Russian Academy of Sciences
Institute of Europe

Dr. Vladimir F. Petrovsky

The Triad of Strategic Security of the Global Society

Annotation

This research is dedicated to the maintenance of security in a new, rapidly changing world. Although in the 20th century the problems of security were the focus of the attention of politics and public opinion; nowadays there is a great need for a new approach to the problem.

This research deals with new challenges to security, the need for a new blueprint and a new means of its maintenance. Security, which now acquires a strategic character, is a necessary condition for the safe existence of a new emerging global society. It is necessary to apply a comprehensive multifaceted approach, the supremacy of law and responsible democratic governance in order to ensure security. This research stresses the need for a consensus on the question of what is to be done to include practical and tangible action, within all levels of international interaction.

Contents

***

Throughout the 20th century, security issues were always the focus of the attention of politicians and the community. Right after the World War I and especially when the confrontation of the two systems began, security was taken as a consideration of higher priority than peace; for it meant not just peace understood as the absence of war, but peace understood as establishing conditions for providing stability and developing friendly and neighborly relations. It was in the interest of states seeking to ensure security that international cooperation was brought to life.

Right after World War I, the US President W. Wilson suggested establishing the first international organization in history, the League of Nations. He had motivated the expediency of its establishment by invoking its necessity in order to ensure security for democracy. The UN was also established for the purpose of maintaining not only peace, but also security of states from outside aggression. At the initial stage of the discussion on establishing the UN, there even appeared an idea to name it the International Security Organization, but it was finally decided that it would be sufficient to call the main body of the UN the Security Council.

In today's rapidly changing world the conditions of existence of states and peoples have sharply changed, but in our political behavior, stressing again the significance of security, we often continue to think and act as we did in the past century. It is connected, to a significant degree, with the mechanism of forming conceptual instruments of social sciences. In natural sciences we have precise and absolute definitions. In the socio-political sphere the situation is totally different. The occurrences there are fleeting, fickle; they have no clearly set limits or constant attributes. It is very difficult to give definitions to such occurrences, but even when it becomes possible, one can never be sure that the occurrence has not already gone through changes which would invalidate the new definition. It is on this basis that re-evaluations of well-known notions and determinations of the extent to which they correspond to reality are always useful.

Therefore this desire to have a very definite idea about what challenges to security we are facing, to ascertain which scenario of ensuring security would be most acceptable and to decide how best to put into practice the aims of a new approach to security is all very natural.

1. NEW CHALLENGES TO SECURITY

Today, and for the first time in history, political leaders of all the states and international governmental organizations agree that the globalization of the world economy, accompanied by uninhibited technological progress, the widespread dissemination of information, mobility of capital, liberalization of trade and democratization of the interaction of characters on the global stage, is convincing proof of just how fundamental and complex the ongoing changes are; exposing just how different the world has become at the advent of the 21st century. The unprecedented speed with which these changes occur is another factor. During the last decade of the 20th century there were greater changes, especially in the scientific and technical fields, than throughout the entirety of the previous century.

Unrestrained scientific and technological progress in the past years, the ascent of informatics and the establishment of a unified global informational space, the strengthening and widening of the exchange of progressive achievements, the tendency for interpenetration of economic mechanisms toward integration at the regional and global levels, and the widening gap in development levels between particular countries—all these phenomena contradict the previously hardened ideas about the present and future. Transformations in the political field have also accelerated. Ideas of democracy, of the supremacy of law, of free choice and of the responsible behavior of states are capturing people's minds. The political activity of nations, peoples, and countries is growing. Unfortunately the positive benefits of globalization are not accessible to everybody.

Globalization acts as a double-edged sword; some countries and people's groups receive colossal opportunities for greater prosperity, while others end up on the verge of catastrophe. The rampancy of poverty is shocking. According to the UN estimates, during the last decade of the 20th century the aggregate assets of the 358 greatest multi-millionaires were equal to the combined incomes of 2.3 billion of the poorest citizens of the planet (approximately 45% of the global population). If we look at this problem from a different perspective, the developing countries own only 22% of the global wealth, while their population makes up 80% of global population.

Poverty, rightly considered as a manifestation of injustice, not only gives rise to social tension, but also creates a fertile field for extremism and religious/ethnic intolerance; thus promoting violence and terrorism. It is clear that poverty and inequality have always existed, but now they have become especially intolerant. Due to growing informational transparency, even the most destitute persons are able to daily watch scenes from the life of the privileged, inaccessibly rich world through dish antennas on their TV-sets. All this promotes an escalation of already existing conflicts and contributes to the appearance of new conflicts, all of which have at their infancy an internal nature. After the end of the cold war, out of 58 conflicts only 4 had an interstate nature (Iraq-Kuwait, India-Pakistan, Ethiopia-Eritrea, USA-Iraq). Other conflicts were mainly ethnical and took place inside states.

Additional reasons for conflicts besides poverty include a lack of democratic structures, an incapability of governments to fight corruption, to ensure observance of human rights, to create conditions for tolerance and to foster mutual understanding and solidarity between peoples. These conflicts bring greater suffering to civil citizens than interstate wars. During World War I civilian casualties compromised approximately 5% of all casualties; in today's conflicts civilian casualties account for 90%. This manifested itself especially vividly in Rwanda, Sierra-Leone and the Sudan.

At the same time, the combatants themselves seriously suffer from using new cruel types of weapons. The situation is aggravated due to the wide spread of all kinds of weapons across the planet, but in particular those with the means of mass destruction. In addition, nowadays nuclear technologies have become quite a profitable business for those who are interested only in their own pocket.

Involuntary migrations of whole peoples compelled by poverty and conflicts, and an exponentially growing number of refugees throughout the globe, create tension in many regions

including many developed countries. To put it in perspective, the world is going to face the problem of overpopulation. According to the prognosis in the annual UN resources of 2004 "Global population", by 2050, the population of our planet will increase by 2.5 billion people and make up in totality 8.9 billion people. At the same time, according to the UN, an increase of population "will mostly happen in poor countries, where modern methods of contraception are not developed." According to the UN prognoses, the most rapid growth would be observed in India: from present 1.08 billion to 1.5 billion. In China, the population is supposed to increase only by 82 million making total 1.395 billion. Speaking about Russia, by 2050 its population will decrease by 41 million and make total 101.5 million, according to the news agency ITAR-TASS.

The expansion of drugs and diseases, AIDS in particular, has also brought about the most negative of consequences.

Uncontrollable processes of globalization also affect the global ecological situation. Biological differences and natural processes, which support life, are being threatened. As mentioned in the 2004 annual report of the UN Secretary General, the frequency of natural catastrophes is increasing and their influence on the poor and unprotected is grievous. In 2003 alone, 75,000 people were killed in 700 natural disasters, including earthquakes in Bam and Algeria. Six-hundred million people suffered from various natural disasters; while total financial losses, according to different calculations, exceeded 65 billion USD. A number of symptoms, such as the rising of sea level, the intensification of fluctuation in temperature, changes in the amount of precipitation and changes in the current agricultural situation are evidence of continuing dangers.

Not only is the political-economic landscape changing, but so too is the cast of players on the global stage. Of course the states still dominate (in 1945, 51 states founded the UN; nowadays there are 191 states as UN members). But although national states remain the main characters on the global stage, many of them are not able to control what is happening within their borders anymore. Failed states are a new political phenomenon of our age. Among them are countries where the government is not practically controlling the territory, and can neither protect their inhabitants nor create conditions for a normal economy. In addition, these countries are some of the main sources of the aforementioned issues of AIDS and other disease epidemics, and of environmental pollution.

Even in the states which maintain their influence in global and regional businesses, there are often processes underway of political stratification into three power structures: executive, legislative and local. Each one of them in turn is seeking cooperation with their colleagues in other countries.

Practically all states experience, in conjunction with the radical advance of technologies connected with speed and bringing about the compression of space and time, fragmentation of the population, redistribution of sovereignty, territorial division and segregation of identities. We cannot disagree with Roland Robertson that today for many people globalization looks like "glocalization". The conditions of constantly growing interdependency force each country and nation to engage problems which know no national borders, but affect the global community as a whole.

The terrorist acts of September 11th in New York and Washington, D.C. have shown that the global community falls within a new paradigm of security. The comparison of the terrorist attacks on September 11th with the Pearl Harbor events is quite relative and has an analogy only regarding the suddenness of attacks. Essentially, it has become a qualitatively new phenomenon. Never before has terrorism in non-governmental form challenged a states' infrastructure, the bases of its social order, the functioning of constitutional institutions and the citizens' well-being. Terrorist acts in Russia, hostage taking in Beslan and on board two planes late August through early October 2004, as well as other terrorist attacks against the civil citizens of Moscow clearly corroborate that terrorism in all its forms and manifestations is a global evil; the most serious threat to security.

Another great danger in the global arena is organized crime. As mentioned in the UN documents, it has acted in developed countries since the mid-1950's and now is more widely expanding its activities in the developing world. First of all concerns are the issues of illegal drug trafficking, human trafficking and arms trafficking. While the developed countries are mostly consumers, the developing countries are suppliers. Another rapidly growing domain of the activity of organized crime is dirty money-laundering. According to the IMF, organized crime launders up to 1.5 trillion dollars annually, approximately 5% of the global gross product. The ability of

organized crime to gain access to weapons of mass destruction could turn into another serious challenge to security. Today organized crime takes the shape of complicated business conglomerates, while such hierarchic structures as "family" and cartels are disappearing. Criminal networks are using civil conflicts and political instability for their own purposes, as well as taking advantage of the opportunity and possibility to offer their services to terrorist organizations.

No matter how we subdivide new threats on the global arena—be it hard threats (terrorism, spread of weapons of mass destruction, organized crime) or soft threats (conflicts, poverty, diseases, environmental degradation)—all of them are equally important challenges to all aspects of security.

2.   STRATEGIC SECURITY AS A NECESSARY CONDITION FOR THE EXISTENCE OF A GLOBAL COMMUNITY

When envisaging the future, it is necessary to have a clear idea not only about the previously mentioned challenges presented by globalization, but also, about what kind of world we exist in, what to do about it and how to do it; so that the world would really be made a safer place.

