

International Affairs: 2018: #2, Vol.64: Summary.

Greetings to Current and Former Russian Foreign Ministry Staff on Diplomats' Day.

Author: Vladimir Putin

President of the Russian Federation

DEAR FRIENDS,

Please accept my sincere best wishes on the occasion of your professional holiday, Diplomats' Day.

The centuries-long history of Russian diplomacy counts many splendid victories and glorious names. Today, guided by the good traditions of the past, the Foreign Ministry's employees show their worth in defending our national interests.

The international situation is quite complicated; however, regardless of apparent hurdles, you do much to ensure favorable foreign-policy conditions for the sustainable socioeconomic development of Russia and actively protect the rights of Russian citizens and compatriots abroad. The central office and diplomatic missions of the Foreign Ministry are facing large-scale tasks connected with building truly equal and mutually beneficial cooperation with all foreign partners. Still among the priorities are upholding the UN's key role in world affairs, consolidating the world community in the fight against the terrorist threat, and strengthening the foundations of strategic stability and the WMD non-proliferation regime.

Against the background of the defeat of the bulk of terrorists in Syria, the peace process has made significant progress, which was confirmed by the outcome of the Syrian National Dialogue Congress in Sochi. Of course, much will have to be done to resolve the Syrian crisis, as well as a number of other regional conflicts.

It is very important to ensure further progress in mutually beneficial integration processes within the Eurasian Economic Union and to assist in increasing the efficiency of the multilateral cooperation structures

established at the initiative of our country - BRICS, the SCO and the CSTO.

I hope that Russian diplomats will continue to work with creativity and dedication. Your success undoubtedly relies on Russian society's broad support for the foreign policy course.

I sincerely wish new accomplishments to all Foreign Ministry employees and good health, optimism, and many years of life to the esteemed veterans of the diplomatic service.

"The Experience of Alliance and Brotherhood in Arms During World War II Is Especially Important Today"

Author: Sergey Lavrov

Foreign Minister of the Russian Federation

COMRADES, friends, colleagues, ladies, and gentlemen,

This year marks the 75th anniversary of victory in the Battle of Stalingrad. This memorable date is widely commemorated in our country and many others in the world.

No doubt, the Battle of Stalingrad, which was the turning point in the Great Patriotic War of 1941-1945 and WWII in general is part of the key events in world history. It became a vivid manifestation of the courage, fortitude, and self-sacrifice of all the peoples of the former Soviet Union, which thwarted the criminal, evil intentions of the Nazis and prevented a global catastrophe. We owe a huge debt of gratitude to the heroes.

The victory at Stalingrad changed the strategic situation on other WWII fronts, inspiring resistance fighters in Europe, who, influenced by the events on the Soviet-German front, stepped up their fight against the occupiers.

It is deeply meaningful that many streets and squares in European cities have been named after Stalingrad. This is a tribute to the unparalleled bravery and courage of its heroic defenders.

Ladies and gentlemen, friends, comrades: Our key lesson from the events of those years should be that we must do everything we can to ensure that such tragedies never happen again. We cannot forget the disastrous consequences of the aspiration to achieve world domination based on ideas of exceptionalism.

Unfortunately, immunity against the Nazi virus in some countries has significantly weakened.

Today, we are witnessing unscrupulous attempts to falsify history, denigrate the liberator soldiers, invent ways to whitewash Nazis and their henchmen. We are deeply concerned by the situation in Ukraine, where neo-Nazis and radicals have reared their heads.

Russia will continue to strongly oppose this vicious policy. In our interactions with other states, we will uphold historical truth, and the ideals of good and justice. The honor and good name of the victors and the outcome of World War II are inviolable.

I would like to emphasize that Russia stands ready to work together in mutually respectful cooperation, to unite efforts and jointly search for solutions to all existing problems in the interest of securing peace, stability and security.

Thank you.

The Battle of Stalingrad in Archival Documents

This material was prepared by the Russian Foreign Ministry's Department of History and Records.

AHEAD OF THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY of the Battle of Stalingrad, the Russian Foreign Ministry's Department of History and Records prepared an exhibition of unique documents devoted to this historic event that marked the beginning of a huge turning point in the course of the Great Patriotic War and World War II. The word "Stalingrad" became a symbol of hope for all peoples of the anti-Hitler coalition, as well as of faith in their strength and in the inevitability of the final rout of Nazism.

The exposition features materials from the ministry's archives testifying to the huge international impact that the Battle of Stalingrad had.

The exhibition gives prominence to materials reflecting the activity of the domestic diplomatic service aimed at strengthening the anti-Hitler coalition, facilitating the earliest possible opening of the Second Front in Europe and ensuring stable supplies of military equipment to the Soviet Union. The Moscow conference of foreign ministers and the Tehran Conference of the Big Three made a substantial contribution to cooperation between the allied powers.

Other exhibits include documentary evidence of financial and material aid sent to Stalingrad from the UK, Iran, Lebanon, Mongolia, and the United States.

The victory at Stalingrad stimulated the formation of foreign armed units on Soviet territory that, together with the Red Army, intensified the pressure on the enemy. The exhibition shows documents related to the formation of the Polish 1st Tadeusz Kościuszko Infantry Division and a separate Yugoslav battalion in 1943. In March 1943, the 1st Czechoslovak Infantry Battalion fought its first battle as part of the Voronezh Front.

Rare publications from the Russian Foreign Ministry's Central Library - news bulletins from the Soviet embassy in the United States and wartime Soviet and foreign periodicals, among others - generated considerable interest.

The exposition also includes rare wartime photos of Stalingrad provided by the Russian State Documentary Film and Photo Archive.

The logical conclusion of the exhibition is the letter from Field Marshal Friedrich Paulus, commander of the German Army at Stalingrad, to the Soviet government. The German military commander, who lost the main battle of his life, condemned Nazi crimes and warned against "forgetting the lessons of the past war."

Expanding the Agenda and Tasks of International Counterterrorism Cooperation

Author: Artur Lyukmanov, *Division Head, Department of New Challenges and Threats, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation*

Darya Kovalyova, *attache at the same department; dnv@mid.ru*

THE UNINTERRUPTED ESCALATION of the threat of international terrorism; its expansion under the banner of so-called "political Islam" on the territories of the Near East and North Africa, and of South and Southeast Asia; and its penetration into Europe and Central Asia have shown that the core of the radicalization of hundreds of thousands (if not millions) of people, and of their involvement in the cruelest and most violent of crimes on the greatest of scales, is primarily the terrorist ideology - an overarching, universal, all-encompassing, and extremely effective, inexpensive, and accessible instrument of mobilization, recruiting terrorists, planning terrorist attacks, undermining public safety and political security, destabilizing governments and law and order, and furthering terrorist aims.

Russia has consistently favored such an approach in international cooperation for combating terrorism. Its position is based on its own effective counterterrorism experience, especially in the North Caucasus.

Generally speaking, Russia is unique in this respect, as it is perhaps the world's only example of the deradicalization of an entire region with a population of several million that had experienced all of the horrors of international terrorism throughout the 1990s and the early 2000s.

The sooner certain foreign countries - Western and like-minded regional ones - stop interfering in Syria's domestic affairs, especially in the unique mosaic of intercommunal balance, the faster the wounds inflicted in Syria and other countries in the region that suffer from terrorist attacks will heal.

It is hard to predict where the next blow will come from terrorists, extremists, and their sponsors. We know, however, that the splitting of societies through conflicts inspired from without, where terrorists and extremists get other people to do their work for them, can be prevented or neutralized in a timely fashion.

Stability and security exist where a government and its relevant bodies play a leading role in the fight against terrorism and extremism, just as with any other type of crime, while social forces, including religious leaders and the media, energetically help them and other socioeconomic services in their efforts to strengthen the public's immunity to and rejection of terrorist and extremist ideas.

We are constantly improving and adapting Russia's antiterrorist and antiextremist systems under the new realities.

In the international arena, Russia is strengthening and promoting its own experience by introducing norms and provisions of its legislation into multilateral agreements.

The Role of the UN in Reaching Diplomatic Settlements of International Conflicts

Author: O. Lebedeva

Deputy Dean, School of International Relations, Moscow State Institute (University) of International Relations, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, Candidate of Science (Sociology); o.lebedeva13@gmail.com

THE CREATION of the United Nations marked the end of the World War II and showed the entire world community the way to the peaceful diplomatic settling of conflicts. The work of the organization, created in 1945 was not limited exclusively to questions of war and peace.

Prominent among the organization's aims, as laid down in its charter, was its creators' desire to strengthen international cooperation, raise the role of diplomacy, and establish dialogue in the processes of international relations. It should be noted here that the area of debate open to the representatives of the UN member countries was formulated to solve a wide variety of problems of the most diverse nature.

The current format of the UN Security Council is obsolete and does not allow the problems it must deal with to be solved according to the provisions of the UN Charter.

We should first of all draw attention to the UN Charter, in which the mechanisms for adopting resolutions by this international organization's higher governing bodies and the problems it was created in its own time to solve are both laid out in some detail. If we examine its history, it must be said that questions of the United Nations' functioning in general and those of its Security Council in particular have now been on the agenda for more than fifteen years.

The problems of language discrimination are often ignored in the UN which deals only with the repercussions of such events as

- international clashes
- armed conflicts
- decline in standards of living
- breakdown of social infrastructure.

All of these problems are ignored at the UN Security Council, which prefers to discuss only the consequences of xenophobic policies when people tired of arbitrary persecution try to assert their constitutional right to participate in the governing of their country.

1. The United Nations is an example of supranational cooperation that offers the opportunity of peacefully settling many of the disputes traditionally resolved by means of armed force.
2. The United Nations and its venues for debate are one of the main sources of the norms of international law.
3. The UN Security Council is the heart of the organization's activities associated with peacefully settling disputes.
4. The current format of the UN Security Council is obsolete and does not allow the problems it must deal with to be solved according to the provisions of the UN Charter.
5. The well-known measures taken earlier to reform the UN Security Council have failed to produce the desired results and cannot be considered effective.
6. The current situation in the world geopolitical arena requires that strategies be developed for a radical transformation of the United Nations itself and the principles of adopting resolutions in it.
7. Along with reforms of an organizational and legal nature, problems concerning the policy instruments currently available to the Security Council must be solved, as they prevent it from using the levers of executive power to implement its resolutions in a timely manner.

