

FROM THE ARCHIVES OF



No. 4, 2002. Pages 18-33.

EMERGENCE OF A NEW WORLD ORDER

Author: Sergei Kortunov, Vice President, Foreign Policy Association, Candidate of Sciences (History).

ONE SHOULD NOT OVERESTIMATE the direct impact of the events of 11 September in the United States and the coalition's antiterrorist operation that followed them on the formation of a new world order. They are nothing more than a symbolic watershed, a result of previous developments of the last decades. Still, we all know that the changes have come to stay, that they visibly affected the international relations' structure, served a watershed in world politics and hastened the collapse of the old and emergence of a new world order.

Today, when more than six months separate us from the September tragedy and when the early emotional responses subsided to give place to more sober and balanced approaches one can discern two circumstances. First, the existing post-confrontational mechanisms and conceptions of international security are in a deep crisis and no longer efficient. Second, the principles, parameters, and content of the emerging system of international relations are unpredictable. Once more world history shamed those false prophets who not long ago had predicted its end.

Collapse of the Old World Order

NOBODY EXPECTED THE NEW WORLD ORDER to take its final shape in six months yet last year there was any number of people who had expected that now there would be something more definite than vague outlines. Today, we can say with a certain degree of confidence that the system of international relations that seemed to be taking shape in the post-Cold War period has collapsed (to say nothing of disintegration of the relatively stable bi-polar world).

Specifically, this relates to the following factors confirming that the old world order has disappeared.

The unipolar world based on the US unlimited domination in the world, at least in the first half of the 21st century, will ensure neither international security nor national security for the United States itself.

The multi-polar world conception cannot provide a firm foundation for a new world order either: the September tragedy has demonstrated that none of the poles of power can protect itself unilaterally and that together they are also vulnerable.

The NATO potential proved fairly useless when it came to opposing the gravest challenge of the 21st century because it had been built up and adjusted to serve different military aims.

The events of 11 September have dealt a heavy blow at the UN and other components of the international security system (such as OSCE): nobody needs them in the new historical situation.

The CIS collective security mechanisms were not used either-this may lead to their complete degradation.

Today, we can clearly see the key factors that make the situation unpredictable.

- First, actions of the main actor, the United States.
- Second, the policy pursued by the Chinese People's Republic. It is China that can derive maximum advantages out of the obtaining situation if further developments weaken the main actors. At the same time it may undermine its political positions if it continues demonstrating a fairly reserved attitude to the use of force by the US-led antiterrorist coalition.
- Third, the Islamic world that is so far not more than a virtual civilizational object. Hundreds of millions of Muslims united by common religion are disunited by legal schools, their attitude to the nature of political power, their religious past, regimes, etc. Potentially, the Muslim community is a powerful factor that may oppose, in a distant future, a new world order if it fails to take its interests into account.

There are the following uncertainty factors related to the conflict area the situation in which directly affects the process of a new world order formation. Since the Taleban is mainly composed of Pakistani Pashtoons (who have never recognized the frontier with Afghanistan) Pakistan, a nuclear power, may become involved in a protracted conflict. India may become also involved in its turn. This may destabilize the Asian-Pacific Region with unpredictable results.

One should not forget that the Muslims of Uzbekistan and Tajikistan are very ambiguous about the antiterrorist operation. If it is extended to other countries, the fact that the Americans are using the local military bases may radicalize the sentiments of the Islamic umma and cause an outburst of anti-government feelings (this happened once in 1992). Continued economic problems that have sent down the already low standard of life will heat up passions.

Obviously, a military defeat of the Taleban means next to nothing in the context of creating a new world order or, at least, of stabilizing the situation in Central Asia and neutralizing Islamic extremism.¹

Even if the Taleban is completely destroyed in Afghanistan (or pushed out of the country) and if the compromise coalition government that includes all major political forces functions successfully terrorism will not disappear. Many experts believe that its center has already moved from Afghanistan to Pakistan where the central authorities are unable to control the entire territory, especially the mountains and the lands along the border with Afghanistan.

Kurdistan in Iraq is also regarded as a possible base of international Islamic terrorists. In fact, they have already set up their fallback bases in the mountains that the forces of the antiterrorist coalition will find hard to reach. They can be used for regrouping and accumulation of forces to continue, after a short while, subversive actions in Chechnya, Central Asia, India, China, and the rest of the world.