Globalization is not at all a new phenomenon that came into existence within the last decades of the 20th century. For the first time globalization has revealed itself back in the time of the ancient world, when the path from China to Rome was paved through the Eurasian continent. The next significant historical points were the great geographical discoveries by Christopher Columbus and Vasco da Gama. Their journeys inspired the search for new lands, markets and goods; then the Europeans began the colonization of Africa, Asia and America.

While already in the initial stages which brought about the forming of the personal connections that enveloped almost all global space, globalization gave birth to significant changes in conceptions of distances, economic and social development, and the cultures of other nations. The unknown has become familiar, and horizons of mutual understanding have rapidly enlarged. However, the present stage of globalization, distinguishable by the unprecedented speed of changes, stimulates the most significant changes not only in politics, economics and society, but also in human behavior and in the lifestyle of persons all over our planet. This all-embracing transformation of lifestyle brings us to the conclusion that we are facing not only a new stage of globalization, but also a change of the paradigm of civilization. The world is turning into a global community.

Naturally the question then arises, "What kind of society is this?" in the political sense. There are many discussions on this topic. Some claim that we exist in a uni-polar world (Pax Americana) and insist on establishing multi-polarity. Others, without denying that today there is one super-state acting on the global stage, are at the same time acknowledging the existence of other centers in the world; although these cannot be compared with the privileged position of the super-state (for example, regional structures or such countries as China, Japan, and India). Keeping that in mind, everybody agrees that in the new global order the multinational corporations and civil associations are gaining influential power.

With all the differences in evaluations of the characters on the global arena and their roles, the forming of a new global order looks like a new Pax, but not as Pax Unilateral (Pax Americana), but as "Pax Multilateral". Pax Multilateral is a multilateral, multi-polar world, representing a multi-leveled and highly mobile global system where the economy comes to the forefront. Poles are represented by states as well as by regional structures, the number of which has grown significantly. At the moment the UN was founded there existed only two regional organizations (OAS and the League of Arabic States), but now there are over 40 such organizations. Added to that is the fact that within the regional organizations there are working sub-regional structures.

The establishment of multilateralism in the modern interdependent world is quite a natural process. Only through the path of multilateralism is it possible to find a solution to the numerous global problems which humanity is facing today, and only through the path of multilateralism is it possible to direct the processes of change onto a firm and secure course. The traditional conception of international cooperation, according to which all states use the UN to find an agreement on collective actions and then to implement them in international relations, has given way to a new

understanding; according to which the interaction of states in the global world resembles the behavior of shareholders who have investments in various companies and are interested in a multidimensional approach.

The advantages of the global multi-polar world are evaluated differently in Western Europe and the U.S.A. While the Europeans explain their preference for a multilateral world first of all by the fact that; to achieve consent in the multilateral world, the decisive role is played by the procedural aspects of a world structure where each one has the right to have his own opinion; the Americans are aiming at establishing their hegemony (leadership) in global businesses and taking one-sided actions.

Multilateralism does not mean that states always act together in everything. Multilateral structures leave enough space for one-sided as well as double-sided, and other kinds of actions and initiatives. The famous Russian conductor Evgeniy Mravinskiy once said, "Redemption of an orchestra is to maintain a common tempo and not to slow it down". It seems this thought is quite applicable to multilateralism in politics.

New forms of interaction assume responsible multilateralism. On one hand, undoubtedly, the role, which leading actors need for bilateral and other joint actions, should be recognized. On the other hand, these actors have to be attentive to the opinions expressed by other members of global community.

The modern system of multilateral interaction has its co-ordinates. On the vertical line, there is the top global level, embodied by The United Nations Organization, the only universal international organization in the world, which includes 25 specialized institutes in its system as well as multiple bodies and programs. The UN is itself, from the viewpoint of its role in global politics, quite a peculiar mechanism. Despite of all its imperfections, many justly call the Organization a "global microcosm". The UN conducts broad activities in political, economic, humanitarian and social fields. It can be said that in our turbulent time, the UN is the place where the world can be grasped in its diversity. Still, the UN cannot and was never supposed to solve all the world's problems. Its main task is to initiate, encourage and co-ordinate the actions of states and their organizations for the sake of peace, stability and the prosperity of citizens. Besides that fact, the UN today is actually uniting states represented first of all by the highest executive power. Parallel with the UN, the Inter-parliamentary Union, which unites the parliamentarians, is trying to actively work on the global level. Local powers, which establish their own organizations, are also starting to come onto the international stage.

On the global level the great eight (G-8), within which the most developed states meet for adjusting their strategic interests, is distinctly making its presence felt. The G-8 is still, however, at the stage of formation. It claims the role of "organization of democratic and most industrially developed states of the world". The matter of including into this organization suitable countries from all continents is an important one. Unlike the UN, this organization seems not to have guaranteed equality in voting for members, nor the possibility to use a veto.

The next level of interaction after the global level is transcontinental mechanisms. The foreground among transcontinental structures belongs to NATO, the ready-for-action mechanism which unites certain countries on the American and the European continents. Within NATO appears and example of the aforementioned influential regional structure: member states of the European Union. The main focus for NATO is adapting to a new situation in the northern hemisphere, and there is only one way to achieve this; partnership with all the Eurasian countries and their structures. The fight against terrorism, which has become paramount, should not overshadow other challenges to security. Therefore a new formulation of goals and tasks for NATO, still reminiscent of a "cold war" entity, is needed.

The Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe has also reached the transcontinental level. Although the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe has proclaimed itself a regional organization, today it unites not only European states but also the countries of North America and Asia, encompassing a significant part of the northern hemisphere. From Vladivostok to Vancouver, from Murmansk to Malta, and from Dublin to Dushanbe: such is the geography of this organization. This geography assumes a scale for its activity that cannot be limited to some selected regions within its space.

7. The Non-alignment Movement, which already covers the whole of the southern hemisphere, also has a transcontinental nature. The Movement still has a long way to go in adjusting to the new global reality, however. Many regional structures of Latin America are also in favor of establishing a new organization in the southern hemisphere. Another new transcontinental structure is APEC, which includes a number of countries located on different continents and both sides of the Pacific Ocean.

The third level of international interaction includes structures representing classic regional organizations, such as the European Union, the ASEAN, the Organization of American States, the African Union, etc... After the end of the "cold war" they all underwent significant transformations and showed the capacity to become centers of adjustment of the practical actions of member states. In the process of changes which followed the end of the "cold war", there also appeared a number of new regional structures, such as the Commonwealth of Independent States, the Shanghai organization of cooperation, the Organization of Central Asian Commonwealth, etc...

The distinguishing feature of regional structures in our times is mutually crossing membership, i.e. the possibility for any country to be a member of either one or a few regional structures. This new phenomenon has fundamentally significant importance because it excludes the establishment of closed regional organizations and therefore contributes to the strengthening of interdependency in the world.

The crossing of the interests of states belonging to various regional formations is also expressed in the encouragement of trans-boundary cooperation, actively promoted by the European Union. Trans-boundary cooperation has enabled easier processes of both crossing borders for citizens of neighbor states, and establishing joint services for providing people's security in the border regions. Two examples of this are firefighting and medical issues. At the same time, regional organizations also establish special structures for interaction with each other. In this way, the European Union has established special relations with the ASEAN and named these relations "the rainbow arc".

In practical terms it is illustrated in annual meetings of the heads of states and governments. This structure known as the ASEM (Asia-European Meeting), which includes 13 Asian and 25 European countries, is essentially an example of "Eurasia" in action. The six priority fields of cooperation include education, cultural cooperation, promotion of stable and responsible cultural tourism, protection of cultural legacy, and the strengthening of the Asian-European Fund. The ultimate goal of which is to promote dialogue among and with respect to different cultures and civilizations.

The fourth level is sub-regional organizations. This layer, as well as the layer of regional organizations, is growing rapidly. It is growing so rapidly that in addition to the Northern Council, many new sub-regional structures have been established lately in Europe: the Council of the Baltic States, the Central-European Initiative (known also as the Pentagonal Initiative or Danube-Adriatic Initiative), the Organization of Black Sea Economical Cooperation, etc... In the African Union the West African sub-regional organization acts efficiently.

In the horizontal direction on all four levels of interaction, along with states and their unions, non-governmental organizations actively manifest themselves. The last decade was marked by the formation of global structures of two new characters: business and civil society being represented by different non-governmental organizations respectively. Three forums have already firmly solidified their place as actors on the global stage: the World Economic Forum (Davos), the World Social Forum and the World Urban Forum. Aboriginal peoples have also established their own international association. There also exist a great number of various structures of both the private sector and NGO's in the other stages of interaction.

The great distinction in Pax Multilateral today becomes not so much the difference between states, but between those who determine the politics of moderate or militant and aggressive forces, which are present in all parties. In every state there also exist forces which stand for cooperation with one country or another, depending on their understanding of national interests. The difference between militant and aggressive forces and the moderate circles does not lie in ideologies and religions, but inside the people behind those forces themselves, depending on what people are being guided by: the logic of power or the power of logic.

The new world demands a new view on the concept of a race. The concept of "an ethnical race," which is so widely represented in our political conventions, was introduced only in the beginning of the 19th century by the French anthropologist Gobineau. Before that, since the era of ancient Rome, there existed a socially derived concept of race (aristocrats and plebs). Humanity followed this conception not only in the West, but also in the East. It seems that in the new global community it would be right to raise a question of a new psychological conception of race: the division of all citizens of our planet into moderate and extremist, independent of their ethnical, political, ideological, or religious affiliations.