British Foreign Secretary Boris Johnson's Visit to Moscow in December 2017

Author: A. Kramarenko

Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary; akramarenko@russiancouncil.ru

BORIS JOHNSON, British Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs, made a working visit to Moscow on December 22, 2017, during which he and his Russian counterpart Sergey Lavrov held talks on a wide range of issues on the bilateral agenda and relevant

international topics. Regarding the results of the talks, both ministers spoke at a joint press conference of the need to restore mutual trust, and how the current state of relations between Moscow and London can in no way be called satisfactory. Hence the mutual desire for more effective collaboration in the international arena; in addition, the status of Russia and Britain as permanent members of the UN Security Council requires both this and the restoration of certain norms in bilateral relations. Johnson's visit was the first trip to Russia by a British foreign secretary in the last ten years.

As is well known, this is far from the first decade in which Russian-British relations have been in disarray. This is largely a factor of the general deterioration of relations between Russia and the United States, and the West as a whole.

The new crisis in relations between the West and Russia affected the development of the situation around the Litvinenko Affair in a strange but nonetheless predictable manner.

The importance of Johnson's visit to Moscow could not be fully appreciated without recognizing the importance of maintaining the great trade and economic ties between our two countries.

Trade turnover doubled between 2009 and 2013, but this rate has slowed in recent years.

Unsurprisingly, the need to settle a number of problems associated with the consequences for our trade and economic ties due to Britain's withdrawal from the European Union was raised during Johnson's visit to Moscow.

It should be noted that with very few exceptions, the British government has in principle never pressed its own businesses to introduce new sanctions on Russia in addition to those of the European Union. This corresponds to the grand tradition of the British Establishment, which believes business come first.

On the whole, it should be noted that both sides displayed renewed civility and even a friendly atmosphere in bilateral relations, along with a desire to reestablish mutual trust. Citing his Russian roots, Johnson declared himself a Russophile. Upon returning from Moscow, he was incidentally seen in the section of Russian literature at the Waterstone book company's flagship store on Piccadilly. At the press conference, Johnson was understandably obliged to resort to the common Western narrative on Russia, occasionally at the cost of disavowing statements of his own made in London.

The results of Johnson's visit to Moscow can therefore be seen from the viewpoint of the development of the political situation in Great Britain itself.

Scientific and Technological Cooperation Between Russia and China as a New Reality in the Emerging Multipolar World Order

Author: A. Biryukov

Leading expert, Center for International Information Security and Scientific and Technological Policy, Moscow State Institute (University) of International Relations, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation; www.abirioukov@my.mgimo.ru

IN OCTOBER of last year, events took place in China and Russia that were highly significant although not comparable in scale - the 19th National Congress of the Communist Party of China (CPC) and a session of the Valdai International Discussion Club. There was something that those events had in common - attention paid by the leaderships of the two countries to scientific and technological progress as an extremely powerful factor in the national development and international politics of these great powers.

Of course, the importance attached by the presidents of Russia and China, Vladimir Putin and Xi Jinping, to scientific and technological progress is a continuation of a consistent policy that has spanned several years. However, it is impressive that this importance was stressed practically simultaneously in Moscow and Beijing in a period of transition to a multipolar world.

China prioritizes the real economy, planning to constantly improve it and make it more effective. This means that the country should focus on manufacturing, seek to integrate resources offered by the Internet, big data and artificial intelligence with the real economy, and stimulate new economic sectors based on green and low-carbon technologies. Simultaneously, China lays the basis for "joint consumption economy," participates in international technological chains and trains personnel to meet the criteria of the global information revolution.

The congress also stressed the role of education in achieving "the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation." Scientific and technological progress is impossible without well-trained personnel, and so the Chinese see education as a fundamental factor in inclusive development. China developed its own national system of technology transfer, which brought together research institutes, universities, private companies, and governmental bodies.

President Putin, speaking at the Valdai International Discussion Club meeting on October 19, said: "The scientific and technological factor is becoming a factor of universal political significance." This statement is in tune with Moscow's consistent policy to increase Russia's scientific and technological power and build a national information society.

During the first decade of the 21st century, Russian society and the Russian state tried to identify national interests, formulate ways of ending Russia's dependence on commodity production and on foreign intellectual resources, and to build a national innovation system.

The strategy is a plan to build a modern governance system for R&D and develop efficient collaboration between the R&D and business communities in order to facilitate the adoption of

innovations by companies. By and large, the strategy involves the reorganization of R&D sectors similar to that carried out in China, namely reforms being continuously adjusted in the space of about eight years to address new tasks.

In view of global risks, challenges, and threats facing Russia, China, BRICS and the SCO in this era of world information revolution, and due to the understanding by the Russian and Chinese leaderships of the importance of scientific and technological progress for sustainable national development, leveling the technological playing field is imperative for building advanced bilateral scientific and technological relations.

Russia's Antarctic Strategy

Author: V. Lukin

*Head of the Russian Antarctic Expedition's Logistics Department, Russian Federal Service for Hydrometeorology and Environmental Monitoring, Arctic and Antarctic Research Institute;
lukin@aari.ru*

GLOBAL POLITICS today are faced with a lot of new challenges and international security threats.

Even though these processes are typically regional, many experts and readers get the impression that these sources of instability in international relations have acquired a global nature.

Even though the Antarctic is a geographically remote region, it remains in the sphere of Russian state interests. In May and June 2017, the 40th Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting (ATCM) - the main international political forum on the regulation of interstate relations in the southern polar region - took place in Beijing. The day the ATCM opened, its organizers held a public high-level meeting regarding the conservation and use of the Antarctic.

Formulating a strategy of activity is an important and relevant task for states pursuing a specific regional Antarctic policy. The development of the system of international relations in specific parts of the world naturally impacts the need to revise national Antarctic strategy depending on changes in the general trends of the Antarctic community's activity.

This community, as an independent intergovernmental association of states interested in studying and developing the sixth continent and the surrounding seas, was established in the mid-1950s during the preparation of the International Geophysical Year (IGY) program.

Recognizing the relevance and importance of directing the activity of the Antarctic community, the Russian Federation, during the high-level meeting regarding the conservation and use of the

Antarctic on the sidelines of the 40th Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting, drew attention to the fact that despite the unquestionable importance of Antarctic environment conservation and the impact of global climate change, it is essential to respond to the existing challenges and threats to the Antarctic Treaty System, which has proved its worth.

Monitoring, the Russian Foreign Ministry, the Russian Economic Development Ministry, the Russian Ministry of Natural Resources and Ecology and the Russian Federal Agency for Fishery, in conjunction with federal executive agencies concerned, as well as the Russian Academy of Sciences, with developing a draft strategy for ensuring Russia's presence in the Antarctic through 2025, as well as a plan for its implementation. This document, entitled "A Strategy for the Development of the Russian Federation's Activities in the Antarctic through 2020 and beyond," was approved by the Russian government's Directive No. 1926-r of October 30, 2010. The strategy is based on a comprehensive approach toward ensuring regional state interests, aimed specifically at:

- ensuring national security;
- facilitating economic development by using the region's natural resources;
- enhancing [Russia's] international prestige.

IN RECENT YEARS, certain political leaders abroad have stated the need to change the ATS, claiming that the 1959 Treaty was a product of the Cold War era and has already served its historical purpose. They proposed developing a new international bipolar legal act extending to both the Arctic and the Antarctic as a replacement for the Antarctic Treaty.

This is important not only for specific states in substantiating their practical activity in the region but also for the Antarctic community as a whole, which can use the positive experience of its colleagues from other countries or get new participants in the Antarctic Treaty involved such activity.

Thus, Russia's experience in formulating the Strategy for the Development of the Russian Federation's Activities in the Antarctic has begun to be actively used by leading Antarctic powers to develop regulatory documents pertaining to their national Antarctic policy.

USA-NAFTA: Reset After 40 Years?

Author: Konstantin Kolpakov, *Chairman, Young Diplomats Council, First Secretary, Secretariat General, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation; diplomatt@mail.ru*
Vyacheslav Shagalov, *Associate Professor, Kazan Federal University.*

IN 1979, during his election campaign, future U.S. president Ronald Reagan, a Republican, spoke of the need to conclude a trade agreement between the countries of North America. Experts are accustomed to comparing the reasons for the creation of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) and the European Union. The main reason for the creation of the latter is the political factor - the European countries' desire after the Second World War to unite in the face of the threat of a possible rebirth of Germany, on the one hand, and the Soviet threat, on the other.

At the same time, most experts believe the main reason for creating the three North American NAFTA was the purely economic factor. There had been movement of capital, labor, and goods and services between the three North American countries for many years, resulting in the need to regulate these processes on the basis of shared rules. In our view, in signing the agreement on a free trade zone, the United States was to a large degree guided by considerations of a political nature.

Almost four decades later, U.S. President Donald Trump called NAFTA "the worst trade deal in history."

To optimize production costs, American companies cut workers' wages; these are much higher in the United States than in Mexico. They move their factories onto the territory of America's southern neighbor in order to produce cheaper goods and thereby gain the greatest competitive advantage. New jobs are thus created in Mexico, while the United States loses jobs. As we see, the political factor, which can be of equal importance when embarking on unification, is in this case pushed into the background, as the course of negotiations on renewing NAFTA has clearly shown.

The North American Free Trade Agreement, concluded between the United States, Mexico, and Canada a quarter of a century ago, is in store for a radical reboot that could proceed successfully and make it easier to strengthen the economic and political ties among the three countries. The only question is: What will the leading partner - the United States - get out of it, and what concessions will the other two have to make?

Two Oil Spaces

Author: Yury Shafranik, *Chairman of the Union of Oil and Gas Producers of Russia, Doctor of Science (Economics); referent@cng.msk.ru*

Valery Kryukov, *Director of the Institute of Economics and Industrial Engineering, Siberian Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Professor of the National Research University-Higher School of Economics*

OIL IN RUSSIA plays a special role in putting the economy on a path of steady development that cannot be ignored. These specifics to a very large degree arise from the incredible vastness of the country's territory.

In addition, it is obvious that the role of oil in Russia cannot be adequately assessed in binary terms alone, which typically results in judgmental assessment.

The "space of oil", as well as its connections with the outside world, is undergoing major transformation.

The "outside world" is characterized by the accelerated development of alternative energy production, as well as the abrupt change of perceptions regarding the economic need for hydrocarbons under the impact of the scientific and technical breakthrough of the past two decades and the higher priority given to environmental protection.

It is also important that the internal structure of the hydrocarbons exploration and production system - i.e., the correlation of various types of companies - is also changing rapidly. All of this is happening under the impact of scientific and technical progress, as well as the new conditions that have evolved with regard to all sectoral processes.

