia collides on the southern borders. Therefore they frequently too easily criticize Russia for different actions. It is rather convenient position. Many executives, in particular in Council of Europe make career on criticism of Russia in connection with human rights. In European Council do not understand real problems, which arise on way of spreading of European values into Russia, and furthermore into Asian continent, for example into Uzbekistan and Azerbaijan. In Europe do not understand, that Russia cannot go by the same way in construction of democracy, that for example, Czech.

In Russia the illusions are largely overcome, that West is going to help Russia in every possible way. A perspective again to see Russia as the great power for many people from the West is not pleasant, though not to all. It is necessary to say, that all over the world, even in contiguous with USA country Canada, in many countries of Western Europe, countries of Asia, Africa, Latin America opinion becomes more and more stronger, that the bipolar world was more stable, predicted, protected, than unipolar. West obviously does not take into

consideration state of public opinion which is strengthening in the world, that strong, democratic, socially oriented Russia where is better for preserving world security, than weak, friable, unstable country.

Kosovo crisis has shown that West does not take into consideration interests of Russia, and last event display, that NATO cannot solve this crisis. Weak Yugoslavia increasingly clearly displays, that Russia should orient on her own forces. The war in Yugoslavia has rendered most serious effect on internal policy in Russia; there was a consolidation of society on the national basement.

USA wants from Russia only one thing - disarming. Nevertheless, with Europe Russia can establish relationships of strategic partnership.

In 10-15 years of USA will be compelled to leave Europe. It is one of the alternate solutions of the problem. It becomes possible, if the courageous ideas of joint security control of Russia and Europe will be pushed. Today it is impossible, because at an authority in European countries the people genetically afraid of the Russian aggressiveness and prefer to hide under the American umbrella of security. But generations change, and the new generation will have other values.

Let us notice, that relationships between Russia and NATO became to defreeze after demission from post of the general secretary Kcavier Solana, being one of the main ideologists and organizers of war on Balkan, and arrival on his place the ex-ministers of a defense of Great Britain George Robertson.

In NATO know statements of marshal Sergeev, made by him on negotiations in this organization. He directly has declared, that Russia is off-the shelf to serious conversation on key questions of international security, if thus she will not feel, that the interests of Russian Federation are restrained or there is a threat to its security. Sergeev has declared, that Moscow does not aim at a right of veto on all solutions of NATO. Its purpose - joint efforts to solve difficult problems of security and stability in Europe. And the resumption of cooperation with a north Atlantic alliance can be only installment, with accent on problems of a prime significance. Among them, marshal Sergeev highlighted peacemaking,

spreading of NATO and scrambling with international terrorism. The negative attitude of Russia to spreading NATO remains constant.

In Russia state, that after disintegration of the USSR for it a lot of threats has arisen: spreading of NATO towards East, new NATO strategy, proclaimed the right of this Alliance to conduct «peace-making operations» in any region of the world, strategic environment of Russia by transformation post-Soviet space in a zone of «strategic interests» of NATO against Yugoslavia undermined positions of Russia in Southeast Europe; «involuntary ratification» of START-II agreements, loosening a nuclear arsenal of Russian Federation.

New threat now becomes ripe: the preparation for deployment in USA national BMD, that means a breach of ABM (Anti-Ballistic Missile) Treaty (1972), which for about 30 years serves as «corner stone of strategic stability in the world».. It is involved not only deterioration of Russian-American relationships, but also firing of geostrategic stability. Its philosophy is, that the vulnerability of territory from nuclear strikes creates confidence of the parties to an agreement that any of them will not risk to attack the probable opponent arranging equivalent forces for a return strike, causing irreversible damage. The parties can not deploy systems BMD on territory of the country and should not create the basis(fundamentals) for such defense; the parties can not have systems BMD radius 150 kms within the limits of one region with center located in capital of the state, and system BMD radius 150 kms within the limits of one arrangement of mine launchers ICBM.

In Russia understand, that real threat for USA on the part of Iran, Iraq and Northern Korea does not exist. The Russian public believes, that USA will use false reasons for failure BMD - II. Series of steps in this direction is already attempted. For example, construction of bases on Spitsbergen. With the purposes of creation of New Ballistic Missiles Defense (NBMD) system the visit to Moscow of the first state secretary of USA Telbot was attempted in September, 1999. His proposals were perceived as the ultimatum, as Telbot has declared, that if the American proposals will not be adopted, USA will leave the agreements BMD - 72

and will act how it will be necessary for them. Political, diplomatic, military-technical, financial and other measures display, that the USA authorities already actually has accepted for itself the solution on creation NBMD.

In this connection offered the implementation of following measures to neutralize NBMD:

1. The preservation of existing guided-missile systems DVH (divided warheads), which service life can be prolonged until 30 years.
2. Providing SPBMF with enough means, which are capable to break through lines of interception, created by objects of BMD.
3. Boosting activities on full recovery and technical updating of radar complexes of Airborne Early Warning system.
4. Including into prior ones R&D that aims strengthening of battle efficiency of guided-missile systems.
5. Immediate equipment of guided-missile systems “Topol-M” with divided warheads.
6. Increase in battle capabilities of marine and air components of SNF. Until 2005-2007 years it is necessary to put into operation one-two nuclear-powered submarines «Typhoon» and 10-15 heavy bombers TU-160. Realizations of these measures will need huge resources, but their finding already called into question.

Russian Military Doctrine

It is known, that the new military doctrine of Russian Federation is aimed on «confirmation of principles of equivalent partnership, mutually advantageous cooperation and good neighborhood in international relationships, series formation of a general(common) and universal system of international security, preservation and strengthening of the general world».