One more thing; ideals of the new Pax Multilateral have to be found not in the past, but in the future. With the happy suggestion of professor Marshall McLuen of European University, at the end of 60-s of the 20th century while simultaneously introducing the term "globalization" the phenomenon was placed on the same level as the term "global village". However, it would be more reasonable to compare the new global community not with the global village where all have access to information from any place of our planet, but rather with a spaceship, where passengers not only have equal access to information, but all of them are equally interested in a safe flight for the spaceship "Planet Earth" through the galaxy. The time has come to develop a planetary way of thinking which presumes the definition of national interest in the global context. The logic of a planetary way of thinking brings to the foreground the tasks of providing not a balance of power, but a qualitatively new balance; the balance of interests of all the countries of our planet.

It is clear that egoism is inherent not only to people but also to states. In state activity, as well as in human relations, it is necessary to follow the idea of reasonable egoism and to demonstrate a sense of proportionality. This assumes the wise, moderate approach which shows no preference to any countries or nations, and which respects them all while trying to understand their national, governmental and cultural specialties. It seems the way to universality is through consideration of all segments of the spectrum of these specialties, done not in order to select one of them, but in order to comprehend the harmony of their combination.

Regarding the goals toward which the global community is working, the question of "what to do" is not as poignant today as it was in the period of confrontation during the "cold war" years. Although it was agreed between the UN members that the main tasks are peace, security, safety, stability, development, democracy, and protection of human rights, still they diverged in their respective understandings of these tasks.

Some considered peace only with regard to its negating ramifications (only the absence of wars), while others considered it with regard toward the positive ramifications (stability and neighborly relations among neighbor states). Security viewed as defense from outside aggression meant for some an emphasis on collective actions, while for others it meant emphasis only on the level of distinctly state to state. Some interpreted stability as maintaining the status quo, while others rejected stability de facto for they considered it incompatible with national liberation movements and revolutions. Development was the subject of endless discussions regarding where it should be directed: the social arena or the economic one. Democracy was given its due only verbally, but no one dealt with its legal bases and the mechanisms for its efficient functioning. There were endless debates concerning the topic of human rights over what rights should be the issue: civil or social and economic.

With the end of the cold war, facing the challenges of globalization, the question of "what to do" was removed from the agenda. In 2000 at the session of the UN General Assembly on the top level, all its participants came to a common comprehension of peace, stability, development, democracy and protection of human rights. Concerning globalization a unanimous opinion was formed that all nations and people should have equal opportunities to reap its benefits. And this assumes that successfully developing countries should provide help to those who need it. The formation of a democratic and just global order including political, economic and technological unity, while still preserving cultural differences, has one main reference point: man's need to be provided with or else provide for himself a worthy way of life, equality and freedom. For this purpose, the primary tasks are the elimination of poverty and hunger, the extermination of human rights violations in all their manifestations and the elimination of the ecological threat.

Special attention in the context of these tasks was given to ensuring stable development. The concrete results are expected by 2015.

Thus, facing new challenges and the change of the civilizational paradigm, the main question is not what to do, but how to pilot the global changes in a democratic, non-violent, and evolutional way, so it can benefit all the people of our planet. All this requires a revision of the conception of security, the instruments of its fulfillment and the ways of its functioning. Therefore, it is only natural to discuss a new strategic measurement of security for the 21st century. Absorbing the idea of collective security based on cooperation, which has been accepted by the international community, the new conception of strategic security discussed by the leaders of Europe, the USA and Russia, is essentially a convergence of the two conceptions: security in all aspects and strategic stability.

The conception of "security in all aspects" resulted from long negotiations between Moscow and Washington on the idea of universal security, which brought the concept of security out of military frames and created the basis for a new political way of thinking for the Soviet Union. The conception of security in all aspects was commonly submitted for consideration to the UN by Washington and Moscow (from the USA side the project was introduced by D. Bolton, from the USSR side it was introduced by V. Petrovsky) and it was unanimously approved by the UN General Assembly on its 44th session in 1989 (resolution 44/21). This resolution dictates that security in all aspects should be considered as security not only from outside aggression, but also from internal conflicts, poverty, hunger, diseases, and environmental pollution.

The conception of strategic security came into being during the negotiations on Strategic Arms Limitation in the 70-s. The essence of this concept is to ensure stability for systems of nuclear weapons, regulation of these systems and reduction of these arms. This conception was applied to strategic offensive arms as well as to defensive arms, and it perfectly blended with the conception of mutually guaranteed destruction. Other components of this conception included prevention of crisis situations and military measures of trust, including exchange of information on certain forms of military activities, and the establishment of zones of limited military activities. During the 70-s and the 80-s, the concept of strategic stability was applied particularly to the military field, since from the ideological point of view strategic stability was regarded as denial of revolutionary struggle. Only in November 1991 did the USSR and the USA reached an agreement on spreading strategic stability throughout all types of international activities. This happened at the meeting of a specially established top level working group on strategic security.

The new conception of strategic security, while combining concepts of security in all aspects of strategic stability, reveals a safe path to peace, stability and prosperity in Pax Multilateral. As it follows from its essence, it basically represents a unique triad which includes first of all; a comprehensive many-sided approach, second; support for law, and third; honest, democratic governance.

3. COMPREHENSIVE MULTIFACETED APPROACH

A comprehensive, multifaceted approach is the main index for practical actions to provide strategic security in our rapidly changing world. The path that led to this approach was a long and uneasy one. During the whole 20th century, security was concerned with defense of national borders and barring outside interference into domestic affairs. It was assumed that a state was able to provide for its own security by maintaining a certain level of armaments and military alertness, in order to repulse any possible aggression. National security concerns dominated over the interests of international security. Perceptions of national security through the prism of military categories were translated into an approach to international security, first of all, global security (as opposed to regional). In practice, national and international security interests usually contradicted each other. Only by the end of the "cold war" with the growth of understanding that the world was becoming ever more interdependent and that a crisis or a conflict situation in any region could cause a global chain reaction, did a new conception of security began to form.

National security began to be considered in the context of international security, while to international security not only global, but also regional approaches were applied. A new conception came into existence—"security of contiguous states"—which is now occupying the minds of the people determining politics. In this way, there arose the conception of common security, i.e. the protection of the interests of an independent state based on global and regional agreements. According to the aforementioned resolution of the UN General Assembly 44/21, cooperation should gain a qualitatively new nature: it should become a joint creative mission of states. The resolution aims at mobilization of the efforts of states to increase practical actions for ensuring peace and security in all aspects, through cooperation. The resolution stresses the significance of political and diplomatic means (negotiations and consultations). As it follows from the resolution, common efforts and constructive parallelism in the efforts of various structures are also required.

Although, military/political reasons still remain important nowadays, security today is not limited to regard for this single aspect anymore. According to the resolution of the UN General Assembly 44/21, security is ensured not only by military means but also by other means: through a comprehensive, many-sided approach. In this way, security is defined as a complex conception. Besides conflict prevention and armaments regulation, it includes protection of human rights, stimulation of stable development, and preserving the environment. It also follows from the resolution that peace, security and cooperation is a united system based on the UN Charter. In this lies the recognition of objective patterns of a modern world that becomes ever more united and interdependent in spite of its diversity. Our civilization is a functioning system; certain components of which cannot be disrupted without damage to the work of the whole mechanism. The organic connection of national and international security become more distinct: a low level of security for any country becomes disadvantageous for others because it leads to destabilization of the general situation.

The conception of security in all aspects underwent further development at the UN in the 90-s, when the human dimension was positioned as its priority: ensuring personal security both from violence and from hunger, diseases, and ecological degradation. It is clear that personal security in no way assumes a renunciation of state security, but rather it widens the scope of activity in order to strengthen everybody's security; that of both states and persons. State security cannot be separated from personal security. Today, ensuring personal security in all aspects is the dominating topic in all points of the global agenda.

The comprehensive, multilateral approach oriented for constructive parallelism in the cooperation of states in all directions of interaction, just as any architectural structure (including an international one), assumes the necessity of finding the golden mean; i.e. the ability to determine a rational limit, on the grounds of self-interests, as well as on interests of all countries and peoples of the planet.

In the military/political field, a comprehensive, multilateral approach assumes a concentration of efforts on non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and limiting all other arms. This topic is not new. Questions of non-proliferation of weapons, and first of all of weapons of mass destruction, equally as limiting of arms and disarmament, occupied the central place at the discussion of security problems throughout the whole 20th century. In the context of searching for ways of ensuring collective security, in 1932 the League of Nations held the first international conference on disarmament which, although it was not able to achieve impressive results, still elaborated on a methodology of negotiations which was officially approved by the UN right upon its establishment and is still being used in multilateral negotiations. When the nuclear weapon was created, it immediately became the centre of attention of the UN. The very first resolution of the General Assembly dealt with nuclear weapons, and the Security Council was immediately engrossed in a discussion of the problems of so-called "nuclear diplomacy."

During the "cold war" we all lived with the permanent feeling of danger of nuclear crush from two super-states. And as the Cuban Missile Crisis has shown, nuclear war could have become a reality if it had not been for the political realism of the leaders of the USSR and the USA. Moreover, security was under threat as a result of nuclear catastrophes in the nuclear industry. Under those conditions, prevention of a nuclear catastrophe, the establishment of firm barriers for the expansion of nuclear weapons and the development of international cooperation in the field of

peace-time uses of atomic energy were the dominating topics of bilateral negotiations; first of all of the super-states, as well as at the international forums. Compounded to this is the fact that governments experienced constant pressure from numerous international and national movements for the elimination of the nuclear threat.

Although nuclear topics dominated in the field of disarmament, it was not limited to them. All other weapons of mass destruction, as well as regular arms, were the center of attention of efforts to ensure international security. Activity in the field of armament limitation and disarmament brought notable results in the form of a comprehensive number of international treaties and agreements. Unquestionably, the existing international treaties established a certain border in the way of using and spreading weapons. First of all, however, there are always lawbreakers and secondly, there exists the so-called post-disarmament syndrome, the essence of which is that in a few new countries there are no safe places for storing weapons, no possibilities of ensuring safe transportation of weapons to the places of their annihilation and no barring of "brain drain". There is no necessity to speak to the significance of spreading weapons in the world, and not only weapons as such, but also of knowledge related to their creating.