Finally, there is a lack of certainty about two key states bordering on the conflict area: Iraq and Iran. The former has fairly strong armed forces and (according to the US assessments) chemical and bacteriological weapons. The latter can bloc the Strait of Hormuz that may trigger a military and economic crisis.

Contemporary terrorism, or hyper-terrorism aiming at large-scale actions with massive loss of life and international involvement, the perpetrators of which and the key figures behind which remain in the shade and no specific demands are formulated (at least in the case of the US) is a sort of a “terrorist show” designed to produce a worldwide shock, not merely to inflict maximal damage or harm.³ It has become possible in the context of globalization though it was not born by it.

There are a great number of objective factors closely connected with these processes. In the first place we are watching a radical stratification of the states into very rich and strong and very poor and weak. For historical reasons the latter are concentrated in the Islamic area. We all know that at the turn of the 20th century the industrial revolution in Europe that started social stratification and produced a huge mass of social outcasts also caused a mighty wave of protest against the rich. It took a form of revolutions that shook many European countries. Russia was among them. In the early 21st century the obviously dangerous gap between the rich North and the poor South creates conditions for a terrorist “International” under the green banner of Islam.

Regional instability will supply fuel for terrorist-provoked military conflicts.

Information revolution, worldwide spread of the electronic media that potentially may become an instrument of manipulating mass consciousness are also of signal importance.⁴

Finally, international terrorism was brought to life by the sharpening contradictions between the value systems. On the one hand, there is a system of Western values that cannot be accepted as universal by the entire world. On the other, there is system of values with which the so-called Islamic world associates itself. Though far from homogeneous the entire Islamic world is inspired by a historical project alternative to the West.

There are also subjective factors that shape the nature and image of contemporary terrorism. The poor countries are protesting against globalization the fruits of which will be reaped by others. They oppose the pressure of transnational corporations that are promoting globalization. Criminal transnational structures have stepped up their activities and are confronted with situations in which military force should be used. They have no armies therefore they resort to terrorism. Islamic radicalism that provides international

terrorism with an ideological basis has taken shape-in a way, this is a response of the Muslim world to the attempts of its Westernization and to many years of disdain with which the richest Western countries were treating it.

On the other hand, we should clearly realize that the September acts of terror are not a “civilization clash” or a confessional crisis. At no times have civilizations fought among themselves. The worst and the bloodiest clashes of the past century took place within the same civilization. There have been no direct clashes between Christianity and Islam since the Crusades.

Today, we have no certainty about those who committed the acts of terror on 11 September or about those who guided them yet we know that it was very serious forces that wanted to deliver a mighty blow at the America-centrist conception of the new world order and the unipolar globalization and to demonstrate that the United States cannot claim world leadership in the 21st century.

To a great extent they succeeded. The role that the United States was claiming with seemingly good reason was questioned. All US national security systems (the CIA, FBR, and airline security service) were disrupted. Its huge military and economic might (today the US accounts for 40 percent of world’s defense spending and 20 percent of world GDP) proved useless: it could not protect common people in the key cities against a small group of terrorists.⁵

Psychologically, the tragedy was no less catastrophic for the Americans than the defeat in Pear Harbor.⁶ Later this shock developed into a powerful consolidating factor yet the idea of American invulnerability and omnipotence tumbled down in the United States and in the world around it.

There is fairly widely accepted opinion that a long-tern common threat to the United States, Russia, and other countries can help shape a new state order. This threat will objectively lead to partner relations between the West and Russia and give a chance to create a new agenda. The same people believe that joint antiterrorist efforts can be regarded as a system-forming factor of a new world order that will push to the back burner other problems of bilateral and international relations.

They are wrong and the latest developments have confirmed this. The United States has demonstrated its readiness to withdraw from the ABM Treaty, to start deploying its strategic antiballistic missile system and to extend NATO; certain US officials made aggressive anti-Russian statements. This shows that so far there is no reliable and firm foundation for a radical and irreversible improvement of relations between the United States and Russia.

This means that there is a long way to go to the new world order.

Possible Variants of US Actions and their Results

SOME EXPERTS BELIEVE that by completely annihilating the Taleban in Afghanistan the United States conducted a brilliant military operation, demonstrated mobilization preparedness and the way wars should be waged in the 21st century. Others believe that the Unites States has failed to achieve its aims and that the war against international terrorism is just unfolding. This was what the US president said in his annual State of the Nation address.