Question in this connection arises, whether the military doctrine can

constrain spreading of NATO. In Russia believe, that the spreading of NATO on East and transformation of the unit in dominating military force in Europe is endangered of new split of continent, extremely dangerous in conditions of preservation in Europe of a mobile nuclear group of a troops, with automatic weapons, and also insufficient efficiency of multilateral gears of maintenance of the world. In a withstanding to threats Russia, as it is determined by its military doctrine, priority returns to political, diplomatic and other not powered means, aiming to equivalent and mutually advantageous partnership from NATO in combination to firm determination to defend by all available forces and means national interests, to guarantee security of country. Russia has designated the geopolitical interests in Central Asia and methods of their settling-out, if the political ways of effect will reach them, and economic will not justify. Russia on a stretching of long-term time is closely connected to countries of Central Asia and considers this region as a zone of the vital interests. First, these states bound with Russia and for it important, that with them the familiarity was kept. Secondly, Russia and countries of Central Asia has common interests, first in sphere of scrambling with international terrorism, islamic extremism, drug Mafia and transportation of narcotics. A part of these countries (Kazakhstan, Kirghizia, Tajikistan) are the parties to an agreement about collective security, other are connected by the two-sided or multilateral agreements to Russia permitting to them to use not only political and economic, but also other, including military methods of protection of the national interests. So, border of Tajikistan with Afghanistan safeguard not only Tajik, but also the Russian frontier guards, and division of Russian 201 motorized-rifle division participate in prevention of break of armed gangs from Afghanistan on territory of Tajikistan and Uzbekistan.

With the purposes of formation and maintenance of stability, maintenance of adequate reaction on arising of external threats at early stages the limited quota AF Russian Federation and other troops can be placed in is strategic the important regions outside territory of Russia in a structure of an integrated or national group

and separate bases (objects). The conditions of such deployment are regulated by the appropriate international-legislative documents.

On territory of Georgia four Russian military bases in Vaziani, Gudaut, Akhalkalaki and Batumi are now located. Pursuant to the agreement between Russia and Georgia on military bases in Vaziani and Gudaut until July 1, 2001 will be disbanded and removed from territory of Georgia. On two other bases the Georgian-Russian negotiations on the order of their operation and terms of staying on territory of Georgia are conducted.

According to the regulations of Military doctrine of Russian Federation, its Armed forces alongside with problem solving on prevention and repulsing aggression should provide implementation Russia's peace-making activity independently, and in a structure of international organizations as well. In zone of the Georgian-Abkhazian conflict now there is a group of the Russian troops by number up to 1800 persons. This group, according to the conflicting parties and international look-outs, successfully manages the tasks, assigned to it, being the guarantor of the peace and stability in region. Due to this group the disconnection of an armed group of the conflicting parties is ensured, the bloodshed brought to a stop and the peaceful life is establishing.

Russia plans to defend state border within the limits of frontier territory, airspace and underwater environment, and also exclusive economic area both continental shelf of Russian Federation and their natural resources. There is a question, how it collects to do(make) Russia in conditions of uncertainty of state border and continental shelf of Russian Federation in the Caspian and Azov seas and Kerch channel? The protection of state border of Russian Federation is provided not only and at all so much with military measures.

As to the Caspian and Azov seas and Kerch channel, here problems consist not of delineation, and in definition of its legal status, taking into consideration specificity of a geographical position of these regions. The negotiations on these questions already long-term time are conducted with Caspian states, and concerning the Azov sea and Kerch channel with Ukraine. There is a confidence,

that the existing problems will be solved with allowance for preservations of amicable and mutually advantageous relationships of Russia with the states, bordering with her.

The reduction of a battle structure BMFSP (Ballistic Missiles Forces of Strategic Purposes) implements within the framework of realization Russia of the international treaties on limitation and reduction of strategic offensive armaments. In connection with ratification by Russia of the Agreement START-II, with which the full liquidation to the end of 2007 of multicharge land-based missiles is provided, in case of the introduction it by virtue of a battle structure SPBMF will be significantly reduced. At the same time instead of out-of-date guided-missile systems injected from a battle structure, BMFSP are equipped by a perspective modern guided-missile system “Topol-M”, which have no analogs in the world by many characteristics. Thereby battle structure BMFSP will be saved at a required level ensuring with allowance for marine and an air component of strategic nuclear forces of Russia balance of potentials of nuclear constraining of Russian Federation and United States of America.

As to a structure of Armed forces of Russian Federation as a whole, it will unconditionally be subject to definite transformations adequate reductions of a battle structure BMFSP.

Perspective of airborne troops

Now airborne troops are mostly combat-readiest troops in a structure of general-purpose forces of Armed forces of Russian Federation. They form main skeleton of peace-making forces of Russia. In process of realization of military reform battle potential of airborne troops will be increased at the expense of increase of qualitative parameters.

Private property and state ownership questions in military respect

With the purposes of maintenance of military security the state can use means and resources irrespective of patterns of ownership. The conditions and order of engaging of resources owned as private property, are regulated by the appropriate normative legal acts of Russian Federation: by the federal acts «About defense», «About mobilization, preparation and mobilization in Russian Federation» and other..

As Internet is regulated in sufficient degree neither international nor Russian law, criminal elements use capabilities of the world wide web for purposes, incompatible with the international law.

The experience of realization counter-terrorist operation in the North-Caucasian region has shown, that the counteraction to attempts to use Internet by the international terrorists in the criminal purposes requires legal regulation of activity of this system at an international level. Russian Federation undertakes active steps in a direction of development and acceptance by global community of the appropriate acts.

Russia principal position consists of observance of principles of non-use of force, non-interference in domestic affairs, respect of person's rights and freedom, and non-admission to use achievements in sphere of informatization and telecommunications for purposes, contradicting the UN Charter.

The danger of «cyber wars» with usage of global computer networks and other means of communications, on our opinion, exists and requires adoption of preventive measures. It is impossible to admit development of a new orbit of arms race, which is capable to provoke a new area of confrontation on international arena based on achievements of technological revolution in sphere of information technologies.

Russia actively acts for development of the international legal regimes of the warning of usage of information technologies in incompatible with problems of maintenance of international stability and security the purposes, for effective scrambling with information terrorism and crime, including creation of an international system (center) of monitoring of threats connected to information

security. So, in 1998 under the initiative of Russia on 53 sessions of UN General Assembly the First committee (questions of disarming and international security) has accepted by consensus, without voting the resolution on consideration «of existing and potential threats in sphere of information security».

The machinery of Council of security of Russian Federation closely is engaged in the sanction of existing problems in this sphere. Therefore, the realization of meeting of Council of security of Russian Federation with the agenda is this year scheduled to June: «About state policy of Russian Federation in the area of information confrontation and measures by its realization». By results of this meeting the solutions will be adopted, realization of them will allow, as it is represented, considerably advance in questions of maintenance of information security of Russian Federation.