Although a nuclear weapon was used only once in 1945, today nuclear weapons are in the arsenal of at least 8 states; future attempts to create them might be undertaken in other countries, too. There are reasons to assume that other mass destruction weapons are not fully withdrawn either, in spite of conventions banning their proliferation. New players—terrorists and organized crime—can resort to the threat of using a nuclear or other weapon of mass destruction. In connection with this fact, the question of the danger from the spreading of rockets and rocket technology, especially on regional scales, becomes particularly acute. Meanwhile, recently the topic of ensuring security through regulating armaments has moved to the bottom of the global agenda. Many-sided cooperation in the field of limitation of arms and of disarmament is now being brought to naught. Negotiations at conferences and forums on nuclear disarmament, on the Fissile Material Cut-off Treaty, as well as the Outer Space Treaty, have come to a dead-end. Revision of the Biological Weapons Convention was postponed, while the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, which was signed in 1998, still has not come into effect. At the same time, military expenses in the world keep growing and have now reached the record amount of over 800 billion USD a year.

It is clear that non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, as well as limitation of other weapons, demand really tangible results which have not yet been seen. To answer the question of how to move the non-proliferation movement from the dead stop it is in, we have to look at the approach to this question in a new way. During the "cold war" the main slogan was disarmament. First limitation, then control over the armaments. It should be reminded that the UN Charter speaks about disarmament as the final goal, and the emphasis is on establishing a system of armament regulation (article 25). Again, due to ideological differences (Moscow demanded disarmament without regulation and control, while Washington demanded control without disarmament and regulation), this statement of the UN Charter was consigned to oblivion. Meanwhile, during the elaboration of the UN Charter, the statement "system of arms regulation" was given special significance, because unlike the League of Nations Charter which was focused only on limiting national arms, the UN Charter laid the emphasis on arms regulation, i.e. on determining maximum and minimum levels of armament in the context of the final goal of disarmament.

Facing new challenges to security, it seems extremely timely to revive the primordial conception of the UN on arms regulation. Stressing disarmament as the final goal, today's premier task has to be the establishment of a comprehensive system of arms regulation. The establishment of such system is a less ambitious goal than total and complete disarmament, and more far-reaching than arms control. Finding support in the already existing regimes, the comprehensive system of arms regulation should not so much serve as a codification of the status quo, as to ensure conditions for adaptation to the new realities based on the conception of strategic security. It is clear that within the frame of this conception, power as the tool of defense and deterrence remains in the arsenal of states. But what kind of power should be the issue?

In military terms, reasonable adequacy is currently needed. Super-armament threatens serious economic and social problems and it can even lead to the disintegration of states. The experience of the Soviet Union reminds us of this. United States President Eisenhower spoke to the

dangers of super-armament in his farewell address to the nation upon his retirement, January 17th, 1961. The power factor, though it is included into the conception of national interest, by no means defines it. In the condition of all people living in the united global space, national interest assumes a global dimension, since today in the united community, as well as in human system, pain in any place is being felt by the whole body. Therefore, strengthening of the power component in national interest cannot be fulfilled at the expense of social and economic programs and humanitarian aid outside a state; for poverty, hunger and diseases create favorable conditions for terrorist and any other extremist actions.

Another most important current of actions in the political and military fields are conflicts. Global society currently has at its disposal a concrete program of actions referring to this issue, which was published in the 1992 report of the UN Secretary General "An Agenda for Peace". This document remains a guiding light for concrete actions in four dimensions. First of all, there is preventive diplomacy, i.e. actions directed at the prevention of arguments among parties, the barring of existing arguments from developing into conflicts and the limitation of conflicts already arisen. In addition to the ascertainment of facts and early prevention of conflicts, provided by the UN Charter, the report suggests measures on strengthening confidence, preventive deployment of the UN military presence and the establishment of demilitarized zones.

Next comes peacemaking activities directed at inducing hostile parties into agreements, mostly with the help of peaceful means, which are provided by Chapter VII of the UN Charter. Third is maintaining peace, which means providing a UN presence in a volatile conflict region; connected to the deployment of military or police personnel of the UN and some measure of civil personnel as well. And finally peace-building in a post-conflict period, which is directed at the revealing of and support for structures that would provide strengthening and consolidation of measures aimed at preventing a recurrence of said conflict.

Today the UN and regional structures are actively functioning in the field of peace-making, peace-supporting and peace-building. As Secretary General Kofi Annan elaborated in his report at the 59th General Assembly session, the quantity and the scale of peacemaking operations are reaching their highest level during any period of their existence, which, on the one hand, improves the prospects of solving conflicts, while on the other hand threatens to extend the potential possibilities of the system to its limit. "The increase in 2004 of demand for the UN peacemaking operations is a challenge unprecedented since the period of the sharp increase of the scale and complexity of operations in the 90-s", declared the Secretary General in his annual report on implementation of the Millennium Declaration, adopted in 2000.

Strengthening its support for peacemaking activities from its headquarters, the UN fulfills governance of 17 peacemaking operations, which are taking place in complicated and unsteady political environments such as Afghanistan, Ethiopia and Eritrea, Georgia and Kosovo. The UN troops are now leaving Sierra Leone, which has recently become stable; where they helped the government of the country achieve peace. In Eastern Timor the UN mission is decreasing according to plan, after the peacemakers have helped to provide for the independence of this state. During the past year, new operations have been sanctioned in Liberia, Cote d'Ivoire, Haiti and Burundi; a large operation in Sudan is being planned as well. The Secretary General is planning to significantly strengthen the peacemaking mission in the Democratic Republic of Congo in order to ensure that the peace process will not be turned back.

According to the Secretary General's estimations, in order to satisfy the wavy necessity in peacemaking operations, over 30,000 military men will be needed in addition to the over 50,000 already dislocated at the beginning of 2004. According to the UN Department of Peacekeeping Operations, this means that among "blue caps" there can be more army elements and civil police than at the peak of peacemaking activities in 1993, when the number of military personnel reached 78,000 people. Welcoming the increasing demand for UN missions as signal of new opportunities for the world, the Secretary General warns that it is necessary to provide the commiserate political, financial, material and human resources, and that it is essential for each operation to have a clear strategy for withdrawal.

At the same time it is necessary to mention that the mechanism of preventive diplomacy is still not being used in sufficient measure, while the establishment of "demilitarized zones" has been

totally forgotten. It is clear that during the "cold war" establishing facts and early notification of conflicts was out of the question. Such activities were unambiguously interpreted by the majority as interference into domestic affairs. It is necessary to stress that once it was possible to introduce the new term for the UN concept of "preventive diplomacy" into the "Agenda for peace," great expectations were created since it was comprehended as both a timely political step and a reasonable economic step; due to the fact as well that it was correctly regarded as cheaper to bar conflict and catastrophe rather than to engage them, in every sense. It seems that the underestimation of preventive diplomacy can be transcended, and ought to be. It is also clear that this has to be done not at the expense of decreasing activity in the fields of peacemaking, peacekeeping and peace-building.

In the social-economic direction, the comprehensive multilateral approach assumes the ensuring of personal security from hunger, diseases and ecological degradation. This makes stable development one of the necessary conditions for security in all aspects. However, providing minimal standards of security in the political and military fields is in its turn, one of the prerequisites of development. The power force of development is economic growth. Nevertheless, in spite of stable economic growth in a majority of the countries in the world during the 90-s, average incomes in 54 developing countries decreased during that decade, according to the Human Development Report of 2003 prepared by the UN Development Program. In order to turn back the decrease of incomes, development strategies should concentrate not only on economic growth, but also on more just distribution of wealth and social goods.

Millennium development goals should issue forth from the prerequisite that economic growth alone will not save the world from poverty, in which over one billion people are trapped. These goals cannot be fulfilled without managing such problems as lack of nourishment and of illiteracy. The statistical facts are shocking: over 13 million children died of diarrhea within the past decade; annually over half-a-million women – one woman a minute – dies during pregnancy or while giving birth; over 800 million are suffering from malnutrition. In the Report it is asserted that investment into industries and businesses which establish workplaces, such as industrial production or textile manufacturers, is more important for human development than into industries which require larger monetary investment, such as oil prospecting and production. In the Report there is also an appeal for initiatives directed toward the support of small and medium sized businesses and the support of businessmen in developing countries.

We have to especially stress the significance of forming "new economics of knowledge", in which the emphasis is placed on education, knowledge and access to informational technology. In the West, getting the "economic knowledge" is treated as a source of gaining wealth in the society. If wealth was previously based on owning land or capital, then with the emergence of global markets the value of knowledge as a competitive advantage has gained decisive importance.

Stable development cannot be separated from people's health. As it was stressed in the New Human Development Report of 2004, diseases have a destructive effect on people-oriented development. Today citizens of at least 46 countries, half of which are located in Africa, happen to be in a more impoverished state than they were 18 years ago. One of the main reasons for this is the spreading of AIDS because this disease harms people at their most productive age.

Stable development assumes relentless attention to the ecological problem as well. Ecological catastrophes are not illusory, but very real. Prevention of ecological upheaval requires nature-preserving measures on a planetary scale, so that humanity will avoid not only irreplaceable losses, but also new destabilizing factors in the development of the international climate. New strategies are required for the prevention of cataclysms and the decreasing of danger. A powerful flood in South Africa in July 2004, although it was tragic, was less destructive than previous floods, due to preparations by local citizens and the potential for response. Struggles against structural barriers in the way of providing food security in the countries around the Horn of Africa have prevented severe hunger that usually results from a drought period, like the one which began in 2002.

It is absolutely obvious that strategic security in the new rapidly changing world cannot be ensured without stable development just as development cannot be ensured without security. In the humanitarian direction of ensuring security, the number one priority is protection of human rights.

The international community has here common goals, fixed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and in the international pacts on human rights.

Today everybody is facing the extremely acute task of pulling national governmental practices up to the level of universally recognized standards; forming for that purpose efficient national structures for the protection of human rights in corpore; and their close interaction with representatives of corresponding international and regional bodies. We have to especially stress that while strongly recommending the states to ratify all international treaties and agreements on human rights protection, the UN is based on the fact that international standards is a minimum program for all its member states. It is clear that regions have the right to create maximum programs too. The standards of the European Union can serve as such an example. National as well as international organizations of human rights protection, which are effectively acting within the framework of international law, along with other institutions dealing with security problems give a direct guarantee for providing security.

