



## ON HISTORY-MAKERS AND HISTORY GRAVE-DIGGERS

A pray of an IT specialist normally starts with «Oh, God, let me reboot this world!» This joke contains quite a topical appeal, as the planet seems to encounter another system error in its history. 20 years after the collapse of the bipolar confrontation mankind reaches another spin of instability and violence, Hobbesian *bellum omnium contra omnes* accompanied by a global financial crisis. And, as usual, a good old grandmother of security – the United Nations Organization, which has passed over the retirement age – cannot provide effective institutional response to such turn of events.

2008 has marked once again that the world has not become a safer place to live. We in the PIR Center were forced to review the basic indicator of our *International Security Index* in September. But even without such move it is obvious to everyone that the year was the Rubicon crossed.

Self-proclaimed independence of Kosovo and a five-day war in Georgia, international muscle playing at the background of failures in Afghanistan and Iraq, instability in Pakistan and non-stop threat of attack against Tehran, agony of the North Korean socialism and Wall Street capitalism... The beauty of the phrases – «global problems», «cooperative solutions», «universal values» – vanishes in the air and a petty conflict in a remote area easily drags in major international actors and demonstrates that nobody fears the war any longer. As Gen. Alexander Haig once alleged, «There are just some things that are more important than peace.»

Is it true that the empires are back? Most of the conservatives on both sides of the Atlantic and Pacific would say that they have never gone, as it is the only viable model of a multi-polar world. If so, we are returning to the tough 19th-century pattern of rivalry for the resources and new clashes on the chessboard can be expected. As Dmitry **Evstafiev** points out in his review, «It is easy to see why control of resources, especially energy–control of as opposed to trade in–is the foundation of any country's stature on the world arena. Possession of resources and effective national control of them are the key instruments of shaping your own future. If you have the resources, you can more actively defend your position and formulate a global vision of the future, not just in theory but in practice too.»

And one can hear many Russian experts urging the government to prepare for the end of globalization and to concentrate on domestic buildup – investments, institutions, innovations, infrastructure – the famous «*Four I's*» by President Dmitry Medvedev. This is not an appeal to a pure isolationism – on the contrary, it is a smart way to realize the dreams about global ambitions of the once again great power. Sounds like a worm turning into a butterfly after a period of intensive internal development inside the cocoon and making maximum advantage of its resources. As Konstantin **Kosachev** puts it in his interview,

«Russia is being framed with some previously formed structures that have been created without our participation... Participation in... integration projects that have been developing for decades, observe the traditions and have well-established interests, is always



connected with the detriment to national sovereignty in exchange for the solutions to some national problems through the cooperation mechanisms... The only country that does not follow this logic is Russia. For us it is much more difficult to sacrifice a part of our sovereignty without infringing the rest of it, and this process is much more painful than for other nations... If we take this dilemma in a simpler way, the root of the differences is that Russia has not yet been turned into the source of gaining profit.»

Such approach wrapped in the formula of «common sense» and lessons learned from the selfish policy of the only superpower is apparently reasonable. At least, it is quite difficult nowadays to expect any significant dialogue among all major players on the global arena. And even if it happens, it reminds more of the talks of the deaf, each of which is pursuing his own agenda. No wonder that in such situation the U.S.-Russian strategic dialogue has transformed into a «strategic pause», as Vladimir **Orlov** maintains in his interview with the Western media and expert community. Moscow is tired of endless explanations of its policy, which are not listened to in Europe or in the United States. «As soon as Washington gets preoccupied with Islamic terrorists or Iran, the Americans rush to Moscow. As soon as Russia starts to raise important questions – on Ukraine, on Georgia, on missile defense, or sets forth its own initiatives, such as prevention of arms race in outer space, the United States immediately gets bored and demonstrates little interest in any dialogue,» writes Orlov and concludes that «Russia can act decisively and independently. Many states expect this step from Russia – they appreciate Moscow's new independent foreign policy course, and along with Russia they plan to be leading actors in the new international security architecture.»