In analyzing the "oil space," it is important to understand not so much the fact that it is constantly shrinking but also what will happen in the future. There is no doubt that in the future, oil will remain (albeit on a more modest scale) not only a source of energy but also a basis for various chemical products. It is important for us that this transition to the "future" state will be accompanied by changes in the internal "oil space."

The Russian "oil space" is based on the specifics of the resource base of hydrocarbons production - the colossal groundwork that was laid during the years of a planned economy, as well as the role that oil and gas play in state budget revenues.

These circumstances predetermine the forms of connections and interrelations between all participants in the domestic "oil space."

Importantly, in the context of market relations fostering Russia's economic development, companies' actions and the mechanisms of their interaction mean more than any legislative initiatives, directives and guidelines.

We need to integrate into the system of global economic ties but not at any price. Thus, port and border areas have priority in implementing oil and gas projects in the east of the country.

The need to maintain production levels necessitates the development of hard-to-access areas that fall into the category of hard-to-recover reserves. What is important is not just modern technology but also expertise and the ability to work efficiently in a specific place in a specific

region.

China's Leading Role in the New Structure of Global Governance

Author: Li Hui

Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the People's Republic of China to the Russian Federation; yonghai@yandex.ru

REFORMING the global governance system to make it more efficient is a top item on the world's agenda. It is essential not only for dealing with various global issues but also for developing the rules and course for the international order and system. It is not only pivotal to the vital interests of all countries, and it is not only a matter of prosperity or decay and life and death of a nation. More importantly, it is a factor of global peace, stability, development, and prosperity, and can be described as the core of our times, something that affects all nations. Although globalization, the development of multipolarity and information technology (IT) penetration are key trends in today's world and are rapid processes, global governance still lacks efficient mechanisms for dealing with serious challenges. There are various reasons for this. AS THE WORLD'S second-largest economy, China is an important co-creator of, and participant in, the current international system. The purpose of China's participation in global governance is to help make the global governance system effective and put it on clear principles. China does not seek to create any mechanisms antagonistic or alternative to the current global governance system. China respects current global rules and joins forces with other countries in trying to reform the global governance system.

Early last year, Chairman Xi attended the World Economic Forum meeting in Davos and delivered a keynote speech there. The speech was a statement of China's determination to do everything under its control to help solve key global problems and modernize mechanisms for global economic governance.

The "Chinese concept" needs good exposition. Principles such as mutual consultation, joint construction, joint use, and creation of a single global human community have received wide-scale international approval. We have to continue to explain these principles and to seek a consensus on them.

CHINESE-RUSSIAN RELATIONS represent comprehensive interaction and are a form of partnership. They are a special sphere in China's diplomacy and a classical example of stable, healthy and mature interstate relations.

China and Russia are important elements of the current international system. They take firm and confident action that helps build a global governance system based on common sense, justice, and order. China and Russia play leading roles in global governance due to the degree of responsibility that their status as major powers involves.

Brexit: Prehistory and Reasons

Author: E. Ananieva

Head, Center for UK Studies, Institute of Europe, Russian Academy of Sciences, Candidate of Science (Philosophy), observer for International Affairs; e-ananieva@yandex.ru

IN MARCH 2017, the European Union was given notice for the first time that one of the integrational association's member countries was leaving: Great Britain. The United Kingdom, which had joined the then-European Economic Community in 1973, almost immediately held a special place in it. Relations between Britain and the European Union were not equable and depended largely on the vicissitudes of the inter- and intraparty politics that determined government policy. Today's speculation on "Russia's interference" in the referendum on Britain's membership in the European Union, now being heard especially around the British Isles, ought not to delude us: Before anything else, the harsh battle over the "European Question" literally tore apart the Conservative Party, which is not known for its sympathies with Russia.

Relations between the United States and Britain during the Second World War were deemed "special" due to close ties in the areas of defense and intelligence and remain "intimate" today - far closer than those between London and its continental neighbors. In the EU, the position of Britain - which wants to be the United States' most reliable ally - is thus often complicated by its support for U.S. interests. At the same time, Germany is now advancing toward the role of the United States' main partner in the EU (even more so considering Brexit), although U.S. relations with the EU have been complicated by Donald Trump being elected president.

FROM 1973 to the present, there has been no consensus in Britain with regard to European integration. The government policies have depended on which party is in power, the predominance of its Eurosceptics or Euro-optimists at any given time, and the influence of interest groups and the mass media. The position with respect to the country's place and role in European integration cost some political and government figures their careers, while parties lost power.

EUROPSCEPTICISM arose due to more fundamental reasons - the very logic of integration, which inevitably required a close union of EU member countries, while Britain demanded exceptions for itself.

The mood of Euroscepticism grew both in the British establishment and among large groups of the population as a result of the Treaty of Lisbon (which Eurosceptics viewed as a step toward federalism) entering into force, the financial crisis of 2008-2009, and the deteriorating economic situation in the countries of the Eurozone.

BRITAIN'S political class - the governing elite - is not monolithic, and different interest groups were unable to reach agreement on the country's degree of participation in Eurointegration. From this came the idea of holding a referendum - returning to direct democracy, as in 1975, to cut the Gordian knot.

The fractious political elite divided all of the United Kingdom: The harsh battle between the supporters and opponents of Britain's membership in the EU flared up with new force, engulfing even ordinary Britons.

Models of American Political Conflictology in Today's International Crises

Author: A. Filatov

Associate Professor, Department of Political Sciences and International Relations, School of Philosophy, Taurida Academy, V.I. Vernadsky Crimean Federal University, Candidate of Science (Philosophy); asfilatov58@gmail.com

IN THE UNITED STATES in the second half of the 20th century, two models that directly contradict each other in content could be distinguished in political conflictology as a branch of political science whose specialists regularly advise government circles. Since the authors of these models did not simply influence but frequently predetermined the foreign policy of the United States, we can also speak of the lines of American foreign policy based on these models.

We therefore have grounds for assuming that the descriptions, characteristics, and estimates of theoretical models of political conflictology in the United States, and their use in practical/applied political conflictology, are directly associated with the implementation of foreign policy and are of great importance not only to scientific circles, but to government institutions active in the system of international relations. Presently, the Russian Federation is

actively and - most important - effectively reclaiming its status as a major political force that the United States does it best to oppose.

In its basic parameters, the negotiation model is built on the premise that the parties to a conflict should seek opportunities to serve their own interests, and wherever necessary be prepared to make certain compromises that do not violate their main interests. In doing so, however, they must avoid confrontational positions that would aggravate a conflict.

The compulsion model of conflict resolution stresses efforts to seek compromise not by juxtaposing the interests of the parties but by asserting their positions and choosing behavior that ensures success.

In different periods of modern American history, one of these models came to dominate in devising approaches to international conflicts in U.S. foreign policy. In 1960, Schelling published a book titled *The Strategy of Conflict*, which has since been reissued many times. It voiced the opinion that any local international conflict was a consequence and manifestation of the global conflict between the West and the East, i.e., between the United States and the Soviet Union.

Following its unsuccessful attempt to defeat the Soviet Union in a geopolitical conflict, and its failure in the Vietnam War, Washington took up the negotiation model to resolve conflicts with Moscow. It did not, however, refrain from using the compulsion model as well.

The instability of the political order in Europe that took shape immediately after the collapse of the Soviet Union has become all too apparent in recent years. The expansion of the European Union, which was partly due to the inclusion of territories that had broken away from other countries, took place under the influence of the United States. Geostrategically, the European Union is nothing other than a medium for opposition - and frequently aggression - directed against the zone of Russian culture and civilization.

We must conclude that in the dispute between the Russian Federation and the United States over the status of the Donbass, and in other international issues as well, no compromise can be reached so long as Washington's geopolitical behavior is based on it being a champion of globalization and essentially an arbiter of world affairs, while the American government uses the compulsion model as its main way of settling conflicts.

How Internal Political Conflicts Become Wars: General and Particular Aspects

Author: V. Vasiliev

Post-graduate student, Department of State Governance and Municipal Administration, Samara State University; valv98@yandex.ru

INTERNAL political conflicts, the exponential growth of which began long before the 21st century started, have been and remain one of the gravest challenges to the world community. Contrary to the widespread opinion, in the 19th and the first half of the 20th centuries, the number of violent internal political conflicts prevailed over interstate armed confrontations. After World War II, the trend became obvious: today, there are much more internal political than interstate armed conflicts in the world.

Not infrequently, internal political conflicts of high tension are further aggravated by armed interference from abroad which wipes off its classification as internal. Several transformations of this sort have been already registered at the turn of the millennium.

Internal political conflicts, the exponential growth of which began long before the 21st century started, have been and remain one of the gravest challenges to the world community.

INTERNAL political conflicts and wars are political processes; this is the key aspect of their comparative analysis. Social systems are responsible both for internal political conflicts and for wars waged for redistribution of economic resources, the cornerstone on which politics stands. In one of my works, I relied, in particular, on the thesis related to another immanent feature of war: it is invariably a conflict waged by its instigator outside its territory. In its pure form, a homogenous social system with no inner political contradictions that could have ripped it apart becomes an object of military aggression. A social system-aggressor, on the other hand, not infrequently is burdened with political contradictions while a war in this case is an attempt to deal with them extensively.

BY WAY of summing up we can say that there are many more differences than similarities in internal political conflicts and wars even though both can be described as political processes. As distinct from the internal political conflict orientated inside the social system, war, as an a priori extensive process, is invariably initiated outside the borders of the aggressor-country. From the very beginning and in all cases, the aggressor intends to enlarge its territory at the expense of the object of its aggression. The case of Scotland, however, confirmed that internal political conflicts may develop peacefully as politically intensive processes.

This should not be taken to mean that Europe has forgotten wars: Europeans fight on other continents. Today, the world is confronted with what I called neo-extensive political processes, in which "ethnopolitical problems are solved with the use of force while describing the main actors of ethnopolitical conflicts as terrorists."

Civil Society and Global Governance

Author: A. Kanunnikov

Senior Research Associate, Department for Social Studies, Institute of Europe, Russian Academy of Sciences, Candidate of Science (History); soceco@yandex.ru

THE WORLD faces a range of problems, among them new infectious diseases, growing poverty, environmental pollution, climate change, depletion of vital non-renewable energy resources, and dwindling reserves of drinking water. These problems affect everyone in the world and cause wide-scale concern, with civil society being one of the channels through which such concern is expressed. It is increasingly often argued that such problems cannot be solved without a system of global governance that would be based on values shared by people of all cultures, political views, religious beliefs, and philosophical principles. Not accidentally, this is one of the issues on the agenda of the United Nations - the organization has a specialized body for this purpose, the Commission on Global Governance.