There is also an indirect guarantee of security: education in the spirit of a culture of peace, which is intensely promoted in the UN system. In the context of this education, a significant role is played by the teaching of citizens to protect their legal rights, which are universal and indivisible. Today no one is disputing anymore the protection of which rights should be emphasized: civil or socio-economic. On the agenda, there are human rights in corpore, and the main task today is to provide these rights in practice.

For that reason it is extremely important that in the field of human rights words should not differ from deeds. There are still states which have declared their adherence to human rights protection and have accepted constitutional or legal acts securing these rights. In reality the story is quite different. Quite often human rights are either interpreted one-sidedly or this concept is carried to the point of absurdity. They are talking about rights while forgetting about responsibilities; they are talking about freedom as absence of all limits.

There still remains the problem of "special" interpretation of human rights in different regions. Let us say the origins of the human right conception in its present form often and quite justly is derived from the European Age of Enlightenment and the Western system of moral and legal norms. Indeed, Western countries have played a significant role in spreading the idea of human rights. On these grounds, cultures outside the west sometimes claim that the West has imposed their conception of human rights on the rest of the world. Some politicians and lawyers from other world regions often talk about special moral values accepted in their countries, which differ from the European ones. For example, a wide distribution found the conception of "Asian values" distinctly different. They emphasize not individual freedoms, but public benefit and by contrast find economic rights more important than political ones. According to the supporters of this conception, in many Asian countries, a person exists only "in the familial context" which is the main cell of the society. Therefore, not personal well-being but family well-being should become the main task of activities on human rights protection.

Undoubtedly, the diversity of human cultures is amazing. However, the task is precisely to find common things in diversity and to create harmony out of obvious chaos. In the ethical systems of all nations there are similar principles which assert basic rights of every human being, particularly the rights to life, justice and human dignity. Let us say moral imperatives of Christianity, Judaism and Islam are similar in many things and can be reduced to common denominators. Proclamations of fundamental human rights are found in the teachings of Confucianism and Buddhism. Chinese philosopher Man Tzy has expressed opinions on human rights which resonate very closely with those widespread in Europe only two thousand years later. Up until now only the Europeans have contributed to the development of the international conception of human rights. Its further evolution will probably follow the path of convergence, including humanistic ideas obtained from the ethical teachings of the ancient civilizations of Asia and/or Africa.

Scientific and technical revolution brings forward still another direction for ensuring security: the informational direction. Two conditions become extremely important: first, the ability to protect from intentional distortion of information; and second, the availability of developed

systems of monitoring, information transfer and new informational technologies. It is necessary to consider these conditions for normal functioning and security management in all aspects.

In the new Pax Multilateral, rephrasing the aforementioned words of President Wilson, we do not need security to protect democracy, but democracy to ensure security. The idea of strategic security promoted by the main adherents of a new approach to security—the USA, Europe and Russia—is not just a change of wording but a principally new approach in historical perspective.

As it is obvious, with the comprehensive, multilateral approach in all directions there is a possibility of finding the golden mean which bears the structure of a new architecture of strategic security. Although today some are emphasizing the fight against terrorism, against the spreading weapons of mass destruction and organized crime; while others are emphasizing the settling of domestic conflicts, the elimination of poverty, diseases and working to prevent further environmental degradation, those at the UN rightly consider that everything needs a complex approach. Taking this into account, there is an imperative for energetic actions in all directions of security. This is essential to the comprehensive approach. Not to accumulate problems, not to coordinate, but to solve these problems simultaneously and parallel to every concrete field. Such an approach also corresponds to the tasks of harmonization of international relationships, strengthening of solidarity between states, stability which does not exclude the social realm and other changes in a non-violent, democratic way.

IV. SUPREMACY OF THE INTERNATIONAL LAW

In addition to the all-embracing, multifaceted approach, effective strategic security demands the supremacy of international law. This is in no way a velleity, but an objective necessity. Strategic security in the broader sense of the word presents a certain system of transnational inter-actions which, to function effectively, need obligatory rules of state behavior; and such rules are nothing short of principles and norms of international law.

The war declared by international terrorism and the events in Iraq, with all their dramatic bitterness, provoke the question for the formation of a new global order; a legal and democratic order in its essence, multicultural (culturally differentiated) in its form. In this context, strategic security is called upon to ensure peace, stability and well-being not for the chosen ones, but for all peoples. Strategic security as a part of a new democratic global order presumes the primacy of international law on all levels—global, regional and national. This means joining the existing international agreements through signing and ratifying these conventions and through real enforcement of them. The efficacy of international law, in its turn, presumes true equality of all before the law and responsibility not of peoples or religions, but primarily of all of those who take political actions. There exist no Rogue States in the new world, there are only rogue leaders. Just as nobody is allowed to be above law, nobody is allowed to deny legal defense.

Primacy of international law in all directions presumes the protection of man, of his rights and of his dignity. There is one universal kind of sovereignty in the new world, and it is absolute. This is the sovereignty of human personality, the sovereignty of the individual. Primacy of international law includes a humanitarian imperative—the observance of the humanitarian threshold in all actions. In connection with this, one of the important questions about how to establish a reliable legal field where it would be impossible to overstep the humanitarian threshold, either during counter-terrorist activity or during military actions, could be applicable, if at all, only in an emergency and according to the decision of the UN Security Council.

Today humanitarian law is considered by European leaders as the cornerstone of strategic security. It should be reiterated that Russian diplomacy came out as the main initiator in establishing humanitarian law as far as the late 19th century, having suggested a conference in The Hague. On the practical level, economic and technological processes of globalization put forward two blocks of issues for international law:
— The struggle against global structures of organized crime;
— The civil and legal regulation of the activities of global transnational corporations through establishing business and financial law as independent branches of the international law.

Special importance is given today to the correlation of international law and human moral-ethical values. Through the ages humanity has held some fundamental moral values common for all. The Ten Commandments in Judaism and Christianity, Sheriat in Islam, as well as the ethical codes of many other religious and spiritual teachings contain practically similar behavioral norms; possessing permanent value and applicable both to individuals and to the states.

As a result of growing interdependence, elements of these codes are included into a number of fundamental international agreements. In international politics it is necessary to combine the supremacy of law with ethics which existed separate from them in the past, and to form a political paradigm that would not disassociate, but unite peoples and cultivate tolerance and solidarity among them.

International law presumes a system of guarantees which present a rather complicated structure of co-dependent and interdependent elements. According to their roles in maintaining strategic security, international legal guarantees can be subdivided into the direct and the indirect. Direct guarantees are measures to eliminate the threat of terrorism and violence, to avert or to peacefully settle international disputes, and to regulate armaments. Indirect guarantees, in order to prevent outbursts of violence among states and people, pursue the purpose of creating stable socio-economic conditions in states and regions, and also of democratization of international relations. If guarantees are considered from the alternative point of view of their impact on strategic security, then we are able to differentiate between material guarantees covering military and political matters, and psychological and behavioral guarantees connected with encouraging contacts among people and their education in the spirit of culture of peace.

Considering all this, a new approach to deterrence is needed. Of course, the sense of deterrence remains the same: the intimidated party would not get the desired thing because it would be punished through military means. Under the present conditions, especially in light of the challenge from new global actors and states housing them, deterrence by force must be backed by deterrence of negation; that means of access primarily to finances and technologies. In other words, it is legal deterrence that acquires crucial significance today. At the same time it does not exclude forced actions (sanctions and military force as the last resort), under the condition that decisions on this point are made by the Security Council.

The main principles of the international law are fixed in the UN Charter and in international agreements. The UN organizations system based on universality, lawfulness and broad mandates must play a unique uniting role, becoming a driving locomotive in coordinating the actions of states. The UN has its own constitution—the UN Charter, and its diplomatic and legal tools necessary to respond to the challenges to security. The UN also has all the necessary tools to create a gold-mine of common values and principles, and to become a special centre of know-how to ensure strategic security. An integral part of the UN is also the court system that includes special tribunals for dealing with military crimes.

Today we are observing a very contradictory situation: fears for the destiny of the UN in the new global community are inwrought with an appreciation of its unique capacity as a centre for co-ordination of the actions of states and as a source of legitimacy for these actions. One thing is required from states—adherence to the rule adopted as far back as the Ancient Rome: *Pacta sunt servanda*. Applied to the UN today, the task of a complete and universal implementation of its Charter is doubly important. And these are not mere words, but a statement that has deep meaning and significance. During the cold war period, states would very often extract certain points from the Charter neglecting its other parts. In the new world, The UN Charter must be implemented in all its articles; it must be a basis for all international actions of states.

This kind of a basis is now needed as never before. The world is changing so rapidly, and at times unpredictably, that such a basis is vital. (By the way, some politicians not without reason affirm that during the cold war period life was more peaceful because the world, in spite of balancing on the brink of the "hot" war, seemed to be more stable as paradoxical as that may seem.) Nowadays changes can take place in any region, at any moment. A contribution to the stability of the international system while in the process of changing can be made only on the basis of the UN Charter.

Let us take as an example the struggle against terrorism. The unique position of the UN is in the fact that it is a forum needed to build up a universal coalition; it can ensure global lawfulness over a long-term response to terrorism. Global lawfulness in the response to terrorism is being ensured by a number of means:

A. A variety of political, diplomatic, legal and forced means for a commeasurable and corresponding response is fixed in the UN Charter.

B. International law gives a basis not only for stifling crime, but also for bringing criminals to justice. Terrorist attacks aimed at non-combatants are crimes against humanity.

C. The UN Conventions on terrorism, regarding its various aspects, enable the international community to take corresponding actions; though at present there is no universal definition of the word 'terrorism.' The support of the necessity to bring to justice persons responsible for crimes against humanity demands that all the governments sign and ratify the existing international documents on terrorism.