And hence, the gunboat policy is back in the world. *Para bellum* is the motto of the *Realpolitik*-minded decisionmakers, who are pushing the idealists away from the steering wheel of global politics. Alexander **Khramchikhin** and Vitaly **Shlykov** dwell on this topic in their polemics about the future of the Russian Armed Forces and strategic doctrines that should underpin military construction. Despite heated discussion, both experts agree that the army is not well-prepared for the contemporary threats and can hardly claim to be called «innovative». Meanwhile, defense industry benefits from the foreign contracts and is not very much interested in modernization, as its production with the 1980s intellectual origin is well sold both in Russia and abroad.

Thus, while general public still leaves in the nirvana of complacency, like in the mid-1930s, the elites are trying to secure their positions in the new world order. Yury **Fedorov** cites Robert Kagan, «Yes, we will continue to have globalization, economic interdependence, the European Union and other efforts to build a more perfect international order. But these will compete with and at times be overwhelmed by the harsh realities of international life that have endured since time immemorial.»

One of these harsh realities is power, which cannot live without weapons. So, they make the focus of our current issue of the *Security Index* journal. We speak about arms sales and armed forces, disarmament and the future of the nuclear weapons, new treaties and prevention of arms race in outer space – the range is broad.

Nuclear weapons remain the principal headache for humanity and the prospect of their elimination is distant. However, according to the Russian gurus – Alexander **Saveliev**, Yevgeny **Maslin** and Roland **Timerbaev** – who took part in numerous arms control negotiations and were founding fathers of various disarmament initiatives, «Obviously we should strive for zero – the time demands for that! And this should be done by active politicians, not pensioners... Hence, even though it is not probable, we should speak about it and should strive for it.» At the same time, all of them agree that nuclear weapons will continue to exist in the next 25 and even 50 years – the world is too unstable to expect the third countries to initiate arms reduction and curb their nuclear programs. Meanwhile, Russia and the United States can certainly continue their «natural» drift towards nuclear-weapon-free world – their aging and excessive arsenals require cuts anyway.

This process, however, will need strict verification. Anatoly **Diakov** and Yevgeny **Miasnikov** in their analysis prove that the best possible solution would be to extend START I (which expires in 2009) and to commence the talks on the new treaty in parallel. The new mechanism can be based on the following principles: (1) a lower (than in SORT) level for the total number of war-

heads with each side. Limits could be set also for the total number of missiles; (2) Russian agreement to count only deployed nuclear warheads. In turn, the U.S. side, should agree that delivery missiles never cede to remain strategic with conventional warheads in place of nuclear ones; (3) ban on development of new strategic offensive arms and restriction on their transfer to third countries; (4) more emphasis on trust, transparency, and predictability of new developments in the area of nuclear weapons; (5) a system of control measures to enforce provisions of the new treaty, being simpler and cheaper than that of START I.

The elimination of nuclear weapons, or at least, the road to partial disarmament should be paved with strict nonproliferation commitments. Such approach is absolutely indispensable, argues Anton **Khlopkov** in his review of Vladimir Novikov's book. «In recent years, when discussing nuclear nonproliferation at the level of states, the focus has actively been shifted from the issues of universality to those of observing obligations under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) and safeguard agreements with the IAEA. The fact that India, Pakistan and Israel are outside the NPT is therefore recalled ever less frequently. And when people talk of the right to uranium enrichment, they mean the right of Iran, Libya and other countries of the Middle East.»

This idea of double standards is further elaborated in Gennady **Evstafiev's** comment on the Pakistani nuclear program, which was developing with silent or sometimes evident support of the United States. «The most interesting thing is that Pakistan's nuclear industry was receiving significant sums of money – not only from Muslim countries sympathizing with the idea of an Islamic nuclear bomb, but also in the form of U.S. financial aid for 'the fight against the Soviets in Afghanistan, and later for the fight against terrorism',» he says. And concludes

«What is really called for in this situation is a joint attempt at aversion of the nuclear threat, not unilateral decisionmaking by the United States. In order to secure Pakistan's nuclear disarmament, an overwhelming majority of UN members should join efforts in attempting to persuade Pakistan to follow the example of Germany, Sweden and South Africa in voluntarily abandoning its nuclear ambitions (persuade, not use force to deprive the country of a source of national pride). This would demand enormous political will, and might require giving Pakistan unprecedented incentives and comprehensive security guarantees, including the international nuclear umbrella Mr. Bhutto was seeking years ago. Such a scenario might sound utopian, but it's worth a try.»

