A.I. Wladimirov
major-general, retd.

The 21st century, the world, Russia and my son Sasha

After the euphoria and stormy democratic sentiments brought about by the disintegration of the USSR and the consequent powerful geopolitical changes in the countries of the former USSR, Central and Eastern Europe towards democracy and civilization, public opinion and especially political leaders of the West and the East are now experiencing soberness, disillusionment and suppression caused by the results of these changes and the scale of ensuing problems. In our view, in Europe and America, Japan and Russia we can see now a clear-cut conceptional deadlock. It was formed not only as a result of this geopolitical change but because the former models of development of these countries and our civilization as a whole have exhausted their resources and despite all their diversity cannot be somewhat effective in new conditions. This global conceptional crisis and hence the necessity of changing the models of existence and development is being felt at least in four spheres: in *ecology*, in *economy*, in *problems of demography and national-ethnic relations*, and in *general politics and security*.

Alexander Iwanowitsj Wladimirov is in 1945 te Moskou geboren en op 20-jarige leeftijd in dienst getreden. Hij volgde opleidingen aan de Militaire Soeworov School en de Hogere Militaire Commandoschool te Moskou, de Froenze-Academie en de Generale-Stafacademie. Vervulde commandofuncties in het Verre Oosten, de DDR en in Vietnam. Op 41-jarige leeftijd werd hij benoemd tot generaal-majoor. In 1992 ging hij met groot verlof en was vervolgens militair adviseur van de Opperste Sovjet van de Russische Federatie. Momenteel is hij president van de Onafhankelijke Associatie van Militaire Experts en hoofdanalyticus van de Administratie van de President van de Russische Federatie op het gebied van sociaal-economische problemen van de strijdkrachten van de Russische Federatie. Genm Wladimirov is toonaangevend specialist op het gebied van nucleaire en wereldveiligheid, auteur van vele wetenschappelijke werken op het gebied van militaire politiek en hervormingen van Rusland.

What are the basic dangers threatening humankind in the 21st century and what, in our view, should be done?

In ecology

This is the irresistable 'green house effect' caused and daily aggravated by the impending ecological crisis. Experts forecast that already in 40 to 50 years' time there will be disastrous climatic changes endangering the survival of civilization. These changes are a result of the universal global and ever accelerating contamination of the environment and the energy-crisis which is due mainly to the growing consumption of organic fuel substances. The existence of humankind is ever more dependent on the sources of energy but the era of cheap and suitable sources which ensured the emergence and development of modern civilization is coming to a close.

According to scientists of different countries, proven oil resources will be enough for humankind only for the next 50 to 60 years, gas resources for another 60 to 70 years, and nuclear materials for the next 100 years. This means that the value of deposits will be on a drastic and constant increase, prices for energy-producing fuel will grow from five to ten times by 2020, and there will be problems related to oil and gas supplies for industrialized countries which have expended about one-third of their potential reserves (Russia and the countries of the former USSR have expended only one-tenth), and wider use will be made of such more ecologically harmful fuels as coal, heavy oil and bituminous shales. In its turn, all this will drastically aggravate the ecological situation and enhance the risk of a climatic disaster because of global warming-up as a result of 'green house effect'. The accumulation of anthropogenic admixtures in the atmosphere also leads to a temperature growth be-

cause of their absorption of the earth's heat irradiation. More than half of this growth is caused by the unremovable discharge of tens of billions of tons of carbon dioxide a year into the atmosphere due to the use of deposit fuels. The growing energy production by traditional methods ('extracted and burnt') can during the next 40 to 50 years raise the average annual temperature by 1,5 to 4,5 °C and in the areas near the Pole by 10 °C. The earth's climate will change drastically. The rapid warming will bring about some global catastrophic phenomena: the flooding of densely-populated shores of oceans, the drainage of basic farm areas, the spread of tropical diseases to the north, to mention but a few. Because of the growing weather instability local disasters: downpours, droughts and hurricanes will become more frequent.

The way out of this situation is quite clear. It is necessary to take radical steps and switch over world energy production to alternative sources, mainly to the consumption of solar energy brought about to the earth from outer space. Unfortunately, the estimates of the scale, consequences and time lengths of a climatic disaster have not been elaborated quite sufficiently and world public opinion is quite sceptic about them and this problem itself considering it to be very abstract and meant for a far future. There is no awareness of the inevitability of the radical solution of this problem for the survival of civilization either in public consciousness or in the decisions and actions of governments of different countries. Public attention is concentrated, above all, on political measures such as agreements on nuclear arms reduction, agreements on the limitation of production and discharge of substances which destroy the ozone layer and the like, which are undoubtedly important but are a makeshift for the problem under review. Because in dozens of years humankind will produce 80 to 90% of energy by burning annually billions of tons of deposit fuel, the 'green house effect'-problem cannot be solved by these means only. In addition, from the very beginning a radical solution of this problem calls for tremendous investments to the tune of tens or hundreds of billions of dollars, which is a complicated task for developed countries and an insurmountable barrier for the developing countries whose role in the overheating of the atmosphere will be decisive.