The majority, however, agree that in the struggle against terrorism armed strikes unsupported by other actions are ineffective and may create dangerous repercussions. What should be destroyed is the soil on which terror is flourishing rather than terrorists themselves by actively opposing terrorism in the political, economic, and military spheres through the concerted efforts of the leading countries.

So far, the United States as the leader of the antiterrorist opposition has not demonstrated such intentions. Despite frequent statements about the “fight against evil” that will be a protracted and hard process, it does not want to produce a long-term collective strategy that will provide radical solutions and offer radical changes in the global economic policy. The United States is addressing other tasks: on the domestic scene there is an attempt to meet the expectations of the crowd and punish those who organized the terrorist acts. In foreign policy there is a desire to demonstrate how the problem of international terrorism can be resolved through the use of force. This is intended as a confirmation of the American claims of “global leadership” and of forcing on the world the “American order.” All this does not call for a frantic search of the crime’s true perpetrators: a mere demonstration of the resolution and an ability to “defend democracy” (even if its fundamental principles and international legal norms are violated in the process) are enough.

This will not put an end to international terrorism, this will not add security either which means that the world order the US is constructing will be repeatedly tested for strength.

The United States has clearly demonstrated that it does not need either the UN Security Council or the OSCE or other international organizations able to supply the legal foundation of its actions, not matter how morally justified. Other states, members of the world community, Russia among them, actually agreed with this-the fact cannot but aggrieve. The world, and the Arab East, was shown once more that it had entered a new age in which force rather than reason, humanism or even international laws predominated. This revived the past and made peace fragile and the world vulnerable.

The world order ruled by law had been destroyed back in 1999 when NATO attacked Yugoslavia therefore, strictly speaking, the terrorists acts of 11 September 2001 against the United States took place amid the world order’s debris when there had been no international laws to violate. In other words the terrorists proceeded from the 1999 precedence accepted and approved by the world so-called civilized community. The US-led antiterrorist coalition is fighting in an absence of the world order based on laws.

The United States did not bother with an investigation or proper court proceedings even inside the country. Legally, bin Laden’s responsibility has not been proven. It remains unclear why the United States selected Afghanistan as the main culprit. What is more, it announced its readiness to fight against other countries, too. This is a legal chaos. The right course required a national and then international investigation-the US preferred to accuse of terrorism entire countries and to speak loudly about “the Islamic trace” without sufficient grounds. This amounted to accusing world Islam of terrorism: in September 2001 President Bush spoke of a “crusade” against it. By its threats to punish all regimes guilty of sheltering terrorists the US has usurped the right to mete out punishment outside UN sanctions. This approach contradicts international legal norms.

At the same time, at home the United States launched an attack on the liberal-democratic institutes that looked unshakeable. Human rights and many freedoms are

infringed upon and replaced with “freedoms of a different sort”-the freedom for the police to tap phones, open private letters, check bank accounts, etc. The special services that demonstrated their complete impotence and seemed to deserve nothing more than total cleansing have acquired new unprecedented rights, more funding and nearly unlimited freedom of action.

It is not clear yet how far the process may go yet it is for the first time in the US history that the citizens are prepared to sacrifice part of their rights and freedoms to personal security. If this trend continues the civil society of the West may develop into a society of total control at borders, customs, transport, by the police, etc.

Some experts believe that amid economic recession the United States is moving towards a mobilization economy (this happened once after World War II and was followed by arms race). According to others, the United States is pursuing, as a priority, its geoeconomic interests, or rather, the interests of their largest corporations that need the Central Asian energy and raw material resources.

Many experts are convinced that Washington will try to improve its image abroad greatly damaged by the aggression in the Balkans, the Middle East and other regions and its total disregard for the UN, other international organizations and laws.

The thought that the US Administration was responsible for the 11 September terror is an absurdity-yet it is obviously wringing it dry for the sake of America’s interests. The US is pursuing the following aims:

- political rout of Islamic fundamentalism as an obstacle on the way towards the US-dominated world order;
- control over the Muslim countries that the US finds objectionable;
- stricter control over the oil-bearing region between the Caspian Sea and the Persian Gulf and complete security of energy fuels transportation routes;
- radical reduction of the political role of the three major nuclear countries (Russia, China, and India) that the US cannot completely control;
- reduction of the political status of the US NATO allies;⁷
- reduction of Europe to the status of a depoliticized economic zone completely dependent of the United States (similar to that of 1945).