English-American system of global espionage «Echelon»

In Russia pay attention that USA together with some allied countries realized the program of deployment and active usage of system of global control over telecommunications «Echelon». Listening-in and data processing stations of this system deployed on continental part of USA, and Puerto-Rico, on the territory of Great Britain, Canada, Denmark, New Zealand and Australia. By the conclusion of European experts, the technical feasibilities of radio electronic reconnaissance means, integrated in «Echelon system», allow executing listening-in and processing of large mass of data.

Only for last ten - fifteen years after the end of the Second World War USA have developed more than ten plans of nuclear annihilation of the USSR (Pincher, Broiler, Frolic, Sizzle, Trojan, Shakedown, Dropshot, SIOP etc.). These plans were not realized basically because of fear of USA to suffer damage, irreversible for them, from a requital return strike.

At the present stage it is necessary to stop process of SNF (Strategic Nuclear Forces) destruction in that point, up to which it sink into. To keep the remaining

staff of the experts in this area. To keep on a battle duty only checked and technically serviceable weapon. Completely to make up these services with the professionals and experts.

To declare an exit by pacts, treaties and agreements, which do not take into consideration a position of Russia after the disintegration of USSR and contradict the adopted and technically equipped doctrine of authorized usage of our nuclear weapon (response-counter usage) to result control SNF in conformity with political-military realities of today. Having stopped everyone's empty reasoning on a general inhibitory and destruction of nuclear weapons to develop with the purposes of the legislative confirmation and realization such doctrine of creation and application of forces of nuclear constraining, which for the nearest decades reliably would shield Russia from any strong external interference, from war and has allowed without dictate, blackmail and threats from the outside is capable to conduct all reforms, including in army.

Military security

It is necessary to understand military security as a qualitative condition of political-military situation, at which is absent or the probability of application against country of armed violence is reduced to minimum.

To the main global changes, determined the policy of Russia in the field of military security, is necessary is to relate disintegration of the USSR and abolition of Organization of the Warsaw agreement that were in rigid confrontation from USA and NATO; policy of USA to become the sole global leader, having subordinated the influence activity of leading international organizations (including UN); ascending of political activity Islamic fundamentalism; large-scale political and propaganda activity in an expansion region of NATO and NATO approaching to Russia borders; numerous local wars (especially arisen on «ruins» of the USSR and Yugoslavia); a skyrocketing growth of Japan military power which has reached the third place in the world for defense expenditures; increase of

the geopolitical status of Germany as a result of integration of two German states. Russia should also take into consideration happening now in the world, and especially in USA, every possible varieties of so-called weapon of non-lethal effects (WNLE). Among its different kinds there are crystalline dusts for destruction of automobile tires; germs making worthless reserves of fuel; supercaustic acids destroying piers of bridges; superviscous polymers making useless take-off and landing strips and runways; powerful blinding lasers; microwave oscillators; soporific substances; special acoustic generators; the means of impulse defeat etc. Debate about new kinds of weapon have begun concurrently with conversations about a new role of USA in the world after the end of Cold War.

In the last decade concepts «information war» and «information weapon» are under active use. There was a final documentary registration of ideas of American military strategists on complex usage of the information as an independent kind of armed scrambling. In 1992 Directive MO USA TS 3600.1 «Information war» was issued, in 1993 - Directive #30 of Joint Committees of the chiefs of headquarters USA AF and in 1995 – USA AF Regulations FM 100-6.

Concept of «information war» (as a synonym is used «information confrontation») has integrated some development trends of military science and engineering: an electronic warfare activity, reconnaissance, psychological operations, and special software-technical effect at computer systems. Therefore, Russian security should actuate: means of counteraction to computer viruses; to logical bombs; suppression of an information volume in communication networks.

It is threatens to security of Russia that there was a refusal of formal neutrality of UN. In this connection there is an weakening of a peace-making role UN, because of switching of UN activity to functions on maintenance of the world of USA or NATO. Modern peace-making actually has transformed from a means of maintenance of balance of global forces to the instrument of new repartition of the world.

New global realities

In the last decade there was a changeover in political paradigm of independent foreign-policy course towards belief in necessity of Russia participation in international cooperation structures, in which Russia will be object of management. This «junction,» to the western rules of behavior on the political scene was associated with obtaining assistance from international community. This transition, to put it mildly, did not comply with national-state interests of Russia, and the proclaimed approach seems simply naive. Systems of not equivalent concessions and (or) tactical compromises, and also covered selfish opposition have caused loss of Russian initiative not only in regional policy, but also in statement and solution of global problems. Moreover, control center of international processes steadily moved to West in these years. The absence in our country reflexion of theoretical and of program activity became reason to use western stereotype in foreign policy, that stereotype turned out to be inadequate to the situation and to the main process of international-political transformation. There was eclecticism in political philosophy, forms and means of realization of programs, in principles of design and of programming of international relationships. For a long time political authorities of Russia remained engaged in fulfillment proclaimed and implanted before that western ideological clichés. However since 1994 difficult transition from satellite-neo-conservative romanticism to neo-realism, that requires reorganization of political creation and new self-determination of Russia in global community, had begun. Foreign-policy realities and inner-local situations formed not only crisis West-oriented partnership, but also have resulted necessity of revision of all foreign-policy activity of Russia. Today in broad intellectual circles understanding arises of features of Russia's historical way, of forms and developments of statehood,

processes and capabilities of participation in western development programs of international relationships system.

In modern world there are two strategies: construction authoritarian new world order using traditions of totalitarian charter, or democratization of global system of partnership, relying on non-rigidly defined frameworks of international relationships on the contractual fundamentals. Contents of the first strategy includes approving of the USA leading role in regional organizations and processes, and also USA paternalist partnership with regional powers in solution of crisis situations and formation multi-polarness on the basis of global political control.

Hypertrophy of functions of USA in global policy acquires to middle 90 years features of challenge for global community.

The second strategy takes into consideration the new global realities much better. West gives to Russia an auxiliary role for problems solutions. But it obviously contradicts the interests of security maintenance of Russia. Processes of Russia displacement from regions of its priority interests cause sharply negative estimations in Russia. The activation of independent external policy of Russia, based on balanced understanding of national, state interests can result significant shifts in international relationships system of Russia. Only actions of that kind will allow to talk about a new step to maintenance of Russian security, to talk about predictability of its policy toward partners and rivals, to create new conditions for maintenance of stability in a system of international relationships, to give way to use more reliable technologies of maintenance international security.