Less than two days after the tragedy of September 11, 2001, the Security Council and the General Assembly condemned the terrorism in New York and voted in support of the actions aimed at the culprits and the states that support and shelter them. Two days after the 3rd anniversary of the tragedy in New York, the Security Council just as decisively condemned hostage taking at a school in the North Ossetian town of Beslan, as well as other acts of terrorism committed against the civil population of Moscow and those which occurred on board two Russian airliners; and especially stressed that "in all its forms and manifestations, terrorism presents a most serious threat to international security." In 2002, the Security Council adopted a special resolution 1373 which serves a mark for practical actions. The Committee on Terrorism established at the Security Council is nowadays a kind of headquarters for the struggle against terrorism. Its efforts are directed toward decisive counteraction to violence and hatred. At the same time the Committee assumes in its activity that terrorism should not create any new schisms within countries or among countries. No people, no region and no religion should be condemned due to the criminal actions of a few persons. In March 2004, the Security Council adopted resolution 1535 which re-organized the Committee on anti-terrorism and assigned to it an executive board, with the aim of fulfilling resolution 1373 more effectively. According to the new resolution, states are obliged to give regular reports of their actions in the struggle against terrorism. By the end of June 2004, 71 states had not provided such data. The activity of greatest importance the Committee has currently undertaken is the compiling of an information Index of counter-terrorist activity and the sources of terrorist support.

As the disputes in the UN show, one of the main tasks is to find a balance between international law and national legislations regarding the rights to shelter, criminals' extradition and lists of suspects submitted to the UN. It is important to underline that the Security Council is the chief body that makes decisions in the field of maintaining international peace and security, and it seeks to build up its work on the basis of consensus. Even the veto of permanent members of the Security Council has acquired a new meaning. For decades it was exercising a negative influence, blocking the activity of the Organization; nowadays it can play a positive role as a powerful impetus to the search for a compromise. The Council members are wary not to push the other members to use the right to veto in hopes of ensuring a balanced approach to new challenges to security.

Certainly the norms and regulations of the UN Charter adopted 60 years ago do not provide a solution to all of the problems of the present multifarious reality. The UN needs reforming and this is the purpose of both the report submitted by the group of top level experts concerning the threats, challenges and changes necessary and of the report of the UN General Secretary entitled "To the Greater Freedom…" The reform of the UN which is being offered, including greater representation within the Security Council, enhancing possibilities for the UN to more flexibly and quickly react to new challenges and threats, should not affect the principles of the mechanism coordinating collective actions of states based on the UN Charter. The reform is not an end in itself; its result should be an increase of the UN effectiveness, strengthening its legitimacy.

However, it is possible to adjust the UN to new realities without waiting for the UN reform. For this, a fresh reading of the UN Charter is needed, first of all in the part regarding the Security Council (SC): According to the UN Charter, the SC can meet on any level, including the level of

heads of states and governments, not only in New York but in any other locations, for example, in the capitals of the five permanent members, which was previously done on extraordinary occasions. The SC special bodies on particular crises at the level of permanent representatives to the UN, which could report to the SC on a higher level, could be established immediately. There Military Staff Committee, which can meet on the level of General Staff Chiefs and not only of their representatives, should be restored. It is necessary to review the practice of using the consensus method and not to spread it to taking procedural decisions. It would be possible to establish the UNO "quintet" Geneva-Paris-Vienna-Hague-Rome in Europe, under one administration which would allow saving means, decreasing expenses and ensuring an effective interaction of the UN with its European structures. In the context of restoring the concept of armament control stated in the UNO Charter, the question about establishing two new agencies should be raised: one on armament control and one on space flights security, and correspondingly a number of organizations on armament control as well as the UN Commission and the Conference on disarmament should be eliminated. Not only the UN Charter, but also other existing norms and regulations do not fully satisfy the demands of time. However, only these can become a starting point for the forward movement and for the elaboration of new agreements and recommendations on various specific questions concerning strategic security.

The development of the principles and norms of international law in the field of strategic security is not a one-time event, but a process. All the more the present status of things is multifarious in its character. There are international agreements on some problems, and here the question arises on their effectiveness. Agreements on some problems are in the elaboration stage, on others, there are only recommendations of the UN and its forums. Finally, there is no coordinated opinion on some problems about their legal execution. Let us take disarmament as an example. The chief task under the present conditions is to ensure further, normal operating and strengthening of the existing regimes which would restrict armaments and prevent their spreading all over our planet.

Today, according to the norms of the international law, there are six regimes of that kind: 1) nuclear non-proliferation, 2) the chemical weapons ban, 3) the biological weapons ban, 4) missile technology control regime (MTCR), 5) all-round control of arms supplies (CoCom) and 6) conventional armaments control. The first three are non-proliferation regimes in the proper sense of the word. The non-proliferation treaty with 178 member states is a treaty which formally restricts the nuclear club with the Five; the bacteriological and biological weapons ban Convention which includes 144 states, and the chemical weapons ban Convention which includes 145 members, are treaties not only on non-proliferation but also on disarmament in the proper sense of the word. The other three regimes do not provide any specific ban on proliferation of a particular type of arms technology. These are restriction-oriented regimes aimed at a regulatory role. In other words, they can be considered to be regimes controlling trade in arms.

So, the missile technology control regime (MTCR) consists of a number of rules controlling exports and provides exports and possible violations information exchange. At present they are discussing missiles capable of carrying any load to the distance of 300 km and more. Now the regime is occupied with the elaboration of an international behavior code. In the export aspect, a nuclear suppliers group (NSG) consisting of 34 states also acts actively. One of its main demands is the complete observance of the guarantees of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). The Coordinating Committee on many-sided export control (CoCom) deals with double-purpose arms, of both civil and military use, no matter whether they are in the category of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) or of conventional armaments. The conventional armaments regime exists in the European arena.

Since 1983, the Convention on banning or restricting certain kinds of conventional armaments which can be considered especially dangerous and have a non-discriminating character, is valid on the global level. It is a kind of an umbrella under which particular bans exist in the form of three protocols (on radar-resistant objects, on mines and on incendiaries). In 1997, the Convention banning the use, stockpiling, production and spread of personnel mines and calling for their destruction was concluded in Ottawa. In the UN there is a registration of the export and import of conventional armaments within 7 categories. In this aspect also, the so-called Wassenar group is

active (Wassenar Arrangements) in exercising control over the export of the most sensitive double-purpose weapons. Light armaments regulation in every aspect is of great importance.

The UN is a kind of arc over all these regimes and first of all its main body—the Security Council, which in case of necessity can take enforcement measures either in the form of sanctions or as last resort, in the form of military force.

From the point of view of further strengthening and enhancing the existing regimes as well as creating new regimes of armament control, the experience of the nuclear non-proliferation treaty is of special importance. This treaty which became open-ended since 1995 has global character and is backed up with agreements on regional nuclear-free zones—in Latin America and the Caribbean Sea (Tlatelolko agreement), in Africa (Pelindor agreement) and in the South-Eastern Asia (Bangkok agreement). In September, the creation of a nuclear-free zone in Middle Asia was completed. Moreover, de-facto nuclear-free zones include the Antarctic, the bottom of seas and oceans, and cosmic space. Banning nuclear weapons production and procurement, the Treaty at the same time gives the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) the necessary authority to ensure guarantees for nuclear weapons non-proliferation, including field supervision, and contributes to peace-time uses of atomic energy. All the member states of the nuclear non-proliferation treaty are obliged to have guaranteed agreements with the IAEA.

And here the global community faces a serious problem at present. Efforts to hold the nuclear genie in the bottle are seriously undermined through the spread of nuclear technology that is all the more ambivalent in character. That is why adherence to the treaty through the refusal of states to possess nuclear weapons and their consent to supervision of the IAEA in exchange for an access to the peaceful nuclear technology does not practically bring the desired results. Giving an assent to certain corrections, the states have differences in their opinions concerning particular measurements. The highlight of the day is the IAEA Director General El Baraday's speech: First, to delegate more powers to the IAEA concerning supervisions in the framework of the Additional protocol. The matter is that the sensitive nuclear technology expert control system would not be restricted with the nuclear suppliers group (NSG), but would affect all participants of the non-proliferation treaty as many industrially developing countries are in a position to produce sensitive nuclear goods.

Second, to control more effectively the process used to prepare fuel for nuclear missiles (i.e. technologies of treating uranium and re-producing plutonium) and to impose a moratorium to supplies of re-production and treatment technologies.
Third, to impose a punishment upon those who leave the non-proliferation regime. This is the field of the UN SC.

An assent concerning particular suggestions as well as concerning all other agreement correction for the strengthening of the non-proliferation regime belongs to the supreme bodies of political power of each state participant of the treaty, whereupon the process of reaching agreements at international forums in all details and legal forming of the reached agreements starts. From the point of view of the international law, this is a rather complicated process. Even in case the states are interested in settling certain questions, their positions in particular aspects differ very often. The coordination of positions demands political decisions again. However, at this stage the decision can sometimes be reached through mere diplomatic technique of framing corresponding norms and rules. As you can see, the international legal tooling plays its essential role in fixing the reached agreements.

As the evidence presented here clearly illustrates, the principles and norms of the international law must be the basis to uphold strategic security control.

V. RESPONSIBLE DEMOCRATIC GOVERNANCE

Strategic security demands democratic, transparent, and responsible governance in the whole reference frame of the new global interaction as a final, third condition.

Such responsible governance pursues the same aims as the other components of the triad of strategic security—a humanistic approach through affirmation of principles of human dignity, justice and equality.

In spite of its age-long history, democratic governance does not have a ready-to-borrow model, since democracy has taken different forms in the course of the historic process. Nowadays the tendency toward equality and the aspiration for freedom contradict each other more than ever before. Freedom demands a government which administers minimally; equality demands a government which administers maximally. As a result, these two tendencies taking populist character keep the governments in suspense and the citizens under political pressure even in traditionally democratic countries.