These aims can hardly be attained, at least in their totality, yet today they are positioned as a real political agenda.

The Role and Place of Russia

OBVIOUSLY RUSSIA JOINED THE ANTITERRORIST COALITION not because it wanted to please the United States or was seeking political or material dividends. In this respect its position differs radically from that of certain Central Asian countries. Russia supported the United States because its national interests coincided with those of the US.

At the same time one can see that in autumn 2001 Russia missed important political and diplomatic possibilities that left the present fairly effective international instruments idle. The UN Security Council should have been convened immediately after the terrorist attack to discuss the problem. Instead, it was convened much later and

merely denounced acts of terrorism and recognized the right of the United States to self-defense.

The Collective Security Council, another international instrument that works according to the 1992 Collective Security Treaty, was equally left aside. The Shanghai Six could have contributed to the situation at a Russia-initiated meeting. Today, the future of this organization looks dim since the United States (that is not its member and has never been one) is playing the key stabilizing role in the region.

Russia could have insisted on a meeting of G8, a non-formal yet quite important instrument of world politics. Washington dismissed Moscow and Rome's suggestion to convene it as useless and inadequate. This left NATO to respond to a global crisis-being unable to deal with emergency situations and initiate emergency actions it passed the initiative to the United States. This further weakened the world legal system.

It turned out that any protracted antiterrorist campaign required Russia's involvement and that even the powerful United States need it. The crisis has amply demonstrated that in Central Asia no state can compete with Russia where political and military-political possibilities are concerned. The United States has no alternative to Russia's support yet so far this cooperation remains unequal.

Some people say that Russia should have sold its participation in the antiterrorist coalition dearly. Many of them know the price-drawing closer to NATO (or even membership in the alliance), redemption of Russia's foreign debts, and its immediate membership in the WTO on acceptable conditions.

Everybody knows that in diplomacy unilateral concessions are simply pocketed and never mentioned again-all who have dealt with the Americans at bilateral talks are aware of this.

There is an opinion that we can ignore the negative effects of the Central Asian developments because Russia is waging, with American hands, a war against a seat of Islamic terrorism and extremism that keeps the Chechen conflict going. The wave of destabilization that engulfed Central Asia, Chechnya and other Russia's regions started in Afghanistan. There are people who disagree with this: they present irrefutable proof that terrorism in Russia is supported, and has been supported, not from Afghanistan but from other countries (Saudi Arabia, Turkey, and the United States) via Azerbaijan, Georgia, the Baltic countries, and other former Soviet republics.

This confirms what everybody already knows: Russia should pursue neither a pro-Western nor a pro-Eastern but a pro-Russia policy with many vectors. The frontier between Afghanistan and its neighbors is practically open-this aggravates the threat to Russia. For historical reasons the former Soviet republics have no frontiers among themselves to speak of. The southern border cannot be sealed off for lack of money therefore a bloc of countries with similar problems in the south is the only possible and pragmatic answer to the situation. We should start with Afghanistan by turning it into a friendly state that will separate Russia from the territories breeding Islamic extremism and drugs. Our southern flank will be better protected if we continue maintaining partner relations based on mutual trust with Iran, India, and China.

A wide-scale antiterrorist coalition of Western and Eastern countries operating under the UN aegis and in accordance with its Security Council's decision will answer Russia's interests best. The UN should formulate harsh conditions to the countries that allow training camps and conscription offices of international terrorism to function on

their territories. If they prove unable to close down these structures special services could pool their efforts to help them accomplish the task. In case they prove unwilling to obey the UN-formulated conditions military and economic sanctions of the UN could be applied against them.