What has been achieved in attempts to build global governance institutions is amazingly behind the current state of financial and economic globalization. Moreover, financial and economic globalization is increasingly often in conflict with the national sovereignty and national interests of some countries, including highly developed ones, as Donald Trump's inaugural address made clear.

Hence, while a single global market is taking shape, governance remains at the level of nations and associations of nations; in other words, it is not a single system but a set of decisions by individual countries and groups of countries.

The international community draws up principles for global governance and makes practical proposals for forms of civil society involvement in it. As part of this work, the United Nations has accumulated rich experience in drawing thousands of NGOs into debates on global problems and offering them the floor at global forums. Civil society makes a significant contribution to global governance, although this contribution is mainly limited to advice and the provision of information.

The United Nations also tries to evolve a paradigm for collaboration between governmental bodies and civil society at the level of large integration associations of countries. The EU leadership extensively enlists the services of civil society organizations. Among other things, EU administrative bodies go to civil society groups for expertise, recommendations and more accurate formulations of public needs, and use the returns of opinion polls conducted by them. As regards the application of global governance principles by integration associations of states, EU experience shows that different associations may need to apply such principles in different ways as each association may have its own specific problems.

Providing High-Standard Services to Diplomats Posted in Russia

Author: A. Izotov

Head of the Chief Administration for Services to the Diplomatic Corps (GlavUpDK) of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation; info@updk.ru

The Russian Foreign Ministry's Chief Administration for Services to the Diplomatic Corps (GlavUpDK) has a rich history.

The history of the organization is part and parcel of the history of the country. It has been a long road from the Bureau for Services for Foreigners (Byurobin), which was set up in 1921, to the present-day enterprise that offers a whole range of services.

Byurobin had extremely difficult tasks to deal with during the Great Patriotic War. It helped evacuate diplomatic missions from Moscow to Kuybyshev, did a huge amount of work relocating the evacuated diplomats, and tried to protect embassy buildings.

It has always been and remains our priority to provide foreign diplomatic missions to Russia with comfortable working and living conditions.

GlavUpDK continued to carry out its mission in the difficult 1990s. Today, it is not only diplomats who use GlavUpDK services, but also hundreds of businesspeople and journalists from more than 180 countries, as well as Russian legal entities and families.

GlavUpDK works for the expatriate community to increase its knowledge of Russia, its history and culture. We organize various exhibitions and meetings with prominent members of the artistic community. Such events are held at the Cultural Center and at our hotels.

In countries where there are no organizations such as GlavUpDK, it is the responsibility of foreign diplomats themselves to rent buildings for embassies, to renovate them if necessary, and to deal with all day-to-day problems. We relieve the diplomatic corps of all these concerns. We

have repeatedly heard foreign ambassadors say that it is very convenient for diplomatic missions and foreign companies to go to a single entity to obtain all the services they need.

GlavUpDK not only ensures service standards for diplomats that the latter's status requires but also safeguards invaluable historical and cultural monuments, and, if any of them need restoring, it provides the full scope of restoration work.

May I add that, in Moscow Restoration competitions - contests for the best heritage conservation and popularization project that are organized by the Moscow city government, - GlavUpDK has repeatedly won the prize as the best organizer of restoration work.

International Information Security: Practical Measures and the Need for an Ethical Consensus

Author: V. Gasumyanov

Vice President, Corporate Security Director, Nor Nickel

MUCH of what is said and written about international information security amounts to alarmist predictions that the use of high technology to destabilize the current world order will continue to grow in scale. With all respect for those who make such predictions, it has to be admitted that it's too late to start getting anxious - what they are foretelling has already happened. Cybersecurity issues are dealt with on the front pages of newspapers and the homepages of websites, and are high on agendas for relations between countries.

Russia's information security policy follows guidelines set by the president and rests on the Basic Principles of the State Policy of the Russian Federation in the Field of Information Security to 2020. It is implemented by the Security Council, the Foreign Ministry and other government agencies. Nor Nickel, as one of the leaders of Russia's industry and one of the world's main producers of metals, is fully aware of the importance of information security for the sustainable development of Russian industry, and for Russia in general.

We estimate that Nor Nickel will achieve an automation level of 80% in the near term. This means that revenues directly dependent on the secure and undisrupted functioning of the company's information infrastructure and its information applications and systems as a whole will grow substantially. A joint study by Nor Nickel's risk management service and leading international experts puts the company's information security risks at hundreds of millions of dollars. A report by Ernst & Young (EY), Top 10 business risks facing mining and metals 2017-2018, confirms the accuracy of this estimate. Cyber risk has moved up to the number three

position on EY's 10-position scale of risks from the number nine position in 2016, the report says. This is why our experts are closely involved in drafting and debating documents to set significance categories and criteria for critical information infrastructure facilities.

We closely monitor the international information security efforts of governments, including work being done by the United Nations Groups of Governmental Experts on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security. A large amount of work is done by Russia's Foreign Ministry with support from the Russian Security Council. Our initiative for an information security charter is meant to contribute to efforts by Russia and other countries to develop principles, norms and rules for the responsible behavior of states in the information space and to put the Internet under international governance.

It is one of Nornickel's priorities to conduct projects that contribute to the social and economic development of various Russian regions, where such development is impossible without improving information and communication resources.

Nornickel followed up its initiative with a proposal for setting up an information security association. The proposal has materialized as the Industrial Information Security Club, an informal nonprofit association of heads of IT security at Russian companies.

Russia and Japan at a Historic Crossroads

Author: Alexander Ilyshev-Vvedensky, *Head of the Japan Section, Third Asia Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation; ailyshev@list.ru*

Mikhail Shvydkoy, *Special Representative of the Russian President for International Cultural Cooperation*

DESPITE their different geographical positions - one being a continental and the other an insular country - Russia and Japan are close neighbors. They are divided only by several kilometers of water, while bound together by an extensive network of ties and cooperation.

An agreement reached at a Russian-Japanese summit in Vladivostok. Russia, in September 2017 declares 2018 a Russia Year in Japan and a Japan Year in Russia.

This landmark bilateral event, the first of its kind in the history of Russian-Japanese relations, symbolizes growing trust between the two nations. Unlike annual cultural festivals - Russian festivals in Japan and Japanese ones in Russia, - it encompasses all spheres of Russian-Japanese relations - political, economic, scientific, technological, scholarly, cultural, and social.

In anticipation of this event, it is worth going through key points of the history of Russian-Japanese relations, which has spanned nearly four centuries. It goes back to indirect contacts

between the two countries in the mid-16th century, some of which were made in the course of major European expeditions to Asia-Pacific.

The first attempt to establish direct interstate relations was made in the late 17th century, during an audience that Peter the Great granted to shipwrecked Japanese merchant clerk Dembei in the village of Preobrazhenskoye near Moscow.

Although the expedition plan didn't materialize during Peter's reign, it laid the basis for the successful missions of Vitus Bering and Martin Spangberg in the 1730s and 1740s.

It is also worth recalling the remarkable story of Saint Nicholas of Japan (born Ivan Kasatkin). St. Nicholas founded the Tokyo Resurrection Cathedral, an Orthodox church that was consecrated in 1891 and is one of the main sights of Japan's capital. There will be one more anniversary in 2018 - 150 years since Father Nicholas performed his first baptism of a Japanese in Tokyo.

As for the 20th century, one notable page in the history of Russian-Japanese relations was the Soviet Union's provision of Japan with vaccine in the 1960s that saved numerous Japanese children during a polio epidemic.

After World War II, relations between our countries entered a difficult period. There still is no peace treaty between Russia and Japan. Yet economic, scientific and cultural relations have been on the ascent.

It seems unfair to put special emphasis on any event or group of events but it is important to mention the outstanding role of music in Russian-Japanese relations. For historical and linguistic reasons, both Russians and Japanese have remarkable love for music and have a good ear and good taste for it.

But it is not only musicians in the two countries who want to perform "in unison" but also politicians and economists - all those who weave the fabric of Russian-Japanese cooperation.

"No Foreign Policy Goal Is More Important to Australia Than Working to Keep Our Region Peaceful and Prosperous"

Author: *The Hon Julie Bishop, MP, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Commonwealth of Australia*

WHEN Australia's Minister for External Affairs, HV "Doc" Evatt, and his Soviet counterpart, Vyacheslav Molotov, met to establish diplomatic relations in London on 10 October 1942, the course of the Second World War was by no means determined. At that time, we were allies against Hitler's Germany.

From the moment Australia declared war on Germany on 3 September 1939 until Victory in Europe Day in May 1945, Australian seamen and aircrew fought in the European theatre - including the famous Polar Convoys that helped deliver essential war materiel to the Soviet Union. We continue to honor their sacrifice and the enormous price paid by the Soviet peoples in achieving ultimate victory over military aggression.

This was not the first time Australia and Russia faced a common enemy in war. It is widely known that Australia's formative wartime experience was part of a campaign to seize Constantinople and force the Ottoman Empire to capitulate. Less well known is that some 800 citizens of the Russian Empire fought in Australian uniform overseas during the First World War, and 35 of them landed at Gallipoli on 25 April 1915.

Our common wartime experiences in the first half of the 20th Century built upon historical ties dating to the early years of British colonization of Australia.

The Russian population in Australia grew in waves after the 1905 Russian uprising, the 1917 Revolution, and the Second World War.

Over the last 75 years we have developed a mature relationship with Russia, which means we can confront our differences directly and not shirk from difficult discussions.

Our relationship is able to accommodate frank exchanges on this and other matters. It also recognises that disagreements do not determine the totality of our relations. Our capitals are geographically distant, but we have intersecting regional and global interests and we find ways to work constructively together in these areas.

Australia and Russia are both heavily invested in the stability of the Indo-Pacific region and in regional architecture, including the East Asia Summit. No long-term foreign policy goal is more important to Australia than working to keep our region peaceful and prosperous at a time of rapid change. We are active in supporting a balance in the region that achieves these objectives.

We will continue to strengthen our alliance with the United States. We will continue to work more with Indo-Pacific democracies, ensure we are a leading partner for Southeast Asia and be ambitious in our engagement with China. We will work with Russia and others to counter the grave danger posed by North Korea.

Australia is proud of the contribution we have made to international affairs. We promote universal human rights, the rule of law and we champion the reduction of barriers between people, economies and governments. We work to address the uncertainties posed by strategic change, just as we seek to enhance our economic partnerships in the region and beyond. Our

foreign policy gives expression to our values - freedom, democracy, the rule of law, equality and mutual respect.