At the same time, in practice states should take into consideration the existing international standards which are a kind of international driver's license used in accordance with the road conditions of each particular country. Here the recommendations of the UN and of other international organizations meant both for the developed and for the developing countries can serve as a starting point from which an upward trend towards higher standards, which can in turn be used as guidance by such organizations as, for example, the Euromarket and the Council of Europe.

Other countries' experience should be taken into consideration by states during their policy making. Let us take the situation with multinational states as an example. As it is shown in the UN Development Program for the year 2004, the most reliable way to avoid conflicts among ethnic and racial groups in these states is new federalism.

Note: There are 23 federations in the world which include 480 Federation members or federal provinces to be compared with 180 sovereign states.

The experience of stable multinational states gives evidence for establishing institutions and pursuing a policy that opens up opportunities for the self-government of nations, and at the same time for joint governance of common institutions and using common symbols.

New federalism is not a ready-to-use recipe for every case. Cultural peculiarities of the particular country should be taken into account in each specific situation. Multinational federations like Belgium, Spain and Switzerland practice asymmetrical federalism; that is they provide different volumes of rights for different cultural communities. Canada has elaborated special legislation to protect French-Canadian language and culture. Malaysia and South Africa encourage a many-sided process of interaction among different cultures.

One thing is indisputable: democratic governance on the state level demands competent leadership that advocates national interest in the global context step by step. Responsible democratic governance must be ensured by the main law of the country—the Constitution approving the supremacy of law, and must have an open, responsible character. A democracy without law is like a body without skin. It should always be kept in mind that democracy is neither anarchy nor chaos. A genuine democracy at all levels can be effectively built on the basis of a constitution which provides supremacy of law, grants powers to authorities and security to individuals. At the same time, law and order do not entail the existence of a police state or a military watchdog, but imply obligatory observation of the law worked out by elected representatives of the people, and everybody's equal responsibility under the law. Without the principle of the supremacy of rights, democracy based on respect of the majority principle can rapidly regress to a condition wherein decisions are taken by those who can control people through money. With those swathed in executive power rests a special responsibility to promote the principle of supremacy of law and to support civil institutions and freedoms wedded with it. Violation of the law by those who are meant to ensure its observance is a complete negation of civilized behavior in a democratic society. The participants of the Millennium Summit stressed that to ensure peace and security, a higher life standard and attainment of goals in the field of development, society should follow an approach based on law and not on power. It is essential for each country, no matter if it is big or small, to pay special attention to the destitute and the weak. Society cannot be regarded as civilized if it does not endeavor maximally to protect its weaker and

more destitute members—the most important human rights and human values rest on this very principle.

With regard to this connection, the role of states in protecting their citizens should be especially stressed. The report by a group of prominent political figures "On a New Concept of Personal Security" rightly remarks that "hard" military power alone is not in a position to engender confidence and the support of the people. "Hard power" must go together with "soft power". The meaning of this is, on the one hand, ensuring transparent constitutional-democratic governance with power, and on the other hand, encouraging non-governmental structures' activity in every way possible. As it was stressed by S. Ogata who presented the report, "the people's security does not obliterate state security but rather strengthens it".

In the context of ensuring human interests, considering the essential differences in the approaches to the market economy of state institutions and the role of private enterprises seeking profit; it is extremely important to ensure an open character of discussions on the main questions concerning trade, finance, technologies, knowledge and information flows, in order to encourage a humanistic approach. At the same time, transparency and responsibility are also the most effective means to protect against corruption, which is not only a reprehensible, deplorable tradition, but has become a political problem incompatible with the humanistic approach to strategic security. An increase in corruption contributes first of all to discredit economic and political elites in power, and eventually destabilizes the political situation of the whole country. Under the conditions when the code of morals in a society erodes and the population as a whole does not express confidence in the politicians, corruption gains strength, becomes all-pervading and to a still greater extent affects the economic sector.

However, in the struggle against corruption the hope for activity from the punitive bodies alone cannot bring the necessary results. To successfully fight corruption, what is needed first of all is strengthening of the democratic principles of society and the establishment of conditions that would prevent the advance of corruption. A return to the inviolable principle of political, economic and social competition can restrict corruption. Such competition has to be carried into effect within the framework of specific rules, and those who disregard said rules should undergo sanctions. The rules themselves and the method for ensuring their observance should be transparent.

The theory of the "mass entering the market" and "let the market itself solve all the problems" does not work. The state remains the main instrument ensuring strategic security, and it has to bear responsibility for control over monopolies, bettering conditions for business activity, stimulation of industrial goods exports, modernization of backward sectors of the economy and encouraging long-term investments primarily through state guarantees to private investors. This is practiced by the governments of all countries with a regular economy. The more effective promotion the state gives to economic measures for solving all kinds of problems, the greater potential for the country to eventually achieve the desired results. At the same time the state should appear in the economic sphere not as an all-mighty supervisor, but as a guarantor of the supremacy of law, of equal regard for all subjects of economic relationships and of unity of economic space in the country. A flourishing state is more than an administrator for its people; it is an instrument of expediting development, which brings good profit to all classes, the mass public and each and every citizen personally.

If the task on the national level is to govern qualitatively better, on the international level it is necessary to formulate and practice not only qualitatively better governance, but joint governance. Effectively functioning states are essential for solving both tasks, and their capacity to solve these tasks demands constant effort. Each nation, large or small, can contribute considerably to the effectiveness of governance. Nobody possesses a monopoly on the quality of foreign policy and diplomacy. The contribution of the state depends on its traditions and culture as well as on the personal qualities of people determining and pursuing foreign policy. So the state acts as a system-building factor in the formation of strategic security in all its components.

Both in the mutual relationships of states and in the relationships of states with new actors on the political arena in the context of strategic security, the paramount task is to form partnerships. In the transnational aspect, partnership means one single interactive structure; the creation of a certain "safety net" based on the division of labor and mutual support. Any crisis or serious problem

in the relations between states must immediately command reaction of corresponding institutions starting with sub-regional structures all the way up to the UN Security Council—the only many-sided body authorized, in accordance with chapter VIII of the UN Charter, to take enforcement measures.

To establish a partnership of the UN with businesses, there is a proposal of a global agreement between the UN and the business world. The essence of this agreement is that its participants should be guided by universal values acknowledged at the UN under the conditions of global markets, and thus business would contribute to building up a new global society with "a human face". That's why the "Global Agreement" is based on an ethic imperative compelling actors to run private businesses and public affairs on the principles of openness, glasnost, and on the intention to strengthen the principles of human dignity, justice and equality in the business field. Already more than 100 transnational corporations, representing various activity fields, assumed obligations under this Agreement; in particular those obligations concerning the implementation of the norms of labor adopted by the UN, ensuring human rights, and ecological security. There has also been a decision to unite the efforts of the UN and transnational corporations in order to elaborate on strategies and implement practical actions, in particular to realize joint projects which would allow villagers to get connected to the Internet and would contribute to the development of small and medium-scale enterprises.

The whole experience of international development shows that acceptance by the business community of morals-oriented codes, to be used in practice, suits their vital interests. It is reasonable to expect more active support for programs of international cooperation from businesses. Charity is not a luxury but a necessity. The problem is not confined to a mutual consideration of public and private interests. It amalgamates to something much greater: to taking constructive parallel actions by both sectors in front of global challenges. And this is an objective necessity; for terrorism, growth of conflicts and the deepening social gap in the world, in practice, lead to both a loss of markets and to the growth of additional expenses for the business world. Corporations cannot interpret security as protection of their own operations anymore. It is in their interest to accept the concept of strategic security. Nowadays security has become the affair of each and every person.

As for the civil society represented by non-governmental organizations (NGO's), on the global level it has already become an integral partner to the UN; most NGO's represent the affluence of expertise, experience and knowledge. Though the NGO's have no voting power in the UN, on the grounds of article 71 of the Charter they are involved in the consultations on elaborations of different problems and to some extent participate in making decisions. The influence of the NGO's initiatives is really felt in practical affairs of the UN. Suffice it to say that the Convention against tortures, the Convention on personnel mines, the Convention on changes of the climate, valid norms concerning a greater role of women in society, protection of children, practical measures ensuring the rights of the natives, minorities etc… are examples of effective NGO action. In the future, a closer partnership between NGO's and international organizations, first of all the UN, will demand a consolidation of all NGO's into a continuing World Forum of the civil society that could hold annual meetings. From the point of view of a closer involvement of the Forum in the activity of the UNO, the Forum should be built up in the image and likeness of the UN General Assembly and should organize its work in six committees, together with plenary sessions. This would considerably facilitate the ability of NGO's to inform the UN about their ideas and missions. In the course of the reform, the UNO should in its turn undertake measures aimed at strengthening the consultative status of the NGO's.

It is constitutional-democratic governance which creates the world order which, as the German philosopher Immanuel Kant of the 18th century remarked, is able to control the activity of the state. Pushing forward the idea of a higher political order "to raise legal organization of the human society to the maximally possible perfection", Kant desired some absolute supremacy of law reached through universal republican social order, by way of transforming a monarchic imperial social order into a republican one. It can be asserted that Kant's vision of what is now referred to as responsible global governance really is a final "realization of Nature's secret plan to create a

perfectly functioning state as a single condition of complete development of man's natural capacities."

To put the formation of a constitutional-democratic global order on practical footing, the political will of each and every participant of international intercourse is needed. Effective multilateralism depends primarily on political will more so than it does on structures or procedures. Political will demands responsible behavior from all those participating in the global interaction, beginning at the state level. The state is in no way a monolithic, impersonal structure. Even before the radical changes in the international arena that occurred at the end of the 20th century, the actions of one and the same state often depended not so much on what party held power, but who personally was in power.

Let us take the USA as an example. In the case of foreign policy, there is a continuing dispute between realists and idealists present both in the Republican and Democratic parties. Realists continuing the traditions of Machiavelli and following G. Morgentau's teaching, stress the importance of orientation to the balance of power as the main way of maintaining stability and peace; belittling the significance of ethical-moral values. Idealists, whose influences go back to Hugo Grotius and Immanuel Kant, on the contrary, put emphasis on the supremacy of moral-ethical values as the factor determining a state's behavior towards other global community members. They specially underline the necessity to adhere to international law and the UNO Charter—an active Constitution of the global community.