Russia, the West and World Islam

RUSSIA'S PARTICIPATION IN FORMING A NEW WORLD ORDER has made the Islamic aspect of its policies especially topical. The myth about Islam as a wild and conservative force threatening civilized mankind and the "rich North" especially should be debunked. Islam should no longer be identified with terrorism, intolerance, violence, and inflexibility where other religions and nations are concerned. Its positive image that reflects its true nature should be created. This will undoubtedly serve Russia's national interests: it will block the efforts of anti-Russian forces in the West and the East to set Islamic extremism against Russia, to drive a wedge between it and the "Islamic states," and, better still, to split it according to civilizational and confessional features. Obviously, the role of an outpost of Western civilization protecting it against the pressure of radical Islam goes against Russia's national interests, and its Muslim community in the first place. Islam and Russia need the true image of this religion be restored. Islamic fundamentalism is driven by different, and often contradictory, forces. We should recognize this if we want to sort things out in the Northern Caucasus, the Middle East, and the Balkans. It is as wrong to speak about single Islam as to hold forth about the Christian powers' "civilizational unity."

Russia has geopolitical allies in the Islamic world, inside Russia itself, within the CIS and in the far abroad (and they are in the majority) that share strategic, civilizational, and geopolitical aims with it, and a common "Eurasian culture." For this reason nobody has the right to look at the Islamic world as a "threat to mankind." We should identify our foes and friends, we should learn to distinguish between traditional (orthodox) Islam from extremist sects that more often than not are guided by anti-Western or cosmopolitan forces rather than Islamic considerations. In fact, genuine Islam is equally threatened by those extremist forms that are regarded as a model of Islamic fundamentalism.

Russia cannot afford a quarrel with Eurasian Islam-it should work towards a Russian-Islamic Eurasian alliance oriented at a "blossoming complexity" to borrow a term from Konstantin Leontiev that will oppose unification of all kinds and the attempts to remove civilizational specifics.

The Tartar, or wider, Turkic variant of Islam that developed into Jadidism early in the last century was one of the components of the Christian Orthodox state. It was not an accidental element but an inalienable ingredient in the "meting pot" of confessions and ethnic groups that was the Russian Empire under the czars. At the same time, "the melting pot" was an ideological platform of the "blossoming complexity" of ethnic cultures and confessions.

The above suggests the following strategic elements of Russia's attitude to Islam:

- respect of Islam;
- active cooperation with moderate Islam of the "Eurasian type;"
- resolute opposition to Islamic extremism;

- prevention of a possible alliance between Islamic extremism and militant nationalism and separatism (these factors are the three roots of the new-generation conflicts);
- stemming the resolution of bellicose vanguard of world Islam to exploit the Chechen factor so that to channel Islamic extremism against Russia;
- opposition to the West's ambiguous policy: on the one hand, it does not want to stir up Islamic extremism; on the other, in certain cases it tries to channel its aggressive designs to the North in the direction of Russia;
- Islamic factor should not be identified with Islamic extremism so that to avoid a confrontation with Islam along the entire front;
- Russia should decline the role of a buffer zone, or NATO's outpost and a shield protecting the West against the Islamic East;
- folding up, by diplomatic and political means, activity of the extremist Islamic groups based in other countries (Saudi Arabia, Turkey, etc.)

Not aggressive by itself the Islamic world serves a breeding ground of international terrorism and, in a broader context, an antithesis to the liberal Atlantic model of world development.

Despite the Taleban's seemingly obvious military collapse the international terrorists have preserved their political and ideological positions-they still are the vehicles of "Islamic protest" against the United States, the situation fraught with more bloodshed. The road towards security in the 21st century lies through a dialogue with the Islamic world based on mutual respect. People should be taught to respect other nations and different civilizations, and bear in mind that some of them will never abandon their values for the sake of alien ones imposed on them-they do not want to become an inferior copy of others. The West, the United States in the first place, should learn to accept the world's civilizational variety. We should condemn the very existence and use of such terms as "rogue countries," "the axis of evil," etc.⁸

On the other hand, Islam should become aware of its responsibility for continued peace and international security. It should cover its part of the road and to resolutely condemn all forms of Islamic extremism, of which Wahhabism is one.

What Should Be Done?

THE TIME THAT HAS ELAPSED since the tragedy of 11 September 2001 suggested several conclusions about a new world order.

First, one can say with a great degree of confidence that the attempt to create an American world order has failed, so far. It offers no alternative trends of world development and therefore has no future: all attempts to impose it on the world will provoke opposition of other subjects of international relations.

The role of Europe in shaping a new world order is declining, in relative terms, while a potential role of Russia is increasing. The role of China is so far unclear. The September events showed that the multi-polar world conception is an unacceptable simplification of the real trends of world development.

