

P. P. Tolochko¹

THE WORLD HAS REACHED A DANGEROUS POINT

The topic of the 19th International Likhachov Scientific Conference assumes speaking about global development trends: today and in the near future. In essence, the global community has to find the answer to the eternal question: to be, or not to be? And not the better world, be it the liberal model forcefully imposed on by the United States and their Western allies, the communist model followed by China and some other countries, or the national and sovereign model that Russia stands up for, but the world in general.

The more and more aggravating confrontation between the United States with the West and Russia suggests these apocalyptic thoughts. Russia has not been a socialist state for a long time already, its economic pattern is practically in no way different from the pattern of its opponents, but as hundreds years ago Russia is accused of all thinkable and unthinkable sins. Such behaviour of the collective West reminds of the well-known parable about the thief who cries: "Catch the thief". It was not Russia that unleashed two world wars but the West that is moralizing about peace-loving all the time. And it was also the West that together with the United States, Japan and Turkey tried to disintegrate Russia by military intervention in 1917–1920. The be-

haviour of the West in the 19th century was similar. Invasions into Russia in 1812 as well as in 1854–1856 are also on the conscience of the West.

So, Russia has immeasurably more grounds to be afraid of the Western aggressiveness. Especially because it does not particularly hide it. It's well-known that in the United States Nuclear Doctrine and Policy providing for the use of nuclear weapons in the course of a common military conflict, Russia's role is determined as one of the main enemies. In accordance with it, Russia is being totally surrounded by the United States and NATO military bases. Currently, this military bloc is in essence an anachronism because its vis-à-vis the Warsaw Pact (Warsaw Treaty Organization) was dissolved over thirty years ago. But more and more countries are being involved in NATO. There are armed forces contingents of the United States and NATO in practically every one of them, missiles bases are being built in some of them (Romania, Poland). After Ukraine and Georgia join NATO, Russia will be fully surrounded. This is dangerous not only for Russia but its NATO neighbours as well, for the world as a whole. Military potentials of the opposing parties find themselves too close to one another, and that increases the confrontation risks many times.

The defense budgets of Russia and the United States are eloquent and show which country is more dangerous for the world. In case of the United States it amounts to US\$ 700 billion and in case of Russia – only 47 billion. The United States President D. Trump's statement that they should provide "peace through strength" in essence means appropriation of the right to war by them.

This goes down well and is supported by the European allies of the United States, especially the new EU members as well as England that suffers from the old phantom pain sensations in relation to Russia. The British ruling elite loses the sense of reality in its traditional hostility to Russia. The most striking evidence of that is the so-called Skripal

¹ Member of the Presidium of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Honorary Director of the Institute of Archeology of the NAS of Ukraine, academician of the NAS of Ukraine, foreign member of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (History), Professor. Author of more than 500 scientific publications, including 25 books: "Ancient Kiev", "Ancient Rus", "Ancient Russian Feudal City", "Historical Portraits", "Russian Chronicles and Chroniclers of the 10th–13th Centuries", "Vladimir the Saint – Yaroslav the Wise", "From Rus to Ukraine", "The Ancient Russian People, Imaginary or Real", "Power in Ancient Rus in the 10th–13th Centuries", "Ukrainians in Russia", "The Origins of Russian Land", etc. Member of the Academy of Europe (London), corresponding member of the Central German Archaeological Institute. Laureate of the State Prize of the Ukrainian SSR in the Field of Science and Technology, State Prize of Ukraine, the Grushevsky Prize of the NAS of Ukraine, Makariievskaya Prize and Alexander Nevsky Prize (Russia). Awarded the 3rd–5th Class Orders of Prince Yaroslav the Wise, "the Badge of Honor" (USSR), the Order of Friendship (Russia). Doctor honoris causa of SPbUHSS.

case, insistently used by the Prime Minister Theresa May, as well as the speech by the Secretary of State for Defense Gavin Williamson delivered at the Munich Security Conference 2019. As the Russian politicians mentioned, it was very close to announcing war in its content and tone. It's unthinkable and irresponsible. May be, first of all, in relation to the people of his country who definitely did not authorize their young minister to such hostile rhetoric. This ill-starred Secretary of State as a loyal handyman of the United States, while he was at it, also told the alliance member states to take more responsibility for their defense and not to shift the burden to the shoulders of American taxpayers.

Unfortunately, this speech was not much discordant with the general tonality of the Munich Conference, set forth by the United States Vice-President Michael Pence and other high-standing statesmen from the West European countries. I can't share the optimistic statements presented by the mass media of Russia that the Munich Conference 2019 revealed serious disagreements between the United States and their European allies. The new EU members and England either have no disagreements with the United States at all or they have no courage to speak about them.

They are surely present in the old European countries but only the Chancellor of Germany Angela Merkel can say about them. The general meaning of her speech came to the fact that there is no need to isolate Russia but it's required to work together with Russia at the solution of global problems. This is close to what Mrs. Merkel said at the World Economic Forum in Davos in 2018: "We Europeans must really take our fate into our own hands". Surely, we should not be deceived. Merkel has not taken the pro-Russian position. Sooner, pro-European, subjected to the interests of Germany's sustainable economic development.

Surely, a long time will be required for all European countries to comprehend this simple truth. As well as to understand that endless victimizing and telling lies about Russia having practically the same nuclear potential as the United States, can lead the world to catastrophic consequences.