These principles continue to guide our interactions with our region and the wider world, just as they guide our relations with Russia.

The 70th Anniversary of the Establishment of Diplomatic Relations Between Russia and Myanmar

Author: N. Listopadov

Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Russian Federation to the Republic of the Union of Myanmar, Doctor of Science (History); embmyan@mid.ru

ALL COUNTRIES in the world are special and unique. However, every state is unique in its own way. One of the most unique and interesting countries is Myanmar, or the Republic of the Union of Myanmar, prior to 1989 known as Burma.

General Aung San, a national hero and architect of the country's independence, initiated the establishment of diplomatic relations between our countries, which were established on February 18, 1948, soon after Myanmar became independent on January 4, 1948.

Myanmar acquired independence as a result of the national liberation movement that had received an impetus from the rout of German Nazism and Japanese militarism with the leading role of the Soviet Union.

Myanmar's geopolitical situation carries a great deal of risks, but at the same time opens up great opportunities and prospects for emerging as an essential link between countries and regions, with all the benefits involved.

Burma, which gained independence in the 1950s, was among the developing states with which the Soviet Union maintained close contacts, as evidenced by, among other things, exchanges of top-level visits.

In this article, which is devoted to the 70th anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between Russia and Myanmar, I would like above all to show the importance of fostering and expanding cooperation with Myanmar.

Myanmar is one of the few countries bordering China and India, the great powers with the largest populations and very high economic development rates.

Myanmar is geographically destined to serve as a bridge between states and regions. Myanmar is rich in natural resources: fertile lands, timber, natural gas, precious stones, and seafood.

Unfortunately, it is still on the UN list of less developed countries. However, this situation is only temporary. Various rating agencies rank Myanmar among the most promising states in terms of economic growth that can in the foreseeable future make a breakthrough and achieve high economic growth rates; even now economic growth is about 7%-8%.

Russian companies should not miss the chance of benefiting from expanding and strengthening their positions on Myanmar's promising market.

Russia is not pursuing any selfish interests in Myanmar but wants it to be a stable successfully developing country and is committed to expanding mutually beneficial cooperation with Myanmar in all areas, based on the achievements that have been made, closely interacting at the UN, as well as at other international and regional organizations. For its part, Naypyidaw regards Moscow as an important partner that is playing an indispensable role in the world at large, as well as in the region, cooperation with which makes it possible to follow an independent foreign policy course. All of this is a guarantee that relations between Russia and Myanmar have a good future.

Contemporary Information Processes in the Post-Soviet Space

This international conference took place in Yalta on 17-21 October, 2017.

Mikhail Yevdokimov, *Director, First CIS Department, RF Ministry of Foreign Affairs*

THANK YOU very much for an opportunity to speak. This is the third time I have attended the conference, and it is always a great pleasure to see the positive changes taking place in Crimea. I have brought a message of greetings to the conference participants from Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov, and I would like to read out two paragraphs:

"The annual meetings in Yalta that bring together authoritative representatives of political, public, and expert circles and members of Russian and foreign media provide convincing evidence of the continued need for a constructive depoliticized exchange of views on integration in the post-Soviet space.

"I am convinced that the implementation of the forum's busy program will make a useful contribution to building confidence and mutual understanding between the nations of the Eurasian continent, will help to generate new initiatives, and will allow the participants to acquaint themselves with the rich potential and numerous attractions of Crimea. I wish you

interesting discussions and all the best. "Sergey Lavrov"

Georgy Muradov, *Deputy Chairman of the Council of Ministers, Republic of Crimea;
Permanent Representative of the Republic of Crimea to the President of the Russian Federation*

AS USUAL, I would like to welcome you on behalf of Sergey Aksyonov, the head of the Republic of Crimea. He expresses his sincere gratitude for the fact that this conference invariably takes place here in Yalta, on Crimean soil. The conference is seen as an important intellectual forum that helps to promote knowledge and scientific assessments of the "Crimean Spring" of 2014.

We are grateful to International Affairs for the regularly published objective information on the situation in Crimea.

Alexey Drobinin, *Deputy Director, Foreign Policy Planning Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation*

DEAR Armen Garnikovich, dear colleagues, we have gathered here, on Crimean soil, at a difficult time. The events unfolding in the world at a breathtaking speed should be carefully studied and analyzed. Our Department has the privilege and duty to engage in these activities and to make recommendations to the Ministry on what action to take, as well as on action to be avoided. In this context, an exchange of views with members of non-governmental organizations, academia, political scientists, and representatives of friendly government structures is always very useful.

To summarize, 2017 has been a successful year for integration processes in the CIS space, and we expect to sustain the pace of this successful integration.

Considering the relevance and importance of our event, I would like to wish you all a fruitful discussion whose results and conclusions can subsequently be used in our practical work.

Goals and Specifics of Russia's Participation in Integration Associations in the Post-Soviet Space: Commonwealth of Independent States, Eurasian Economic Community, Single Economic Space, Customs Union

Mikhail Yevdokimov

This year, Russia chairs the CIS. We hosted a CIS summit in Sochi on October 11, 2017. Back in 2016, Ukraine announced that it would not take part in CIS events while Russia held the chair. This choice was made by those who are now in power in Kiev. The summit was a very useful discussion of both international and CIS topics.

The most interesting outcomes of the summit relate to more active economic cooperation, progress on the free movement of services in the CIS, and efforts to coordinate economic cooperation within the framework of the CIS and the Eurasian Economic Union, because five of the countries that are part of the CIS Free Trade Area are now moving towards deeper economic integration. On the topic of culture, common values, and the institution of the family, the summit participants adopted a statement on traditional family values in the CIS area, which was supported by the heads of all delegations. Under another resolution, 2019 was declared Year of the Book, and 2020, Year of the 75th Anniversary of the Victory in the Great Patriotic War. The Eurasian Economic Union is making good progress. It is clear that the deeper the economic integration, the more difficult it is to reach agreement.

We have reached an understanding on the Customs Code. It is a very massive document, and the negotiations have been long and difficult, but by January 1, 2018 it will be ratified. We have outlined an agenda for our Union until 2025: a single electricity market is to be launched in 2019, and a market of excisable goods, alcohol and tobacco products in 2020. Today we have different levels of excises and regulation, which leads to cross-border flows of excisable goods, especially between border areas. Clearly, alcohol and tobacco products should be harmonized. By 2025, there will be a single financial market and a common market of gas and oil products. I can say that 2017 has been a successful year for integration processes in the CIS space: cooperation is increasing, and all CIS states except Ukraine show a strong interest in further cooperation in the economic and humanitarian spheres, as well as in addressing new challenges and threats. And we expect to sustain the pace of this successful integration.

International Relations: Negative Factors Are Mounting

Georgy Muradov

The scales of world politics are totally unbalanced with heavy weights of negative factors on one of the pans (among the heaviest being the refusal of the West to recognize territorial integrity of Russia and its sovereignty over two Crimean Federation subjects).

This is a serious problem that will not be resolved soon.

Our so-called Western partners consistently violate the basic security-related documents, the Russia-NATO Founding Act in the first place, and it is the second heavy negative factor. We all know that new military objects are being built in different places, Ukraine being no exception. It has been transformed into an anti-Russian political and military springboard with a new American military base in the process of construction in Ochakov.

The dialogue formats between Russia and the West used in the past to talk and reach understanding are being destroyed. The mechanisms of cooperation inbuilt in our relations with NATO, the European Union and the United States have been stopped. There is an undisguised aggressive diplomatic war waged by the United States in the first place. Washington is piling up sanctions spearheaded against the most sensitive spheres of Russian economy and forces its allies to follow in its footsteps contrary to their economic interests. Our response "we hope that these sanctions would be reasonable" is translated across the ocean as "you can beat us. but please do not kill." Everything that Donald Trump said about his intentions to "come to terms with Russia" has been forgotten as well as his earlier statements that "Crimea wanted to be part of Russia" and that he as the American president would take this into account. The American establishment has neutralized this.

Finally, a total information war waged for the hearts and minds of the Western civil society is in full swing: people should be psychologically ready to accept a war against Russia.

Today, the world has become more dangerous because of another one and mostly neglected aspect of our allies' frantic activities. I have in mind the revived EU Eastern Partnership Program.

Our adversaries have not abandoned the hope of undermining stability in the relations between nations inside Russia, which is especially obvious in Crimea. We all know that many organizations, including those affiliated with the UN, have been stamping resolutions on alleged oppression of the Crimean Tatars and "extrajudicial tortures and executions." I regret to say that when it comes to voting in the UN many countries accept these "idiotic inventions" without murmur.

Let us assess the positive factors on the other pan of the scales.

First, there is an obvious trend in Europe, at least in several countries, toward stronger sovereignties and independent policies.

Our successes in Syria that confirmed our military might, the constructive and positive dialogue with China and our efforts to consolidate the Eurasian Economic Union can be regarded as our achievements. We should carefully analyze our allied relations with the EAEU members and assess their integration efforts.

The United States is talking about building up potentials to "deliver a lightning global strike" in a

hope to draw Russia into the arms race amid the strict financial and economic sanctions already applied to our country.

We should follow a very simple road, the option that causes a lot of apprehension in the West. I have in mind political and military-political measures, one of them being official recognition of the self-proclaimed Donetsk and Lugansk people's republics. The West should know that we have political answers to their sanctions.

In these conditions, we should work toward further consolidation and common policies with the EAEU countries; we should find adequate responses to the pressure applied to some of them, on the Crimean issue among others.

We should probably oppose the loud declarations of the United States about its intention to introduce total sanctions against Russia with a warning that diplomatic relations might be limited or discontinued.

And finally: we should strengthen our military-industrial complex; the state should strictly control its resources and incomes; we should stop pouring oil and gas money into Western securities.

We should step up our efforts in the information sphere of EAEU and CSTO to make it clear to all members that they have profited a lot from the reunification of Crimea with Russia in the security, economy, tourism, and transportation spheres. The refusal to recognize Crimea an inalienable part of Russia should be interpreted as an encroachment at Russia's territorial integrity, which is unacceptable.

Islamist Terrorism as a Revolutionary Movement

Ivan Blot, *politician, member of the Valdai Club (France)*

FOR TEN YEARS, I headed the anti-terrorist service of the foreign ministry of France which means that I am well aware of the problem of international terrorism that my country has been facing for some time. I regret that we, the French, are very limited in our external cooperation regarding terrorism. In fact, we cooperate only within NATO, a wrong and hardly sensible policy.