Eurasia still plays the key role in ensuring worldwide security therefore Russia, as a Eurasian country that is expected to contribute, on a great scale, to antiterrorist struggle in this region, should not be regarded as a partner of secondary importance.

This should not be taken to mean, however, that the new world order will take shape within the limits of bilateral Russia-US cooperation. First, today and in the nearest future the United States will continue its drive for global domination as the only leader. Second, Russia is too weak economically and politically to play a role of another center of power and be an equal partner of the United States in building up a new system of international relations. Russia has to rely on Europe, China, and the Islamic world: if skillfully applied this multivector diplomacy will make Russia a valuable or even indispensable partner of the world community.

At the same time, despite certain euphoria over warmer Russian-American relations, one should soberly assess the prospect of drawing closer together of the United States and Russia as very limited because of the gap between their military-political potentials. So far the sides are guided by tactical and purely pragmatic considerations and are pursuing their own aims. This sort of partnership will hardly develop into a strategic union or even an equal partnership: they require both sides' serious intentions so far absent.

We should not overestimate the potential of the antiterrorist opposition that is not more than an ad hoc instrument created to address a limited task of fighting a common enemy. It cannot serve the basis for a worldwide alliance for the sake of security between Russia and the West. In fact, there are no objective prerequisites for such an alliance. For the same reason Russia can hardly become a NATO member yet a close cooperation between them for the sake of antiterrorist struggle is possible and has no alternatives. It could serve a basis for their cooperation as "NATO at Twenty."

The events of 11 September confirmed that international terrorism was not merely a sort of criminal activity but a policy, a continuation of political intercourse and war with other means. International terrorism was born by contemporary civilization that distributes world incomes in an unjust and disproportionate way and it has come to stay. The brazen challenge of the new barbarians should be punished, it should be rebuffed in a resolute way so that to prevent its spread across the world. At the same time it is clear that military force alone is not enough, it is important, but not all-important. It should be supported by other joint and very expensive measures in the social, economic, political, information, and other spheres that still have to be identified. No alliances and no efficient bombing will destroy the causes of terrorism: they will continue reproducing themselves since we are fighting the malady's external manifestations. We cannot avoid analyzing in depth the causes of terrorism. We should remedy the present situation in which 20 percent of the Earth's population lives in the rich countries and consumes 80 percent of the world's resources while the poor countries get nothing in exchange for their resources but polluting technologies and hazardous waste.

Obviously, the conflict between the North and the South, the rich (and strong) countries consuming the bulk of the world's resources and the poor (and weak) countries is the main contradiction of the 21st century. International security depends on the way this contradiction is resolved-the main role in it belongs to the rich countries. The United States, the richest country of the North, is the main and obvious target of attacks, international terrorism is of an anti-American nature. The terrorist acts in the United

States should be interpreted as a response of the poor South to the rich North. The gap between them has left vast areas, not merely individual countries, on the roadside. It is senseless and dangerous to bomb them as a source of “world evil:” ideology cannot be bombed out.

This means that the processes known as globalization will probably slow down. They should be reassessed in the light of the recent events. In any case these processes should integrate the interests of a larger number of states than they do now. From a limited idea that reflects the wishes of the rich countries globalization should develop into a genuinely global process the boons of which will be reaped by all, not only “chosen” countries and nations.

To step up antiterrorist struggle, we need: unified criteria of terrorism and its manifestations; closer antiterrorist legislations; unified methods of antiterrorist operations and negotiations with terrorists; regular conferences, seminars, and working meetings of specialists engaged in fighting terrorism; exchange of methods of approaching specific aspects of antiterrorist activity; mutual exchange of professors, lecturers, and specialists in the problems of terrorists; unified technologies for the mass media describing the relevant problems, etc.

It would be useful to work out stable principles of antiterrorist operations, to carefully regiment the way the media describes acts of terrorism, etc. To narrow down the leeway for the terrorists, the countries fighting them should bring closer the legal assessments of terrorist acts, unify as far as possible the methods of prevention of and stemming such acts, and cooperate more actively on a wider scale. Politicians, sociologists, psychologists, and the legal institutes should contribute to the efforts of settling this global problem that has many aspects.