The special feature of the contemporary global development is its complete unmanageability. In the past, in the years of the Cold War and later, up to the start of D. Trump's presidency in the United States, there was such manageability. It was based, on the one hand, on the system of international agreements and treaties limiting the nuclear arms race, and on the other hand, on the authority of such international organizations as the World Peace Council that had its structures in all the countries of the world as well as the Non-Aligned Movement that was a kind of global referee in the arguments of the two poles of power.

After the Soviet Union disintegration and collapse of the whole community of socialist countries, the said international organizations as if lost their meaning and purpose. There was no longer any necessity in their intermediary services. Currently, their voices in defense of peace are not heard absolutely. The United States and their allies regarded their victory in the Cold War against the Soviet Union as the confirmation of their being right in determining the ways and meanings of global development. And though nearly thirty years have passed after that fateful time, and Russia is far from the country it was in the 1990s, the United States can't change the victor's psychology – the psychol-

ogy of the owner of the globe, the only one responsible for arrangement of the "free and democratic" world.

As the former Vice-President of the United States J. Biden said in Munich, the United States are "willing to shoulder our responsibility of leadership... I promise you [one should think, European allies. – P. T.] we will be back. Don't have any doubt about that". Why is it the United States' responsibility and who imposed it upon them? Biden did not explain that. And the current U.S. Secretary of State M. Pompeo does not explain it either but says about the necessity to change the regimes in Venezuela, Nicaragua and Cuba. Biden's optimistic promise to come back, no matter how strange it may seem, is at the same time the acknowledgement of the fact that the unconditional leadership of the United States in the world has been lost.

Surely, the treaty systems of the past are not eternal. Probably, certain agreements and treaties such as the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty, the Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and Short-Range Missiles or the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action on Iran's Nuclear Program need to be revised or even signed anew. But new talks between the interested parties are required for that and not the diktat of one of them. In this case that's the United States announcing their withdrawal from a number of international agreements on control over nuclear weapons without any consultations and explaining their reasons, and they were the agreements on which the global stability was based. In essence, the accomplished acts were presented to the global community. And only later, it seems in order to somehow save face the United States started looking for justifications. It was either Iran not inspiring confidence, or it seemed to them that Russia was bypassing the ban to build medium-range missiles. But the United States withdrew from the Paris Agreement on Climate Change with the same irresponsible easiness while Russia does not violate it in any way.

We can only say that such return of the former global leadership to the United States can cost the world a lot. The evident truth for some reason cannot be comprehended by the United States political elite – that their country though still capable of a lot, can't already do everything. The example is the Middle East. The United States managed to destroy the traditional pattern of life there, and that was accompanied by many thousands of victims among its residents and millions of refugees flowing into Europe. But they have not managed to build a new – "free and democratic" order. And they completely covered themselves with shame in Syria. The announced aim to overthrow "dictator" Bashar al-Assad turned out to be beyond their strength.

When these lines were written, the United States that have not learnt anything in the Middle East, started establishing order in Venezuela. The legally elected President Nicolas Maduro was announced overthrown and their protégé Juan Guaidó was appointed a temporary President. This scandalous arbitrariness brought about decisive protests not only in Venezuela but in many countries of the world. The United States demand to recognize their puppet Guaidó as the President of Venezuela was not unanimously satisfied even by their closest allies in Europe. The U.S. Vice-President Pence actually demanded from them in Munich to recognize the "new" President of Venezuela but he was not completely successful. Probably, the United States are capable to overthrow Maduro forcefully, using their own force or their allies as they did in Iraq with

Saddam Hussein or in Libya with Muammar Gaddafi. But, first, they will hardly manage a bloodless coup and, second, another non-healing wound on the body of the global community will weigh on their conscience.

Surely, no one believes any longer in American tales about the United States being a sample of freedom and democracy and having a special mission to make the whole world happy. Everyone understands that they are driven by exclusively imperial economic interests, the striving to make the world the treasury their own. But they can't understand that Russia, China, Iran, India and other countries have their own interests, and they also should be taken into account. If the times of the cowboy with guns in both hands (and even long-range missiles) are not over yet, they are definitely ending. The world is really becoming multi-polar. And it can only exist on principles taking mutual interests into account. It can't be managed by any one country, no matter how unlimited its possibilities may seem. It's necessary to come to agreements, enter mutually acceptable agreements and live according to them. If the United States do not learn this simple truth, if they do not find enough brains to refuse from the conviction that the whole globe is the sphere of their exclusive interests, that may have catastrophic consequences for the world.

Currently, it has already reached a dangerous point. The hopes for the U.S. President D. Trump's sanity have not come true. He did not fulfill his election promise to get along with Russia. The already accumulated nuclear weapons are enough to eliminate everything alive from the surface of the globe. But the opposing sides – the United States, Russia and others – are preoccupied with creation of more and more deadly kinds of weapons. And the most dangerous in all that is that the global community in essence has reconciled with such a prospect. The Americans say that their military doctrine provides using nuclear charges in a common military conflict, and the global community is silent. It does not sound the alarm. Probably, it seems to many that such a local conflict will bypass them. But this is an illusion. Any military nuclear explosion in a conflict between the United States, NATO and Russia will detonate a global catastrophe. It's necessary to do everything possible for nothing like that to happen. Use of nuclear weapons even in a local conflict should be announced by the United Nations a crime against humanity and prohibited by the respective legal act. It's also vitally required to restore the authority of the World Peace Council as well as the Non-Aligned Movement.