Military situation in Russia after USSR disintegration

After disintegration of the USSR geostrategic defense system considerably has worsened – space of political-military maneuver was diminished; echeloned defense is deranged; many defense combat-ready and technically equipped troops

turn out to be outside country - the air defense system, electronic warfare are deformed, reconnaissance - operative-strategic control of large group is broken.

In CIS countries there were 13 combined-arms armies and corps, 2 missile strategic destination armies, 3 air-raid armies, 5 air-force armies. These units were equipped with the latest engineering achievements. Only 15-20 % of materiel of AF USSR has passed to the Russian Armed Forces.

Transformation USSR former republics into independent states has made Russia more vulnerable. The Moscow military district became frontier, and the approach time of missiles up to Moscow from the side of Baltic States now counts only 3-4 minutes. It is necessary to take into consideration that in case of entering Baltic States in NATO quartering military bases of this Alliance on their territory is possible. Today on territory of Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia intelligence services of USA and Germany create branches collecting information about Russian Federation.

Having agreed on troops withdrawal from Germany, on joining up of FRG and GDR, Russia has not demanded Germany to exit from NATO. Eltsin has shown too short historical memory.. Foreign Affairs of Russia has pass over in silence also he question of indemnification of costs invested in GDR, which by a number of estimations counted in billions DM. meanwhile, USA and Germany were ready to discuss this question and to make concessions. Baltic countries exit from Russia arises a question in the West about revision of the status of the Kaliningrad zone. The partition of Yugoslavia has passed under the German scenario. Germany now is involved in sphere of Hungary, Czechia, Slovakia and Poland influence, has invested its capitals and has magnified political positions on Ukraine and in Baltia, skillfully benefits from the Russian-Ukrainian contradictions. In other words Germany isolates Russia from its conventional allies. With formation of CIS Russia has lost a number of the native lands, seaports, objects of strategic purposes.

As sources military perils our country considers rushing the separate states to dominate in regions and their adherence to the solution of questions of raw

materials and recourses by military means, presence of powerful units of armed forces in some states and keeping system of their basing near to borders of Russia; instability of political-military situation in combination with escalating of military potential by some countries; distribution of nuclear, other kinds of mass destruction weapon and international terrorism; attempts to use means of political, economic pressure and military blackmail against Russia. These factors are danger to Russia. However, there are also other. It is known, that the agreement for conventional armaments and armed forces in Europe signed by the Soviet Union, has put in very complicated position Russian Federation, which geopolitical characteristic considerably differs from USSR. Russia according to the mentioned agreement can have in flank districts as regular army units only 700 tanks, 580 Armour vehicles and 1280 artillery systems. Taking into consideration, that these two military districts take huge territory, on which tens European states can be placed, and also their geopolitical value, becomes obvious insufficiency of this military equipment and armaments for creation of a defensive units. Military personnel of units and formations of our overland troops located in these districts, remains without tank and marine cover and protection.

After the realization of START-II Agreement strategic nuclear forces (SNF) cannot cause irreversible damage to the opponent. Besides that, START-II Agreement does not take into consideration available in USA Navy cruise missiles arsenal of surface ships and submarines, which can transform to powerful strategic automatic weapon. USA disposes quite definite advantages on detection of mobile guided-missile systems. A main means of constraining of aggression at Russia was rockets with divided warheads of personal conduct. At the expense of possible engaging in ASNF (air strategic nuclear forces) additional quantity of strategic airplanes such as B-52 and B-1 a rocket volley with nuclear charges ASNF USA to exceed a rocket volley ASNF of Russia more than in 5 times. ICBM (intercontinental ballistic missiles) is main means of constraining of a potential aggressor and Russia has offered to liquidate them by agreement, having substituted on single-block (with one nuclear charge). It is possible quantitatively

(with the help of criterion «efficiency - cost») to show, that such proposal of Russia on annihilation of multicharge ICBM with DVH IT (divided warhead with individual targeting) augments efficiency existing BMD USA in some times without realization of its modernizing and improving. Therefore USA send even on almost double reduction ASNF (air strategic nuclear forces). The main argument about necessity of liquidation ICBM with DVH IT (especially such as SS-28 with ten warheads) for Russia was economic profit. However, it is completely incorrect. It was the error solution of the Soviet chiefs. It can be an example of incompetence (then from the USSR authorities), how USA removed CM (cruise missiles) of surface ships and submarines from subject of negotiations on conventional armaments in Europe (Agreement OSCE), while under the initiative USSR tanks were determined as offensive weapon. But yet in 1976 in the field charter of army of USA FM 100-5 was stressed, that the tanks and anti-tank guided missiles are the most effective means of a defense.

The quantitative estimations on fulfillment START-II display, that USA receive even greater superiority among nuclear weapon carriers (1,26:1) and among nuclear charges (1,13:1). Significant superiority of USA will have in total power of nuclear potentials:

	Characteristic in 1993			To 01.01.2003		
	USA	Russia	Ratio	CIIA USA	Russia	Ratio
General number of nuclear weapon	4025 carriers	3694	1,09:1	2196	1748	1,26:1
General number of nuclear charges	10563	9915	1,06:1	3492	3046	1,13:1
General megatonnage	2785	5352	0,52:1	1424	1006	1,43:1
Rates of reduction of a general megatonnage				By 1,96 times	By 5,32 times	

The most serious concerning about the anti-missile plans of USA is stated by China, created intercontinental nuclear potential largely to maintain the status of superpower, can not allow, that this status in the political-psychological plan will be lessen by the value of USA NBMD.

USA NBMD and countries of the other world

NATO Allies of USA also are unsatisfied by the American activity in BMD area: with appearance of NBMD, may be actually very limited and ineffective, there is a situation, in essence unacceptable for an alliance, of unequal security of USA and Western Europe. France with independent nuclear potential, which was essentially reduced in latest years and has a steady downward tendency found itself in especially heavy situation. If China obviously goes (under effect both plans in relation to USA NBMD, and operations of NATO in Kosovo in 1999 on escalating of the intercontinental strategic means), France most likely can not afford this,

inasmuch as, by many sources, the national will to provide the status of the great power at the expense of a necessary level of nuclear potential has run out.