So far, the modern methods of armed antiterrorist struggle proved inadequate. We need fundamentally new methods that will use intelligence and information means. Nuclear weapons are not adequate both militarily and politically. Even the US closest allies will not approve their use-this will send another anti-American wave around the world and undermine the non-proliferation process. One cannot but feel concerned with the recent revision of the US military doctrine that in fact does not rule out a possibility of using high-precision conventional and nuclear armaments under specific conditions. The United States has, in fact, lowered the nuclear threshold and made US military actions unpredictable.

Special services of different countries should receive a new cooperation impulse. We should always bear in mind, however, that the results of their maximally close cooperation are limited. They can heal symptoms of an illness and its effects rather than its long-neglected social, economic, and political causes.

This cooperation should rely on decisions of the countries’ leaders about the aims and tasks of their joint antiterrorist struggle. It is their task to clearly formulate the aims, trends, and forms of such cooperation, specify which forces and means can be used to address common tasks. The special services should cooperate within the framework of the decisions made by the leaders, such decisions and cooperation forms should be open to timely adjustments.

The special services should concentrate on early warning and prevention of terrorism-the best of the special armed operations against terrorists who have taken hostages is an evidence of missed opportunities to identify, localize, and liquidate the

menace at the stage of planning. The factors of terrorism as a phenomenon the special services should prevent, identify and stem belong to the sociopolitical and economic spheres outside the special services' direct influence: they have no access to them and no right to interfere lest they step beyond the sphere of their responsibility and violate the law. We should not expect the special services and the law-enforcement structures to resolve the problem of terrorism. What we need is broad cooperation between states that should include operational, special, and military measures and also political, ideological, social, economic, educational, propagandist, and other efforts.

In the present conditions information technologies and information struggle have become two key instruments of the fight against terrorism therefore the states should cooperate with the media. To liquidate terrorist bases and training camps, we should create a single planet-wide information space. The states on the territories of which such bases are found should be held responsible to the world community, preferably to the UN Security Council. The special services of the leading countries should pool their efforts to create a single data bank in this sphere.

Contemporary methods of warfare cannot defeat international terrorism. Even the United States with all its might will not wipe off terrorism single-handedly. We need a collective structure able to promptly destroy the seat of terrorism and terrorist bases without affecting civilians. Collective efforts are the only possible and the most effective response to terrorism yet we should say that the world community has not acquired adequate international antiterrorist instruments. Neither the UN, nor OSCE, nor even NATO, at least in their present form, can be regarded as adequate organizations.⁹ It might prove easier to improve the already existing international security structures than to set up new ones. Our recent experience has taught us that the existing international organizations, NATO included, are too bureaucratic and too inflexible to promptly respond to the unexpected challenges in this sphere. It seems that we need a fundamentally new flexible international mechanism the structure of which will help it respond to the terrorists' wide-scale and varied challenges. It is suggested that a supranational organization be created to unite all antiterrorist forces. It should include a command and control structure and structures designed to analyze information, carry out intelligence, exercise financial supervision, engage in propaganda, and apply force. The force structure should include well-trained and well-equipped antiterrorist rapid deployment units to be used in the areas of trouble. Naturally enough, this international structure should operate under the UN Security Council.

The antiterrorist center created by Russia, China, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, and Uzbekistan can serve a pattern for an efficient international structure. It can be also set up according to a different pattern. One thing is clear: Israel, the UK, and the US should be its members.

Its efficiency will depend on how straightforward the algorithm of its functioning will be and on a list of consistent measures designed to gradually build up a united antiterrorist structure and to fill it with a reliable specific content. Any attempt to speed up the process by issuing empty declarations about its broad functions may negatively affect the prospects of real and efficient antiterrorist cooperation. The problem calls for a balanced approach-this is confirmed by a wide range of opinions about the structure's functions supplied by representatives of different states. The most reasonable step would be to pool efforts step by step. We should start with information exchange, unified data

banks on individual aspects of antiterrorist activities, coordinated antiterrorist methods, and other measures. This will move us closer to more complicated and responsible cooperation forms: the already attained stages will show when to move further.

The events of 11 September questioned the role of international laws as a whole. We should form a clear idea about the correlation between the right and force. The role of laws, their moral authority, the moral prestige of all international organizations, including the UN, have been undermined by the well-known developments of the previous period, the US actions in Yugoslavia and Iraq, in the first place. Many became convinced that international laws are nothing more than a decoration with no force behind them. Today, law is sanctioned by the use of force. Those who have force can apply laws. This cannot be tolerated any longer: the developed countries should demonstrate that they respect international law. To do this, they should change themselves-time has come to realize that the world community of the 21st century is not a world with centers of power but a world of nations and cultures that respect each other. This world needs a new geopolitical ethics and new geopolitical morals based on international law.