A far more dangerous phenomenon, which got new impetus in 2008, is the weaponization of outer space. Pavel **Luzin** gives a comprehensive analysis of the U.S. space programs, including their military capabilities that would enable Washington to prolong its domination. The author assumes that the competition is increasing, the contradictions may aggravate, but one cannot expect real star wars or battles between spacecraft in the foreseeable future. Unless the new opportunities of outer space and specific benefits are clear, one will not be able to understand what the space should be defended from, or where, with which means and whom should be attacked. However, he maintains, «So far prospective opportunities exceed the potential risks of unregulated space activities and, therefore, new international legal mechanisms will hardly be created. On the contrary, the existing system of space treaties has all chances to disappear. At the same time, even though there are no space weapons yet, the medium for conflicts in outer space exploration is already being formed.»

Such view is shared by Uzi **Rubin**, a leading Israeli expert, who speaks about the space program of Iran and recent launches of Kavoshgar and Safir missiles. Even though such tests cannot lead to immediate progress in militarization of outer spaces, they have a significant educational impact for the entire generation of Iranian rocket engineers. Thus, Rubin maintains, «A space program by itself is not necessarily malign, and has a potential to benefit humanity. A space program in the hands of fanatics, on the other hand, can become a deadly weapon. Under its present leadership with its uncompromising objectives of changing the world order, Iran's space program should be viewed with concern by the entire international community and especially by Iran's closer neighbors, Russia included.»

And Russia is concerned about militarization of outer space, as Deputy Head of the Federal Space Agency Sergey **Ponomarev** mentions in his interview. «Russia faces the problem of maintaining security of its orbital group – the latter is not excessive, so we cannot afford to lose



any of the satellites even in the long run. The most acceptable scenario for us and for other nations is to promote the treaty preventing the deployment of weapons in outer space,» he says and dwells on various international programs that should overwhelm military uses of outer space with mutual economic benefits of peaceful cooperation.

Alexey **Obukhov** in his historical review also maintains that the principle of equal security should be replaced by the principle of mutual security. So far, «moving away from the concept of mutually assured destruction towards mutual security is cautiously worded as an aspiration, not an accomplishment. One imagines that this task will be solved gradually, as constructive approach and common sense in world affairs prevail.»

The same idea is emphasized by Vadim **Kozyulin** in his analysis of the global small arms and light weapons market and respective initiatives to curb their illicit trafficking. Most of the efforts undertaken by NGOs face tough national ambitions and have to resist cynical lobbying of arms producers, who are careless about the political implications of their trade. Any substantial progress in the stance of countries that are major arms dealers can be expected only after a great war, argues Kozyulin. But do we really need a new world war to have our minds changed?

And here comes another way out of the current international security deadlock. This is a need for thinking a new, or some sort of revival of Mikhail Gorbachev's détente principles. Such idealistic approach may not be welcomed by present-day pragmatics, but in the long run it seems to be the only remedy. Tensions and military buildups cannot last forever. They eventually lead to wars, like the notorious Anton Chekhov's rifle on the wall, even if everyone speaks mainly about defense and crude national interests without bearing aggressive plans. Therefore, Russia's initiative of a new comprehensive treaty for the Euro-Atlantic area reiterated by President Medvedev in Evian in late 2008 is more than a necessity – it's a must. And in general, there is a need for complex inventory of international law – the provisions that are inefficient now and provide for dual interpretation should be revised or removed to make the room for new international security architecture. This should probably be a priority task for the international community in 2009. 

**Dmitry Polikanov**