Russia actively acts against creation of USA NBMD, against destruction of the agreement on BMD. This item is quite justified, as the destruction of the Agreement on BMD can result in destruction of all system of strategic stability and control of arms. A problem of a proliferation of nuclear weapons and possibility of purchase by such countries as North Korea and Iran, could be decided by statement on more high level of cooperation in this question of Russia, USA and PRC, for example, with reference to North Korea. Russia - USA and Western Europe to Iran. Unfortunately, this cooperation has not reach a level adequate to the scale of problems.

Pekin asserts, that, having defended from Chinese missiles, Washington begins to talk to it in completely different way. Washington will conduct conversations from position of force and absolute superiority. It is very similar to the truth. The purpose of deployment national BMD - protection of USA against missiles in general, irrespective of their state belonging – to North-Korea, to Iran, to China and to Russia. In Washington, do not conceal the intention to organize BMD irrespective of Russia opinion. If Russia agree to change the old Soviet-American agreement on BMD from 1972 – very well. If not – there would be no trouble. And when the territory of USA will be reliably protected from the Russian missiles to talk to her it will be possible just as with Yugoslavia, Iraq or Libya. No these means, that Washington is hatching out the secret plans of bombardment of Russia and at once after creation BMD attacks the Russian cities. The arsenal of means of pressure is wide enough - from the sanctions to full isolation. Nevertheless, all this is possible only after last parameter equalizing USA and Russia - ability to a mutual cancellation - will be removed.

Recently Europe protests against the plans of deployment of national USA BMD more loudly. So the president of France Jacques Shirac has declared, that «the creation of collective security system in Europe is impossible without Russia participation in this process». Also he added: «the European Union should be on

Russia's side, which (Russia – I.P.) we want to see modern, democratic, resolutely entering the way of reformatory transformations». Western Europe understands, that in case of a new orbit of confrontation between Moscow and Washington Europe remains tête-à-tête with Russia outside of the American anti-nuclear umbrella. Therefore they try to not admit Russia backward movement onto anti-western positions.

There is similar statement made by the chancellor of Germany Schroder who has declared danger of national BMD creation. In Europe understand, that Russia does not intend to agree to change BMD Agreement, and in case of a unilateral USA exit from this agreement (deployment of NBMD will mean automatically demolition of the Agreement of 1972) will go out from the existing agreements for limitation and reduction of nuclear armament. It is recorded in the law on a ratification of a treaty START-II, Putin is open spoke about it the president. He spoke and about a possible exit of Russia from the Agreements both on reduction of intermediate- and short-range missiles. For Europe it means, that in Russia again would appear missiles threatening not to USA, but to Europe. Naturally, it trouble Germany and France. Europe obviously is afraid of a new orbit of arms race, new cooling-down in relationships between Russia and West. For USA problem of NATO unity remains essential. However, it contradicts the major principle - principle of equal security of NATO countries. Creating a new nuclear umbrella, the Americans create two levels of a defense - one for themselves, other – that one is much worse - for other members of NATO.

In the NATO there is no unity on many questions: on special contingent of military forces creation within the framework of European Union, aggregate number 50-60 thousand military men which will be capable to execute peace-making functions. However, it is not clear, who will control this military equipment. These activities of the Europeans cause extremely anxiety to Canada, which called this process European rivalry. The EU thinks how to connect military potential of neutral countries - Austria, Finland, Switzerland and Sweden - to NATO. It is reasonable that this also raise a question in Russia.

Until now Russia has not prepared a strategic position in relation to NATO, still hoping on reasonable, balanced policy in relation to Russia. However, these hopes become smaller. It is necessary to say, that the Russian policy transforms into active, open, non-isolationist, independent, multivectorial, pragmatism and economized one.

New approaches to understanding of Russia security

If USA abandons the Agreements, Russia in turn abandon whole system of contractual relationships on limitation and control strategic, usual and probably of tactical arms and Russia starts realization of independent policy in the field of nuclear constraining. Unique capability of the compromise, negotiating in context reached in 1997 and until now not ratified arrangements on disarming strategic and non-strategic BMD.

Until now there is no univocal understanding of Russia national security. Though it is necessary to say, that recently at a level of state authorities, public consciousness, civil society, became to change priorities, problem and means. The national security is differently treated, earlier it was reduced to military security, now territorial integrity is added, etc.

Until 1988, USSR KGB executed the constant observation and analysis, including ecological, technological and epidemiological arising threats to security.

Recently state system of security control actuates Council of security of Russia, Scientific Council and interdepartmental commissions at him; the ministries and departments (Defense Ministry, Federal Security Council, Intelligence Service, Domestic Affairs Ministry, Ministry of Extraordinary Situations, prosecutor's offices, courts, Health Ministry, etc).

The system of threats to security can be presented as follows:

- Geopolitical threats to Russia, including threats of military attack;
- The interethnic and social conflicts in Russia and in countries of CIS, went into a phase of confrontation;
- Strengthening of separatism and nationalism;
- Conventional espionage-blasting activity of special services of foreign countries, sharply evolved last years;
- Prevention of clashes between civilizations and religious confessions;
- political-economic instability in Russia and countries of CIS;
- criminalization of all spheres of public life, increase in organized crime;
- The further disintegration of a national economy, especially agriculture reinforced by export-import expansion of the foreign manufacturers;
- Danger of recovery of a totalitarianism both from the right, and from the left;
- Legal nihilism, defiance and violation of the laws;
- Loss of morally - ethical values and guiding lines by significant part of the population;
- Threat to personal security of the citizens, including an arbitrariness from authorities;
- Uncontrolled distribution of weapon of mass destruction;
- Terrorism;
- expansion of drugs.

Is acute there is a problem of the confirmation at a highest state level of the strategy of national security and priorities. Now statement that «we have no right in a name of the future generations and our fathers to keep a freedom of action behind them, who were engaged in maladjustment, destruction of achievements and defiance of the state role» is putted forward. Thus, we can say, that Eltsin's epoch has reached its end is over.

It became already clear, that XXI century will bring mankind into a new stage of fighting for survival.