Is no longer sufficient to adequately respond to crises and conflicts. Time has come to manage them together and to rely on their prevention. This means that in the long-term perspective people should be educated in the spirit of the culture of peace and tolerance and the need for a dialogue among nations. Finally, we need a fresh approach to the old values, we should revive the ideas of Justice, Equality, and Fraternity, we have to revise in the spirit of humanism such ideas as “the market,” “freedom,” “well-being,” “self-expression”, and other liberal concepts. We shall have to wage a hard battle for the “hearts and minds” by promoting values, ideals, and ideas. This presupposes a dialogue among millions of people that will mutually enrich cultures and civilizations.

It seems that the destruction of the international terrorist terrain which was Afghanistan under the Taleban is a necessary yet the very first stage of the worldwide antiterrorist struggle. It seems that together with it we should carry out the second stage. By this I mean an alliance with all constructively minded forces in the Islamic world. Together we should destroy the entire infrastructure (its military and financial elements in the first place) of the Islamic “International” that has nothing to do with Islam. We should prevent further radicalization of the Muslims by inviting them to cooperate with us on an equal basis.

Granted political will, the developed and rich countries are able to set up a structure of international relations in which every country and every nation could reach prosperity, an adequate standard of living and self-expression. We need a clear program of the changes needed to alter the present world order and the entire philosophy of international relations. Russia can and should contribute to the process the result of which will be a more just and humane world order.

NOTES

1. Many military experts believe that the declared aims in Afghanistan have not yet been attained. The Taliban was not destroyed but simply deprived of power; the new government does not control the entire territory; weakened Al-Qaeda is still alive and is regrouping. Bin Laden is still free. A complete victory in Afghanistan is not visible while liquidation of the international terrorist network is nowhere in sight.
2. Classical terrorism presupposes two stages: first, sowing fear and then insisting on fulfilling certain demands. The terrorist acts of 11 September contained one stage only.
3. In the latter case terrorists would have aimed at the most sensitive and vulnerable points of the large cities' modern basic infrastructure. Such attempts would have not required suicide acts. It seems that the terrorists preferred to strike at the buildings that symbolized America's financial, political and military might rather than at nuclear power stations or chemical plants.
4. Early in the 1960s three-quarters of the world's population had been living in permanent poverty and did not complain: they simply had no idea how people lived in wealthy countries. The information revolution has changed the situation at a fast pace: television awakened people to the wealth of other countries and revealed how wide was the gap between them and the industrially developed states.
5. The United States spends \$30 million a day, or \$1 billion a month, to fight terrorism. The Administration insists that the military budget should be increased by \$48 billion, \$29 billion of which will be used to fight terrorists. Tighter security at home will require more money-the expenses will reach \$39 billion.
6. Twice as many lives were lost on 11 September as in 1941 when Japan had attacked the US Navy. The American economy lost about \$150 million, or 1.5 percent of GDP. For the first time in its history the blow was delivered at the American territory. One hour claimed more civilian lives than 150 wars the United States had waged in the past.
7. It seems that NATO will become, at best, an instrument of the global policy: Washington is obviously inclined to unilateral decision-making. After 11 September NATO was ignored as a political and military organization. NATO Secretary-General Robertson, Schroeder, Blair, and Chirac were hanging around the White House doorway in a hope to be invited to join the operation. They were offered auxiliary actions on the periphery of the theater of war.
8. On 10 November 2001, in an interview to the chief editors of the leading US media's Moscow bureau President Putin pointed out: "The worst mistake we can make is to try to isolate any country from the rest of the world. I mean any country including those that you have mentioned [Iraq, Iran, and North Korea. - Ed.]. We maintain relations, different relations, with all of them. These relations are absolutely transparent. We have nothing to hide. What is more we maintain relations with our partners in other countries of the world, including the United States. You know this."
9. This is confirmed by the fact that Washington intends to ensure its own security by setting up an antimissile system. The NATO allies will have to look after themselves. I can even suggest that the tragedy of 11 September will spell a tragedy for NATO and mark a beginning of its end.