Islamist terrorism is a new revolutionary phenomenon, very different from moderate Islam, a traditional and familiar religion. In fact, this phenomenon gave birth to ISIS (the organization banned in Russia) in the Middle East and other dangerous terrorist outcrops.

Indeed, there are no terrorist acts in the countries that closed their borders for migrants.

We had to readjust our laws because of Islamist terrorism. The first important law had been passed in 1986; the latest was ratified in 2017. Under French laws, nobody could be arrested before he had committed crime, terrorists being the only exemption. To prevent terrorist acts and fight terrorism, we created a new field of law.

It should be said that European cooperation in this sphere is insufficient; the same applies to international cooperation. In my opinion, the fact that most of our functionaries working in this sphere belong to the pro-American lobby is the highest obstacle on the road toward an efficient cooperation with the countries outside the EU.

In the West, the elite and the masses are worlds apart. Elites are not interested in fighting terrorism. Our president cut out two minutes out of his hour-long televised conference to mention terrorism and counterterrorist struggle and spent ten minutes to explain to the nation why Americans were our friends. I regret to say that this was not an exception; as could be expected, it caused a lot of anger among the common people living in fear of terrorist acts. People would like to see a lower level of political confrontation with Russia. In the next few years, domestic policy in the West European countries will probably tip the balance of power and change their foreign policy course.

The Eurasian Union as an Important Component of the Global Multipolar System

Aymeric Chauprade, *member of the European Parliament (France)*

IT WAS thanks to Vladimir Putin's acceleration of the integration process in the post-Soviet space at the very beginning of the 2000s that regional cooperation between the former republics entered a new, centripetal stage. The president of Russia made the decisive contribution to building up the Eurasian Economic Union needed to "reset" economic integration in the Eurasian space against a very unfavorable background of contracting trade turnover inside CIS and the emergence of new and aggressive trade partners - Turkey, Germany and Iran - at its borders. Much attention was paid to a more rational organization of the process up to and including supranational institutes of power.

Fully aware of his responsibility for the restoration of geopolitical and single economic space, President Putin had to respond to the strategic Euro-Atlantic offensive intensified in the first years of the new millennium.

The Eurasian Economic Union entered into force on January 1, 2015. Even if it borrowed a lot from the EU and its experience, it is a unique and very specific alliance best described as the

first, since the Soviet Union's collapse, successful experience of the logically thought-through integration process in the region.

It is considered good manners in the European academic community to write of the Eurasian Economic Union as an instrument of Russia's domination in its Central Asian, Caucasian and European periphery. This approach is primitive and hardly honest. If Russia wanted to spread its influence on the near abroad, it would have never made numerous sacrifices to stimulate regional integration. It spends a big share of its budget on it.

The fact that Ukraine chose Euro-Atlantic integration rather than a union with Russia contradicts the very spirit of their common history. It is possible that the Ukrainian state will soon come close to a total collapse and an exclusion from both, the EAEU and the EU, processes of regional integration.

Europeans find it hard to admit that Russians do not need them; in fact, they need Russians.

Russia has many trump cards in the Eurasian space and the Iran-Turkey region, in particular.

Asia needs Russia's hydrocarbons extracted in Siberia and the Far East. The Europeans have not yet realized that they are no longer the center of the world.

No Future for Ukraine Without Russia and Other Post-Soviet Countries

Yuri Kot, *President of the Future of the National Association for the Development of Public Diplomacy and Social Institutions (Ukraine)*

Ukraine has been the theme of nearly every presentation today. You can use different names for what happened in that country in 2014 - a dignity revolution or Maidan or something else. De facto, it was a coup d'état based on "color revolution" technology. That's the only objective way to assess those events. I'm sure that in a while this fact will receive a fair legal assessment and that those who were involved in that illegal change of government will be given the punishment they deserve.

I believe that Ukraine has ended up in a deadlock and that there can be no other solution than the use of force. How would that happen? Most likely, it would be very quick, unexpected and very painful for Russophobia apologists.

Going back to definitions and terminology, it would be a correct statement that in February 2014 Ukraine was occupied by the Americans. In fact, the current presidential tenure of Pyotr Poroshenko is a result of it all. There is a vast amount of evidence of rigging - Poroshenko didn't get more than 28% of votes in the first round of voting.

Let's take Russophobia, which is fanned intensively in Ukraine. In fact, those who do it don't believe in it. I know many of them, and I realize that they are just playing a short-term opportunistic game. As soon as a new government takes office, they'll change their stance. Sooner or later, Ukraine will have to be "reset" as a state at all levels. Vladimir Oleynik and I have drawn up quite many proposals, primarily as the basis for a political platform. I'm convinced that there must emerge a force in Ukraine that will defend the genuine interests of the Ukrainians, national interests, and friendship with Russia is part and parcel of these interests. I'm convinced that the Russians, Ukrainians and Belarusians are parts of the same people, the Russian people. The unification of the three Russian states - Ukraine, Belarus and Russia - would be a nightmare for Western civilization.

If Ukraine starts falling apart, Russia will have no other option than trying to preserve its population the way this was done in Crimea a while ago.

The "resetting" of the country would have to include "denazification" - the ideology of Bandera and any similar ideology would have to be declared fascist.

Moreover, there are more than 6,000 political prisoners in Ukraine today. Restoring justice means, among other things, carrying through a quick investigation, without breaking any law, into the killing of the "Heavenly Hundred." The investigation into the events in Odessa, which has come to a standstill for some reason, must resume. All high-profile cases must be investigated to prove to people that justice does exist.

Migration Without Integration

Olga Yegorova, *professor at Bauman Moscow State University, Doctor of Science (History)*

Alexander Moiseyev, *journalist*

SURVEYS and articles in some of Russia's key media publications suggest that increasing numbers of people all over the world would like to move abroad in search of jobs and better life than they have at home. But they don't always have an easy time trying to integrate into new society, to adapt to the economic, social, political, and religious environment of their new home. Quite often, the local population is not prepared to put up with in-migrants even if the latter do a lot of work that benefits the host country. Experts believe that in such situations the state, nonprofit organizations and business companies should try to facilitate the integration (but not the overexploitation) of migrants.

A recent survey by Levada Center suggests that the Russians take a more negative attitude to migrants today than they did in 2007: 32% of respondents saw migrants as poorly educated

people who were only capable of unskilled work, whereas in a 2007 survey 28% took that attitude.

Nevertheless, many Russian analysts believe that Russia will remain a destination for labor migrants from neighboring countries because of a shortage of domestic labor. This means that Russia will have to develop new methods for the economic and social integration of migrants. Otherwise, tensions between the native population and migrants might lead to ethnic conflicts. Demographic statistics that are regularly published in the media suggest that, despite its impressive present-day scales of labor in-migration, Russia will need to import more labor because of its natural population decrease.

Some experts argue, on the basis of European experience, that Russia needs the following measures to ensure successful integration of labor migrants:

1. Simplifying entry, residency and employment procedures.
2. Encouraging Russian companies to make arrangements for the legal employment of migrants.
3. Promotion of grassroots communication between migrant and indigenous communities.

Ghettos are the result of lack of such communication.

Russia is the world's number three country in terms of scales of in-migration, with the United States ranking first and Germany second. According to official reports alone, about 11 million foreign nationals live and work in Russia today.

Some Russian officials have said that today's rather chaotic migration is fraught with serious problems and risks, among other things complaining about security hazards and the costs of numerous side effects of migration for the welfare state. There are people in Russia's ruling elite who realize that the current migration policy is unacceptable and that measures that have been taken, such as patenting and Russian language exams, are insufficient as they cannot achieve what should be the main objective of this policy - replacing spontaneous with selective in-migration. It is not more workers but more effectiveness that we need. If the state fails to regulate Russia's labor resources and continues to plug labor shortages with migrants alone, rapid modernization that our country wants will never be achievable.

Turkey's Foreign Policy and Changes in Eurasia

Arif Asalyoglu, *director general of the International Institute of Scientific Cooperation Development (MIRNaS) (Turkey)*

IN KEEPING with the fundamental principles of its creation, the Turkish Republic has sought to foster cultural, trade, economic, military and other forms of cooperation with the West. Western standards were consistently introduced in every sector.

However, starting in 2003, Turkey as a member of the Western bloc, as well as a NATO member, abandoned its secondary role of the Cold War period, set on a policy course of asserting its regional influence. In this context, Turkey's relations with the West began to develop in a different direction. There are several reasons for the change in these relations. One of them is the disappearance of most factors after the end of the Cold War that Turkey perceived as a threat. This also includes the skeptical approach by the republic's decision makers toward automatic support for Western and NATO policies, since there was a growing perception that this was becoming risky while political obligations with regard to the alliance were weakening.

The transition of the world order from bipolar to unipolar and then the period of the evolution of a multipolar world enabled Turkey to take a politically proactive role and largely get rid of its passivity. This predetermined the character of the foreign policy course followed by the Justice and Development Party (JDP). Within the framework of the foreign policy doctrine formulated by Ahmet Davutoglu, former foreign minister and prime minister, JDP, Turkey laid claim to regional leadership. Another factor here is that the Middle East - Turkey being part of it - has emerged as a major geopolitical center on the continent. This marks the period of a new rapprochement in Russia-Turkey relations.

In 2017, Vladimir Putin made a historic visit to Turkey, the first top-level visit after a 32-year hiatus. Since then, there have been regular talks between our two countries at the level of heads of state. We have seen rapid rapprochement between our two nations. It is especially important to note 2010, when the possibilities for strategic partnership between Turkey and Russia began to be discussed, including cooperation in energy projects, such as South Stream, Blue Stream 1 and Nabucco, as well as visa-free travel and a nuclear power plant project, among other things.

Russian and Turkish political figures take a critical approach toward the U.S.'s global domination. The U.S.'s activity in Central Asia and in the Middle East has aroused discontent in these regions. The protracted process of Turkey's admission to the European Union, the attitude of Russia's neighbors toward it as a "dangerous" country and the equivocal relations with the West have led both countries to create an "alliance of outsiders."

Competition has always been constant in relations between Russia and Turkey. This situation, which dates back to the Ottoman empire and tsarist Russia, finds its reflection also in relations between the Republic of Turkey and the Russian Federation.

Competition along the borders with Central Asia, the Caucasus and the Balkans has shifted to the Middle East, as evidenced by the civil war in Syria. Rapprochement has been observed mainly in the economic and trade and sometimes the military sphere. However, until now, there has been

no political coordination in the full sense of the word. Unfortunately, the rapprochement that has been observed in recent years should be seen within the framework of a short-term historical period and regarded as a transition period.