With the course of time becomes more and more clear, that in Russia will not take root neither old regime, nor implanted new liberal regime.

Russian national security includes:

- Prevention of any aggression endangering Russian security;
- Rushing not to bring up threat to Russia to armed conflict;
- Maintenance of strategic stability;
- Equivalent, approved agreements on the control of armament;
- Implementation of constant measures on modernizing of forces of strategic constraining, technology of a strategic defense development;
- To strengthening of conventional armaments;
- Exception of key military technology and resources transfer to hostile countries or states presenting potential military danger, especially transfer of weapon of mass destruction.

Russia interests and former republics of the USSR

Speaking about interests of national security, it is necessary to mention its economic interests in former Soviet republics. Through them, the major communications connecting country to the remaining world pass. At them live tens millions Russians, the protection of the rights and their interests is included in priority purposes of the Russian state.

The political-military interests of external security of Russia are incompatible with rise of hostile governments in former allied republics, deployment of armed forces, countering to Russia, and formations, bases and objects other («third») countries on territory of “new” foreign countries. For Russia it is necessary to avoid involving in territorial and national conflicts. Russia aims at collective security. It is necessary to pay attention that Russia began to pay significant attention to economic security. The leading place here is taken by economic threat to Russian state, which internal essence consists of a capability to disorder the key sections of economy, control system over economy, non-

reversible technological gap from industrial developed countries, uncontrolled foreign investment.

The managing figures of the new members of NATO make statements that are extremely irritant to the population of Russia. So the prime minister of Poland has declared Eśi Buzek, that Poland supports acceptance not only countries Baltic and Slovakia - our neighbors, but also distant(remote) geographically Slovenia, which exerts influence on a situation on Balkan. The chapters of the Baltic countries - Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia are going to address to the president Bush with appeals to accept them in NATO. If nine new candidates will be adopted in NATO, in him the split will amplify: on the one hand, will be USA, standing for a principle of open doors; with other - European mandatory powers, is dual relating to spreading NATO. American, and many European chiefs do not understand, what is it will cause to rising of conflicts inside countries of NATO - for example, German-Polish conflicts because of Silezia. These chiefs do not understand, that mood in former socialist countries, are dissatisfied with extremely western orientation of the governments and even more often pay attention to East. So, even Polish Russophobes were compelled to return to study of Russian at schools, symbolizing Russia strengthening of notice to her and displaying West, that in case of strengthening of pressure on it, they can improve their business by approach to Russia. It is a question not of today, and nearest historical perspective. Many versions in NATO are not counted. For example, what will be economic consequences of entering of countries Baltic in NATO? It is usually considered, that the spreading of NATO has not caused the appropriate response in Russia. However West deeply makes an error. Generic a lot of espionage signals, arrival to an authority many military and chiefs of special services. West leaves from the facts of reality. The external policy of Russia hardly has changed. It adjusts strategic partnership with India, China, restores relation with the old amicable mandatory powers. Western Europe attempts the answer to calls of present by spreading NATO. At all external rhetoric of an improvement of relations, recently they were hardly destabilized. Countries Baltic receive at the expense of transit 15

billion US dollars. They hope and henceforth to accumulate these currency receipts. But in Russia the development of construction of new ports in the Leningrad area is conducted. West does not take into consideration also problem of shifting of centers of economic activity toward East. The chiefs of countries of East, since Jawaharlal Nehru, declared, that on a stretching millenniums the center of economic and political activity was in East and Europe was only small increase to Asia and this time will return. It is necessary to the chiefs of NATO very carefully to muse above this maxim. Exclusion of Russia from Europe only accelerates this process. West is guided by the short-term moments, and the long-term strategic thinking is necessary. New small countries of Europe, live in NATO, have the historically implanted type of destructive thinking, withstanding and separatism. The positive, positive development Russian-NATO relationships requires not spreading of NATO, and adjustment of good relationships with Russia. The history has developed so, that Russia on a stretching of long-term time organized space, removing many conflicts. However, naturally, there were also significant costs of organization of this space. The supporters of entering in NATO act extremely unreasonably and inadvertently, unreasoned, скоропалительными by the applications only worsen Russian-Western-European relationships. The time of hasty solutions has passed. If Poland did make such statements, now they are necessary to be made. First is relation to foreign troop deployment on the territory. Second is relation of automatic weapon deployment on the territory. Simpler – it is relation to the strategic concept of an alliance. Whether it is possible to apply force in international business around of the solution of Council of Security UN. What want to make countries to enter in organization, which will take into consideration more interests of Russia and which, at least, will not act in a violation of international law? Alternatively, do they want to move up to territory of Russia a military infrastructure by largest in the world of political-military organization? On these questions, there are no answers, and anybody does not attempt at all to be risen to formulation of an item on a problem. There is no answer to a question: why NATO wants to include in the structure the Baltic States? There is

predestination on friendship of former republics a USSR in relation to Russia.

Countries of NATO recognize that spreading NATO is a spreading of European stability. In Russia opinion becomes stronger, that the spreading of NATO is its internal destabilizing because of significant conflicts in the Alliance, some countries receive security at the expense of security of other countries and deep destabilizing in the world. The military unions extend in two cases: when something threatens to them, or when they make dispositions to attack. If Baltic countries will join NATO, the Lithuanian troops will join and nuclear weapon will be located in Lithuania.

Russia was roughly deceived: at first have offered “partnership in a name of peace” as “alternative to NATO spreading, and then anyway have expanded NATO. New members of NATO and candidates to members have false alternative - good relationships with West or good relationships with Russia.

Russia can offer Baltic countries of the safe conduct Russia - NATO. Thus of country Baltic on the Swedish and Finnish sample to develop the defense spirit of a defense of self-sufficiency, as it do Sweden and Finland. It is possible to produce the Baltic strategy together with West. If there will be an introduction of new countries in NATO, it finally will destroy all structure of relations, though it is now blasted by operations of NATO in Kosovo and process of spreading of NATO, which was attempted absolutely disregarding of items of Russia.

Till now is not found of an owing place during construction of European security, if this structure of European security is under construction on NATO-centered fundament. From the very beginning, it was on agenda, that for Russia special place would be found during acceptance of the fundamental decisions in the system of European security. Russia today is eliminated from the gear of decision-making on problems of European security. Russia even does not have such simple thing, as the mechanism of removal of mutual stimulus.