The new development—"democratic globalism"—which goes beyond "realistic" and "idealistic" concepts, appeals to certain normative values and to democracy, and insists on their establishment and defense by force. The situation becomes even more complicated because all the mentioned schools of political thought speak in some measure for one-sided actions. The adherents of unilateralism postpone international obligations to the state interests, and this turns into a selective approach to international agreements. As it appears under the conditions of forming a new constitutional-democratic global community, moral-ethical values become a categorical imperative.

Moral-ethical orientations are needed not only by idealists, but also by realists as well as by democratic globalists. Without moral-ethical principles, the choice of actions can eventually become counter-productive. This is made all the more important due to the facts that human civilization is at such a development stage that moral reasoning and ethics as a whole could become the driving-force of global politics. Nothing else pulls people together as strongly as a common understanding of the categorization of elements into good and evil. And nothing else divides people so strongly as different groups and national ethical norms depriving a "stranger" of human dignity and of the right to be treated equally. Unfortunately, the importance of moral principles is often underestimated in different societies. Some political scientists even insist on the fact that morals have nothing to do with political reality. International affairs are considered to be an object of power pressure, enforcement capability and an arena of confrontation of national interests. However, this is not accurate in regards to reality. From time immemorial morals have exercised considerable influence upon foreign policy. Even in the darkest periods of human history only few aggressors admitted to have attacked their neighbors out of greed or out of some other amoral reason.

In the new global context there is a need for a certain re-estimation of one-sided actions where the states, especially militarily and economically powerful ones, would manifest their tendency to ensure freedom of action. Cooperation with other states, including participation in international organizations, does not put a veto on one-sided actions. It comes only to the conclusion that one-sided actions should be taken in the framework of the existing international structures, but not with an effort to evade them.

Note: It is characteristic of even those American authors who believe that the USA is meant to play the part of the hegemonic actor to think that it would be advisable for the USA, when taking one-sided actions, to act in the framework of coalitions and international organizations because these structures ensure a high degree of predictability and stability in the world.

This new view of security would undoubtedly contribute to the formation of a necessary political will for joint actions. Bearing in mind all the significance political will has, it cannot but be noted that its appearance and effectiveness depend to a great extent on the executive culture of those exercising it, on their skill in mastering the political culture of compromise, their ability to use the existing complicated, but smoothly working mechanisms of joint elaboration, and on making decisions; as well as the political savvy necessary to choose the proper moment to reach a compromise.

One of the most effective instruments of diplomacy is the taking advantage of the age-long experience of negotiation technique accumulated by diplomats throughout history. Diplomacy can do much, but for this purpose it should heed the rapidly changing reality. First of all, there must be a clear distinction between negotiations and the conclusion of treaties, which is the last and highest stage of negotiations preceded by the other stages—determining the subject of negotiations, the outlines of agreements etc. Nowadays a number of states withdraw or forgo negotiations with reference to being not ready to conclude agreements. But in order to hold negotiations this readiness is not needed, for it is in the course of negotiations that the possibility to reach a compromise is ascertained, and only after that a transition is made to the next, and final stage—the conclusion of an agreement.

It is now the time to also review the tactics of holding negotiations from the position of "all or nothing", when negotiations on different questions get linked into one knot. Such links were used in diplomacy during the period of the cold war, when it came to big political problems. So the start of negotiations on the reduction of armaments in Europe, for example, was linked to advancing the question of the protection of human rights. Now the tactics of links is absent nowhere. For example, at the Disarmament Conference in late 90s, the negotiations on one out of three questions (nuclear disarmament, halt of fissile material production, halt of arms race in space) came to a dead-end; being dependent on reaching an agreement in the negotiations on the other two. A new diplomatic tactic of constructive parallelism is obviously needed in all aspects. Such being the approach, success in one aspect can give an impetus to the advance of other aspects. Today diplomacy is no more monopolized by professionals. Its knowledge is needed by everybody, business in particular.

The significance of dialogue in the formation of political will and executive culture which has no alternative nowadays deserves special mentioning. Dialogue implies a politically correct language which should reflect politically correct thoughts. The word takes on special importance, for signals inherent to it open a way to regulating disputes. Dialogue should have a universal character—political and diplomatic, intercultural, inter-confessional. It should be oriented toward establishing an alliance, a kind of new "International" of the moderate forces which do not accept violence in any form or manifestations and advocate the piloting of rapid changes in the world in a democratic, evolutionary way. An International of this kind should be formed in the whole system of international axes: East-West, North-South, and should include all people of moderate views irrespective of their party affiliation, religious beliefs, cultural heritage, or any other background. Meetings of political leaders give a convincing example of the significance of dialogue. So, for instance, with all the differences in estimating the military actions of the coalition in Iraq, everybody agrees that in future similar situations, joint actions are needed.

Dialogue on the non-governmental level means active involvement of the civil society and the academic community. The experience of holding the dialogue of civilizations at the UNO brings convincing evidence that civilizations, as some figures consider, are not unitary and static formations. They consist of many layers and mean different things to different people. And even more important, it is generally admitted that the interaction of civilizations is not only confrontation but also mutual enrichment. Dialogue must represent all of our global community in its cultural diversity. Only thusly will we be able to reach the lofty goals the dialogue of civilizations pursues. Special importance should be given to the dialogue with youth; where future leaders in all walks of life are all formed. Here it is very important to make the accent on mutual enrichment of cultures in the interaction of civilizations and to find out such human values as freedom, equality, tolerance, solidarity, a respectful attitude to nature and mutual responsibility in the course of the dialogue. In all countries of the North and the South there is great need and desire for such a dialogue.

In the course of the dialogue in all directions, it should be taken into account that under the conditions of a new global community, the behavioral aspect of political and economic elites takes on a special meaning. The consolidation of the elites within the countries and outside them based on adherence to the norms of law and moral-ethic values is extremely important. An illustration of this is found in the joint initiative of May 14, 2002, by the US ex-Secretaries of State, Democrat M. Albright and Republican L. Eagleberger, to resume transatlantic dialogue; which met with a positive response in America, Europe and Asia.

It is practically impossible to ensure state security in all aspects without consolidating society, without mobilizing all citizens to defend their vital interests. From the point of view of an influence on the formation of international processes, the meaning of two factors in the behavior of states should be underlined—the power of personal example and renunciation of double standards in policy. It is important to achieve a change in the manner of conducting interstate affairs. Approaches of a Messiah, the attitude of a maitre instructing others are not only restricting in effect, but simply counter-productive. Conducting mature and wise affairs of state does not need recipes imposed by one side, but decisions based on the power of law and not on the law of power.

<p style="text-align:center">***</p>

In conclusion, it is most important to underline that when there is clear understanding of strategic security and its triad, it is essential to get move downward from a consensus of what and how to do something, to practical, really tangible actions toward that something's achievement. "Actions, not words," is the categorical imperative of our time.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Petrovsky Vladimir Fedorovich, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, Professor, Doctor of historical sciences, Head of the Centre of political-diplomatic dialogue of the Institute of Europe.

Mr. Petrovsky has a vast diplomatic experience. In 1986-91 he was Deputy and First Deputy Foreign Minister of the USSR; in 1992-2002, Under-Secretary General of the United Nations; in 1993-2002, Director General of the Geneva Headquarters of the United Nations; in 1993-2002, Secretary General of the Conference for Disarmament; Special Representative in Libya (1992 and 1997) and Albania (1998).

He is the author of 10 books and many publications.

«Reports of Institute of Europe» published in 2004-2005

141.	Centers of Power in the Modern System of International Relations. Materials of International conference, December 10, 2003. Ed. By V.S. Rykin. Reports of the Institute of Europe, № 141, M., 2004.
142.	D.E. Furman. Post-Soviet Political Regime of Kazakhstan. Reports of the Institute of Europe, № 142, M., 2004.
143.	N.B. Kondratyeva. Levelling of Socio-economic Development of the European Countries in the Integration Context. Illusion and Reality. Reports of the Institute of Europe, № 143, M., 2004.
144.	V.B. Belov, K.K. Baranova, Al.A. Gromyko. Reorganisation of Industrial Territories: the Experience of Major European Cities (Paris, London, Berlin). Reports of the Institute of Europe, № 144. M., 2004.
145.	The Arc of Instability in the Mediterranean-Caspian Region. Ed. By A.A. Yazkova. Reports of the Institute of Europe, № 145, M., 2004.
146.	T.T. Timofeyev. Civilizational Contradictions as Reflected in Euro-Atlantic Debate. Reports of the Institute of Europe, № 146, M., 2004.
147.	N.V. Govorova. Supply and Demand on the European Labour Market. Reports of the Institute of Europe, № 147, M., 2004.
148.	O.G. Bukhovets. Studies of Nationalism in Europe and Eurasia: New Aspects. Reports of the Institute of Europe, № 148, M., 2004.

149. A.D. Khaytun. Competitiveness of Russian Energy Resources on European Markets ("East-West" axis). Reports of the Institute of Europe, № 149, M., 2004.

150. N.P. Shmelev, V.N. Shenayev, L.N. Volodin. West European Countries: Main Features of Modern Economic Development. Reports of the Institute of Europe, № 151, M., 2004.

151. E.V. Vodopiyanova. The European Science in a Mirror of the National Cultures. Reports of the Institute of Europe, № 151, M., 2005.

152. Ed. by A.A. Maslennikov. Ruble in the Post Soviet Area. Reports of the Institute of Europe, .Ns 152, M., 2005.

153. V.S. Tsirenshchikov. Europe: Forecasting for Innovation Development. Reports of the Institute of Europe, № 153, M., 2005.

154. V.P. Fyodorov. Does Russia Have Friends and Does It Need Them? Reports of the Institute of Europe, № 154, M., 2005.

155. A.I. Bazhan. Money and Monetary Policy in the Western Europe. Reports of the Institute of Europe, № 155, M., 2005.