It can be concluded that the Turkish-Russian alliance was formed as third forces attempted to interfere in spheres where a conflict of fundamental Turkish-Russian interests existed. A chance for countries with serious differences - what's more, with conflicts of interests in the foreign policy sphere - to become strategic partners may appear in the event of serious changes in the global balance.

Armen Oganessian

I WOULD LIKE to draw your attention to the issue of migration. If I were opposed to integration in the post-Soviet space I would choose the migration problem and everything associated with it as a tool to subvert integration processes. It seems that the integration process in the post-Soviet space to a very large degree depends on how migration issues are dealt with. It is important to pay attention to this. Unfortunately, there are no ready-made recipes here. As it was rightly pointed out here, it is important to move very carefully. On the one hand, it is impossible to open borders uncontrollably. This will arouse increasing discontent among the native population. On the other hand, tough migration laws can affect relations with our partners. And then we will be simply unable to find a common language with them. In this context, the best way will probably be the middle way. This is very difficult but this has to be done.

Now regarding the backdrop against which integration processes are unfolding. Globalization was a project for a new world order that would create a harmonious model of global coexistence. None of the world's leading economists are arguing anymore that globalization has failed but are arguing about who is responsible for that. Some are saying that globalization per se, as a claim to yet another universal model is to blame. Other say the heads of states, the world political elite are responsible. They failed to meet the challenges of globalization.

In its turn, regional integration also has received an impetus because globalization began to lose traction. People realized that it was not a universal model and began to look for protective mechanisms that would make it possible to cushion the negative effects of globalization. Please note that when we say "regionalism" it is used in the broad sense of the word.

The deeper the globalization crisis becomes, the more negative consequences there will be and the stronger the trends toward various regional integration forms, alliances and associations will be. It seems to me that this point has been clearly made here.

Veneto: Referendum, Historical Background and Forecast for the Future of the EU

Dr. Eliseo Bertolasi, *anthropologist, University Milano-Bicocca, research associate at the Institute of Advanced Geopolitical and Interdisciplinary Studies (IsAG) (Italy)*

ON OCTOBER 22, 2017, a referendum took place in the Veneto and Lombardy regions, with the overwhelming majority of voters (90%) casting ballots for more autonomy. This shows that the wish for change led the electorate to the polls. Northern Italy proved that it can mobilize to defend its rights. Now the Paolo Gentiloni government cannot ignore this vote.

Lombardy and Veneto's main goal is to ensure that they retain 90% of tax revenues. These territories transfer to the state an estimated 70 billion euros in residual taxes (i.e., the difference between revenues and spending) per year and get practically nothing back from the central authorities.

However, this is not only a matter of money. These two regions want more autonomy in such areas as education, environmental protection, cultural heritage, road construction, and state administration.

There are two scenarios for Europe's future development.

Scenario No. 1: changing the current structure and abandoning the euro currency. I hope that this can restore the independence and flexibility of some countries, as well as their economic policy. This scenario is equivalent to the dissolution of the present European Union.

Scenario No. 2: restructuring the European Union, possibly as a two-speed union. As we know very well, in terms of economic production levels, Northern Italy is closer to Germany than to the rest of Italy, especially the south of the country. So, in case of a two-speed Europe, we are bound to see the resumption of the separatist project.

This referendum will not produce an immediate result. We hope that the authorities will listen to the people of Lombardy and Veneto.

Geopolitics and Cyberspace: A New Security Paradigm

Leonid Savin, *editor-in-chief of the Geopolitika.ru news portal*

Cyberspace was not created by nature but is an artificial construction with components that can change over time.

The entire arsenal of cyber assets is used throughout the world for a variety of purposes.

Technology not only influences politics but is also used for political purposes.

There is no consensus on the definition of cyberspace although everyone agrees that the new model needs analyzing with regard to its varied applications. So, on the one hand, there is a need for clear-cut taxonomy in order to avoid double standards in international relations and to apply the technological apparatus in strategic planning, but on the other hand, there should still be a certain measure of flexibility and room for political maneuvering.

On the whole, cyber geopolitics should be understood as a new discipline that studies what happens via the man-machine interface in the political and geographical context, including but not limited to interaction between social media, virtual space and diplomacy web.2.0, and also current activity, including the principles of feedback in the social, political and military sectors, where the assertion and dissemination of power, albeit by more sophisticated methods than before, is an imperative.

In developing and formulating approaches toward cyberspace, it is necessary to pay attention to the ideological component of cyberspace, which, unfortunately, is essentially being ignored by the domestic expert community.

Because of stiff competition for control over advanced technology, as well as extensive geopolitical disagreements, many of which are absolute imperatives, at present, there is intense interest in issues related to cyberspace security.

The United States relies on the Nobody But US [NOBUS] technology, i.e., using unique tools and capabilities; neuro technological approaches to intelligence gathering and articulation (NEURINT); building up the Pentagon's offensive cyber components (C4ISR) that are already being compared to a nerve system, including the Internet of Battlefield Things (IOBT).

Importantly, about 80 commercial companies, including not only traditional defense contractors but also relatively new venture firms, are involved in ensuring the U.S.'s cyber security.

In addition to the purely military application, cyberspace is used for various political purposes. Many countries are hastily adopting their own cyber security strategies and doctrines.

Sometimes, various government agencies use the same approaches toward this issue, for instance, focusing on the advantages of e-trade. The UK government is providing additional funding and personnel to combat cyber crime, also cooperating with the United States in the intelligence and defense area.

Unfortunately, Russia has yet to adopt a national cyber security strategy. The initial document of November 2013 was subjected to justifiable criticism and its development was suspended.

However, a credible, full-fledged legislative basis is needed to deal with cyberspace and protect the national interests and the citizens of the Russian Federation, since the current information security doctrine only partially reflects the challenges and realities that are connected to cyberspace.

This strategy should include a viable synthesis of ideological, legal, political, and economic specifics within the framework of a general approach aimed at strengthening sovereignty and fostering multipolarity in international relations.

Information Security in the Light of External Threats to the Sovereignities of the CIS Countries and Eurasian Integration

Audrey Klimov, Chairman, Commission of the RF Federation Council for the Protection of State Sovereignty and Prevention of Interference in Internal Affairs of the Russian Federation

The subject of our discussion is multisided, yet all of us here who are involved in politics should concentrate at the threats created by some of our partners; I have in mind information warfare waged against the Russian Federation and many other states.

. I will not go deep into the past but will merely remind you of the starting point: the speech delivered by President George W. Bush in 2003 to mark the 20th anniversary of an American NGO (listed in the Russian Federation as "undesirable"). In his highly emotional speech, the American president was, in fact, talking about changing political order in 40 or 50 states. This forced Pyongyang to invigorate its efforts to acquire nuclear and ballistic weapons.

Barack Obama, the Democrat, went along with the idea formulated by the Republican president. In December 2014, America adopted the well-known Ukraine Freedom Support Act. Mind you, this act related to Ukraine was in fact a law that contained a paragraph of a "very much needed support for Russian democracy and civil society organizations." This is "interference in domestic affairs" pure and simple, isn't it? The scope of this interference defies imagination: next January, the volume of "support for Russian democracy" will be increased by a quarter of a billion dollars. Let me remind you that in 2011 U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton announced for everybody to hear that America should do everything - she said "everything" - to prevent Eurasian integration. "Everything" in this context spreads to the information, military and political spheres. Eurasian integration should be stopped at all costs. This was the year 2011 when the Maidan and the sanctions were nowhere on the horizon. As could be expected, in December 2014, speaking at the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation, President Putin said that "even if the coup in Ukraine or even the so-called Crimean Spring had not happened... they would have come up with some other excuse to try to contain Russia's growing capabilities." I want to conclude my presentation by saying that we are open to international cooperation in preventing foreign interference in domestic affairs up to and including information warfare and are ready to ensure information security. Today, our position of non-interference in domestic

affairs of other states and protection of our own interests and the interests of our friends if they ask for it is gaining popularity. According to my own assessments, three-fourths of the UN members totally or partially agree with this thesis.

The Role of the Russian Language in Integration Processes in Central Asia: The Experience of Russkiy Mir Foundation

Maria Mokhovichova, *Press Secretary of Russkiy Mir Foundation, Russia*

IN THE 26 YEARS since the collapse of the Soviet Union, Central Asian countries have largely ceased to be part of a single cultural and historical space that took shape in the Soviet period and was based on common educational and cultural principles. The ideological vacuum of the 1990s was promptly filled by religion and national identity ideas that primarily manifested themselves in culture and language.

The Russian language had played an important role in Soviet Central Asia as not only an official language and a means of interethnic communication but also a means of access to world culture and literature and a condition for career advancement, but it lost this status.

Turkmenistan is the Central Asian country that puts the Russian language under the heaviest restrictions.

The general policy of sweeping Turkmenization with the mandatory use of the Turkmen language for all official purposes had serious adverse consequences for Russian speakers who did not know Turkmen. Many of them lost their jobs and emigrated. In July 2000, a law came out that banned teaching in Russian at higher education institutions and hence made it more difficult for Russian speakers to receive higher education in Turkmenistan.

Russkiy Mir Foundation is an organization that works to popularize the Russian language and Russian culture and supports Russian language teaching programs, cultural cooperation projects, Russian-language media abroad, research programs, and projects to safeguard and study the culture, traditions, history, and philosophy of the Russian World.

Ever since its emergence, Russkiy Mir has run a permanent program of grants.

The foundation has an international network of Russian language and culture popularization facilities called Russian Centers. It has 110 Russian Centers in 49 countries, including ten in Central Asian countries.

Russkiy Mir and Russia's Ministry of Education and Science ran a program from 2014 to 2016 to send Russian university lecturers to foreign countries on secondment. The program helped establish interregional educational contacts.

To sum up, I would like to point out three conditions for strengthening the positions of the Russian language: first, going over from what is the phase of planning to the concrete, systemic, multilevel work of sustaining and propagating the use of Russian; second, launching a larger number of long-term projects in various fields with the participation of several countries and Russian as the compulsory working language; and third, - although I would rank it as the number one thesis, - raising the quality of life and improving working conditions within Russia, which would ultimately make our country more attractive and stimulate learning the language of a large, powerful, and dynamically developing country.