Main proposals

To work out the strategy of the further relationships, it is necessary for us to know, from what bricks the strategy will develop. We must learn even elementary to understand one another. Any strategy now has transient character. The political life varies in such a manner that those nuances, which occur today, should be taken into consideration. The step-by-step strategy should act. The controversies should exist at miscellaneous levels.

For NATO it is necessary to turn face to Russia and to not yield to an extremism of forces, from countries seeking enter into the Alliance, and also not to be under a delusion of extremism by those under a delusion by weakening of Russia. The following in fairway extremist forces creates more problems, than solve these problems. The countries - satellites run on the one hand on other. But the countries - satellites never solved problems, they aggravated them.

There is too much rhetoric and too muddy current goes from countries - satellites. On the first steps this need to be stopped even a little. In such serious problem as security control, should dominate not emotions, but cold reason and rational solutions. Miscellaneous emotions storm in NATO countries. So, for example, Turkish people in private conversations declare, that if Georgia will enter in NATO, the following day all Armenians will escape from Armenia, and all Georgians become Turkish; and in general overall picture of Caucasus and Central-Asian region will change radically. We do not know, what would be better for NATO - preservation of the old states or Turkish religious extremism.

Political spectrum in Russia, in CIS countries, and all over the world considerably has shifted in many respects because of West actions.

As Russia is increasingly magnified concern by NATO activity, the idea that through territory of new NATO countries, except Poland, Russia will not transferred oil, is already repeatedly expressed.

In Russia are very much concerned with frank confessions of West that the swearing of a period of joining of Germany given then by the western mandatory powers that NATO will not advance on East, were straight fraud. In book of

American researcher G. Goldgather this complete fraud is not hidden, but writer braves, how this fraud is cynical proceeds. Parts of that fraud are that NATO promised to accept Russia into Alliance and to establish “special relationships”.. In the book is exhibited, that the advancement of NATO on East in 1999 has become possible as a result of two primary factors: unfair game of NATO authorities led by USA hiding the real purposes; conciliatory, antinational policy of Eltsin regime.

The life has shown insolvency of disoriented installations of Eltsin regime that Russia does not have external enemies. The major documents, adopted in the last year, of Russian Federation on the military doctrine, the national securities of country and its external policy characterize as the main threat for Russia exactly spreading of NATO. Russia should find out NATO intentions on spreading the unit. Russia in no event cannot go by way of confrontation.

But if the NATO will keep and even to magnify the military Alliance, these efforts, there is a question on whether to recede of Russia and further in settling-out of the vital interests or to conduct a public boundary, which interception will be beforehand declared by the non-amicable act. It most fundamental issue. The responsible for an exacerbation for the international situation and even more for confrontation should be the one who started it all. The answer to this question is recently given unambiguous (including President Putin): the NATO can not actuate all new countries being in the past constituents of the Soviet Union.

Russia has no right of veto on spreading of NATO, on creation NBMD, but before adoption these solutions, should clearly represent all probable consequences of this step and potential hazards for regional and European security.

Fundamentals of consideration of security model of XXI century is recognized to be consider comprehension of principled change of the contents of concepts of security, warranties and forces of its maintenance. Traditionally the military factor was considered as the major element of security. Now situation is changed. Political, legal, ecological, humanitarian, sociological and other not military aspects of security are playing the increasing role in it.

Conception of response-counter attack

The safety control of Russia is connected to the strategy of a response-counter attack – the only reliable way of constraining. It is the most effective way to solve problems of constraining both nuclear, and non-nuclear aggression, threat of irreversible damage deposition in strategic nuclear forces responses. Thus the correct combination of information components of Combat Control System with nuclear-missile weapon allows to save potential of guaranteed retribution at a minimal level of strategic nuclear forces. This strategy bases on thorough account of all parameters determining efficiency of offensive means of an aggressor and defense of potential of guaranteed retribution of the party, constraining an aggressor, and also on complex correlations between them. The determination of optimum ratio between these parameters and requirements, implied from it, to components of strategic arms allows to find the desirable solution, which will lower the level of strategic nuclear-missile forces with simultaneous stability augmentation of strategic equilibrium, increase of the warranties of confidence between countries in the solution of a pivotal problem rising before mankind - prevention of global nuclear war.

It is very important that the given strategy rests on objective points (rules) of development of strategic arms, which allow hoping to solve the problem of prohibition of usage of weapon of mass destruction in solid way.

Objective rules of weapon development

1. Law of transformation from defensive arms by giving them global characteristics into the most modern offensive strategic arms.
2. Law of temporary lag in creation of offensive and defensive strategic arms causing impossibility of creation effective large-scale BMD.

3. Stabilizing character of informational-control components of strategic arms and destabilizing character of SNF - considered as strategic offensive forces.

Usage of these objective regularities is the warranty that the development of the strategy of a response-counter attack will allow to solve the global problems, which humanity have faced from time of nuclear bomb creation - prohibition of usage of nuclear weapon for solving conflict situations between countries.

Conceptual aspects of realization of the strategy of response-counter attack

The realization of the strategy of a response-counter attack can be reached by an integration of informational - control and shock - strategic systems in a unified system which is capable to ensure necessary time for decision making about usage of strategic nuclear forces, preparatory operations and transmission of commands of battle control for strategic nuclear forces to Navy, Air Force and Supreme Command, and also to render effective counteraction to creation of a space flight level large-scale BMD. Consideration of a capability of practical creation has shown, that as the basis the following existing and created systems can serve as a unified system realizing the strategy of a response-counter attack.

1. Global informational-reconnaissance systems Dosop, AF of determination of intentions of the opponent, of authentic determination threatened period of HQ MIO (Headquarters of Main Intelligence Office).
2. Global observation systems over carriers of nuclear-missile arms
 - by land launch complexes and mobile plants of IBM of BMFSP;
 - ASAMD (Anti-Submarine Aviation-Missile Defense) and surface ships of BMFSP and of Navy;
 - by airplanes of strategic aviation of Air Force.
3. BMEWS (Ballistic Missile Early Warning System) of BMFSP.
4. Space Early Warning System of GFSP.
5. System of space protection of GFSP (General Forces of Strategic Purposes).