Kyrgyzstan as the Last Remaining Stronghold of Cyrillic in Post-Soviet Central Asia

Ulanbek Alybayev, *general director of a media holding company (Kyrgyzstan)*

IN THE FORESEEABLE FUTURE, the Kyrgyz Republic may have an addition to all its current problems - the problem of Latin script. Its neighbors have already gone over to Latin script. One of them, Turkmenistan, adopted it a long time ago; another, Uzbekistan, did so recently; and a third one, Kazakhstan, is making intensive practical arrangements for adopting it. It isn't we the people of Kyrgyzstan who will decide whether the country will stick to Cyrillic or go over to Latin. As is common these days, it's money and the powers that be that will make the dictatorial decision.

Some of the members of parliament are claiming that the Cyrillic alphabet hampers technological development in Kyrgyzstan, that it is an obstacle to the modernization of the country, although meanwhile they leave themselves room for maneuver - they say that Cyrillic is part of our intellectual legacy and that we naturally will continue to use it.

Let me make a brief excursion into history. In the early days of the Soviet period, the Arab alphabet was introduced in Kyrgyzstan, then it was replaced by Latin script, and the latter was replaced by Cyrillic. This made us lose whole epochs of our legacy. If we change our script again, there will be inevitable new cultural and historical losses. We are already having a painful time with our economic transition, and adopting Latin script would add cultural and intellectual problems to this. We all can see that neither Uzbekistan nor Turkmenistan has very positive experience. Those countries made what were political decisions to distance themselves from Russia and from the Soviet past, and as a result we have what we have.

I share the belief of many sober-minded people that switching to Latin script would pose a risk of derailing the idea of Eurasian unity, which is acquiring some physical shape after a laborious process. Moreover, many political analysts emphasize that Latin script would put us under the

influence of Turkey because Turkey is closer to Europe than the rest of the Turkic countries that use this script. This would tear us away from our Eurasian roots. I think that the Kyrgyz president made a substantial case against this at the forum on Altaic civilization that I have mentioned.

It's not too difficult to conclude that replacing the alphabet without any absolute necessity means that there is somebody who needs this, somebody who wants to cause phantom pains to a body that is not too healthy at all. The replacement of Cyrillic with Latin script can be compared to limb amputation. Society eventually becomes an invalid. It would take the Kyrgyz three generations to get used to Latin script the way they are used to Cyrillic nowadays.

I think that behind this large-scale issue of Latinization of written Kyrgyz is a desire to definitively sever ties among all former Soviet republics.

Armen Oganessian

MS. MOKHOVIKOVA has made an interesting addition to her presentation by saying that more than 95% of the population of the Central Asian countries say that they want their children to know the Russian language. I think that the same is the case in other member countries of the Commonwealth of Independent States. A competent state policy is essential for maintaining the current status of the Russian language.

I wish to thank you all, because I haven't heard a single presentation that wasn't interesting. Everything has been very professional and concrete up until the last minute of our discussion. I want to give special thanks to Ms. Torres. We all have spoken about geopolitics but she spoke about geopoetics. One may know the Spanish language or not, but she made an elegant speech and an impressive presentation of poetry yesterday. Thank you very much, it was a vivid tinge on our conference. But in fact, all of you are vivid, all of you are talented. Huge thanks to you all, and all the best.

The Soviet Union and Great Britain: Allies on the Afghan Track in 1942

Author: Yu. Bulatov

Dean, School of International Relations, Professor, Department of World and Russian History, Moscow State Institute (University) of International Relations, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, Doctor of History; mo@inno.mgimo.ru

ON MAY 26, 1942, in London, Vyacheslav Molotov, People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs of the USSR, and Anthony Eden, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of Great Britain, signed the Anglo-Soviet Treaty of Alliance in the War Against Hitlerite Germany and Its Associates in Europe and of Collaboration and Mutual Assistance thereafter for 20 years.

It should be said that the Soviet-British agreement of May 26, 1942, accelerated the process of further consolidation of forces within the Anti-Hitler Coalition. Negotiations that had been going on for some time in Washington were concluded on June 11, 1942, with the Mutual Aid Agreement between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The two agreements concluded on the eve of the radical turn in the Great Patriotic War strengthened the Soviet Union's positions in its fight against fascism and increased the number of its allies in the West and the East.

The Kingdom of Afghanistan, however, was in two minds about the May 26, 1942 treaty: officially, it remained neutral during World War II and maintained diplomatic relations with the countries of the anti-Hitler Coalition and the fascist bloc powers - the so-called Rome-Berlin-Tokyo Axis.

Throughout 1942, contacts between the Soviet and British special services and diplomatic missions in Afghanistan became an established, permanent feature of relations between the two countries.

At first, the Afghan society was highly positive about the 1942 agreement: the elite and common people were equally satisfied with the fact that the allies in the anti-Hitler coalition were drawing closer.

In the letter of July 2, 1942 to the Deputy Minister of NKID Vladimir Dekanozov, Mikhaylov reported that in Afghanistan the Anglo-Soviet Treaty was positively assessed by the wide circles of progressive-minded people. He pointed out that, according to reliable information, many people from among the middle class, petty bureaucrats and the military assessed the treaty as "a death sentence to Hitler." The Afghans, being gradually awakened to the fact that Hitler Germany was fanning the war to enslave peoples, wanted the war to end as soon as possible even though this realization had not yet become absolutely clear, concluded the Soviet ambassador.

Very soon, however, the Soviet Embassy to Afghanistan had to admit that, due to a propaganda campaign unfolded by the diplomatic missions of the Axis Powers, the embassy of fascist Germany in the first place, the Afghan ruling elite became very concerned with the Anglo-Soviet Treaty of May 26, 1942. It was further disturbed by the rumors spread by Germans and their agents that Russians would reduce Afghanistan to a transit territory across which they would move their troops to India to protect the British interests there.

Great Britain had concluded the treaty from which Britain and the United States profited much more than the Soviet Union. The Soviet ambassador pointed out that in his effort to pass for a friend of the Soviet Union the Afghan minister had gone as far as saying that a separate peace treaty with Berlin "in the interests of the USSR" would have been much more advantageous.

Such fairly contradictory assessments surfaced at the meetings the Afghan cabinet of ministers held soon after the full text of the treaty had appeared in the press. Prime Minister Hashim Khan opened the first of the two meetings by saying that the Anglo-Soviet Treaty presented no threat to his country since both sides weakened by the protracted war could no longer pursue any kind of active policy let alone threaten freedom and continued existence of other states, Afghanistan among them.

The majority of the cabinet members, however, disagreed.

Having analyzed information extracted from official and unofficial sources, the Soviet embassy to Afghanistan concluded:

1. The Afghan government was obviously worried by the Anglo-Soviet treaty, especially by its second part that spoke about collaboration and mutual assistance for 20 years;
2. The ruling circles of Afghanistan feared that the allies might devise an Anglo-Soviet plan on the liquidation of the fascist threat in their country.
3. Having assessed the treaty as a threat to the country's independence, the Afghan cabinet of ministers moved to the positions of local Germanophiles: this warped assessment played into the hands of the Hitlerite clique and its satellites.

The Soviet ambassador also wrote that it was impossible to predict British and American maneuvers in Kabul. Under the Anglo-Soviet treaty, British were expected to be basically open when dealing with the Soviet Union and to keep away from secret talks with Afghans.

Afghan ministers and generals, including War Minister Shah Mahmud Khan, were welcomed at the steadily increasing number of receptions at the German diplomatic mission; the majority of Afghan bureaucrats and officers acquired a habit of missing receptions in other embassies; some of top officials flatly declined invitations to the Soviet embassy.

Mohammad Hashim Khan, wanted to establish close contacts with the German and Italian missions in Kabul. These "dissidents" of the royal blood from the Nadir dynasty planned a coup in Kabul as soon as Germans, having occupied the Caucasus, would move to Iran, in a nutshell, to the Afghan border.

They planned to replace Hashim Khan and other pro-British officials with a new cabinet inclined to help Germans and Italians in their drive to India.

In 1941-1945, anti-Sovietism typical of the ruling circles of the UK, was one of the highest barriers on the road toward closer Soviet-British contacts. The process of drawing closer was slow, malfunctions - frequent. All too often the posts of any consequence in Moscow and Kabul went to people the anti-Soviet positions of whom were no secret.

The Soviet-British cooperation was predated by the events that had taken place in Afghanistan shortly before fascist Germany attacked the Soviet Union. Early in 1941, a young Indian, Bhagat Ram Talwar arrived in Kabul. Few in the British mission, let alone outside it, knew that he was a British secret agent of the Indian Political Intelligence (IPI). Very soon, however, he attracted attention of special services of practically all embassies in the Afghan capital because he accompanied Subhas Chandra Bose, former chairman of the Indian National Congress and one of the most prominent left-wing nationalist leaders.

The Afghan secret services immediately recognized S.C. Bose and B. Ram, two Indian revolutionaries, as objects of special importance: they monitored their contacts and followed them across Kabul. When in Kabul, where they stayed from February to March 1941, these two Indian "refugees" were sheltered by an Indian merchant Uttam Chand, owner of a small shop His Master's Voice who traded in crockery and electric appliances. Bhagat Ram recommended him

as his old party comrade with whom they had served a term in prison and whom he met in Kabul "by chance." This safe house arranged by the British secret services was immediately disclosed by Afghan counterintelligence and foreign residents operating at their corresponding embassies.

The leaders of Soviet intelligence decided to continue checking Ram while not breaking contact with him. He did not cease to cooperate with German intelligence but from that time on he was supervised by Allakhverdov.

The Soviet side did not abandon its efforts to find out as much as possible about Ram and his true aims which made the British side anxious. To secure the positive result of Soviet verification of its agent, it responded with certain precautionary measures designed to preserve the contacts between Ram and Soviet intelligence. It was decided to demonstrate that the Fuehrer's closest circle treated Ram as a valuable source of information on the situation in Afghanistan and India.

Throughout 1942, contacts between the Soviet and British special services and diplomatic missions in Afghanistan became a fact and a permanent feature of relations between the two countries. It was a positive feature for the anti-Hitler Coalition: confidence was consolidated on the platform of the emerging legal base of cooperation.

Disagreements between the allies, however, did not disappear. British officials, for example, never responded to the Soviet suggestion to work together toward squeezing the diplomatic missions of the Axis Powers out of Afghanistan.

London also did not allow the Soviet Union to draw Afghanistan into the united anti-fascist front of the freedom-loving peoples. The British politicians remained true to their usual Divide and Rule principle. Thanks to its active foreign policy, the Soviet Union kept the British Great Game in Afghanistan within certain limits while the year 1942 that brimmed with events of worldwide importance confirmed that the Soviet foreign policy course remained consistent in the West and in the East.