6. System of anti-ballistic missile protection of Moscow region of GFSP.
7. Triad of Strategic Nuclear Forces IBM of BMFSP (Ballistic-Missiles Forces of Strategic Purposes), ASAMD (Anti-Submarine Aviation-Missiles Defense) of Navy and strategic aviation of Air Force.
8. Main Command center with dedicated space-communication system of General HQ of Moscow Region

In modern conditions the major security warranty are consolidation of democracy; maintenance of an openness of society, confidence and stability; ascending of force of public opinion and constructive co-operation.

The conclusion

One thing is clear, that, unfortunately, all old system of security control, especially after proclaiming Bush's proposal about NAMD, not only in Europe, but also all over the world is blasted. It is necessary to create a new system. It should include arms control, disarming, measure of confidence. During construction of this model it is necessary to take into consideration questions of the military budgets and control over them, conversion of military industry, contents of military doctrines, limitation in creation of new kinds of weapons etc.

The development of the concept peace-making is necessary. The Russian external policy has begun free and vigorous search of gears of safety control, ground which could be offered co-operative architecture of security and cooperation. Russia with the purposes of maintenance of the safety revises problems of the Russian actuation in trans-regional and regional processes of development. Russia starts revision of relations with the Arabian world, countries of Central and Southern Asia and Far East. The state strategy and will of a direction on decisive settling-out of state interests is shaped. Russia recently displays hardness of the intentions and responsibility for the expressions and operations. She begins to assert its new independent face on international arena.

The safety control of Russia happens at the expense of spreading a geopolitical field of priority cooperation, search for mutual understanding to the world of less developed countries, creation of new capabilities for political maneuver.

The prior international-political problems Countries and regions that need special attention are highlighted. The directivity of foreign-policy activity carries a peaceful and exacting profile. The work on optimization of activity foreign offices, improvement of the diplomats' living standards, maintenance of their social security now in process.

However it is impossible to rest on one's laurels, Bush's proposal about creation of NBMD is rather dangerous. Its danger can be seen in following:

1. Demolition of the old system of the mutual arrangements;
2. Attempts to create of a hierarchic system of "safety control", that actually appears as a system of maintenance of hierarchic organization of the world, system of maintenance of American hegemonism.

Hegemonism and democracy are incompatible. If USA will create NAMD and will make the safety, as they declare, invulnerable, they can impose their will to all countries without exception.

Hegemonism causes intensified struggle and withstanding.

Naturally, it will become apparent in military area also. The creation of NBMD creates completely unforeseen consequences. First, it will cause countries to want to get their own weapon. No need to suppose, that it will be used in war actions with countries of NATO. But the capability of spreading of war actions between them sharply arises, and consequently, the capability of retraction in war action NATO countries will be increased also.

The old of decision making about usage of international forces (Security Council) is becoming a thing of the past, and there is no new one. It is necessary to improve the old machinery, or to create a new machinery of implementation of the forced sanctions on acceptance of the rational solutions. Unfortunately, many solutions are received too rashly, without careful study and without taking into account psychological realities. This fact is can be illustrated that in Europe there

is a very serious problem of peace ensuring, - I mean Yugoslavia. There is no exit from this serious situation.

Hegemonism and, first of all, military hegemonism reposes removal of an internal resistance. However this resistance accrues by number of reasons. In 1988 Department of Engineering Estimations of USA Congress has made a conclusion that «equating of development Yugoslavian BMD to technical achievements of the past, such as the project «Manhattan» or project «Apollo». It is necessary to note fighting with the laws of the nature, which are predicted and are constant from fighting with the clever opponent, which is unpredictable will use the same laws against the founders of a defense and causes them to provide whenever possible all versions of retaliation. It is natural, that those opponents, which called by USA (Iran, Iraq, Libya etc.), do not represent threat for them.

Surveying scenario of nuclear-missile war, it is also possible to recollect statement of the former minister of defense of USA R. McNamara, who declared: «Determining policy on arms control and in the area of defense, it is extremely important to understand dynamics of operation - counteraction, taking this into account. We should learn to understand, that each operation stimulates counteraction and this cycle is ensured. The cost of our unwillingness to such step is too great - arsenals will up to ridiculous and capabilities will be swelled to agree upon the agreements on their reduction» (McNamara. By way of errors and catastrophes. «Nauka», 1988 – P. 81).

NBMD will cause to spreading of also other new fatal kinds of weapon. The situation in the world is destabilizing. For many years, people built fortresses for maintenance of security and superiority. It is enough to see huge fortresses occupying tens square kilometers. For Europe and USA it is necessary to see security by other aspect: the military security is now decided by not only military way; in many countries accrues disintegration. It is necessary always to remember a Bible parable of Babylon tower construction.

Escalation, the seizure now is possible by not only military way, but, for example, by peace spreading of one's ethnic space. Now there is a fluctuation of

spaces. In New Time completely new problems can arise: destabilizing of problems solution now will be decided by internal more often instead of external way. West should more attentively concern to this problem.

West does not understand and does not take into consideration many moments - including new countries into NATO; it deprives its conventional markets of weapon and thrusts to approach with countries of East. West does not take into consideration unity of geographical space with Russia, vulnerability of this space, its curtailment. The new countries or already included in NATO countries take extremely extremist position, aiming to justify the entering in NATO. In West, as well as in Russia, the serious prejudice in relation to one another still exists. Unfortunately, the situation, especially after the proposal on creation NAMD, is worsened.

instead of weak Russia. The weaker Russia will be, the more difficult will be for West to maintain security; the stronger Russia will be, the easier and it will be easier and simpler for West to ensure security.

The mutual understanding between countries is largely formed by scientists. I thought, that it would be worthwhile to conduct more meetings, conversations, symposiums, round tables. For example, I am going to discuss this problem with UN University for Peace. The help promised to render me in it Erling Dessau, responsible employee of UN. The Moscow University and, in particular, our faculty conducts regular meetings with ambassadors and representatives of the foreign states. It is possible to think over and to discuss a problem of organization of that meeting in Moscow.

The doctor of philosophical sciences, professor,

Member of Expert Commission of Foreign Policy Committee of State Duma

_____ Iouri Pavlov