A resultant delay in active counteraction to the 'green house effect' can be fatal. According to many researchers, unless radical actions are taken in the next 10 years a disaster will become inevitable. Its consequences can surpass the consequences of a world nuclear war. Therefore, in order to survive, humankind should determine already now the priorities of tackling this task which in itself can and must become a program bringing together the formation of a new model of the existence of our civilization.

In the economy and policy of economic co-operation

It is practically impossible now to find a country or region which can be traditionally referred to 'developed countries' which, according to the statements of their government leaders, would be quite well-to-do. Each of the great economic powers has a complex of its own economic difficulties linked up to a certain conceptional deadlock of the models of development which are available or have been adopted in them.

For Japan, the USA and Western Europe this is felt, first and foremost, in the anxiety of their leaders over a slowdown of the rates of enrichment which is awful not in itself but for the predominant public psychology of the population of these countries because the (existing) emergent crisis of overproduction does not threaten as yet the impoverishment of the population but grows into a fierce but still peaceful struggle for commodity markets and the switchover of attention on their own problems of internal development.

For the countries of Eastern Europe and primarily for the countries of the former 'socialist camp' the economyic crises is characterized by the lack of funds for the modernization of their economies, the practical curtailing of integration economic ties with the countries of the former USSR and the still unsuccessful attempts of getting integrated into the Common Market. Even for such an economic giant as Germany the search of funds for the modernization of eastern lands represents a serious problem.

The countries of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) and Russia are confronted with fundamentally other problems. Characteristic of them is a common heavy economic crisis aggravated by the general political instability and the insufficiently detailed elaboration of the conceptional fundamentals of state arrangement and economic

programs. The main task for them now is to survive and carry out a political and economic modernization.

Practically all of the above-mentioned countries and regions are characterized by a stoppage of integration processes, obsession with internal problems, and the search of answers to the questions 'what is better: to deepen or to expand?' and for Russia 'how to survive?'. The answer to this question if of fundamental importance because it will have to determine the place of the given region or country in world economy, its competition capacity and consequently its place in the world politics of the 21st century. Of fundamental importance, in our view, is also the fact that both the countries of Eastern Europe and CIS-states and Russia see the main strategic direction of the way out of the crisis in the assistance of the West by getting Western capital, equipment, experience and technologies without having or offering almost nothing which could become the basis of such co-operation except an immense commodity market capable of devouring everything without any serious positive domestic changes. This situation is all the more strange because all these countries have similar problems, similar interests and economic ties which were not bad some time ago. A reasonable option of uniting on this basis for joint actions to get out of the crisis is being suppressed now by the competition, ambitions and struggle for power on the part of leading elites and the lack of conceptional foundations of the activity of these countries. Though it becomes quite clear that the 'West' has neither funds nor even a serious desire to get involved actively and responsibly in the process of modernisation of entire 'post-socialist' space. The awareness of this need is awakening only now. Therefore, as there are no chances for a massive assistance of the West, it is necessary to change the strategy and elaborate development models oriented mainly to one's own forces and a new integration of the 'old' economic space. Consequently, the countries of Central Europe, the CIS and Russia are confronted with the problem of choosing priorities which are, to put it mildly, not compatible always and in everything. This is either the implementation of modernization on the basis of integration and everything concomitant with this way or the bad infinity of curtailing reforms by means of their nationalization. Since these alternative ways embody opposite types of political and economic culture and presuppose alternative solutions, without acquiring conceptional certainty at the level of a country (Russia, CIS, Europe) and a definite choice of an integration way Russia and the Commonwealth have no future. Closely linked to this problem is also the problem of political and economic development of the regions of Russia itself as a vast multinational country which has a long-standing regional division of labour and market.

In demography and national-ethnic problems

A demographic explosion which is taking place in the countries of Africa, Asia and Latin-America poses already now a real danger for our civilization as a whole and for the stability of these and neighbouring regions and countries. At the same time it is of little probability to prevent or reasonably regulate this process. A direct danger lies in the fact that:

- stable parasitic sentiments are arising in some countries and whole regions which make direct demands to the 'rich North' that it must feed, serve and develop them. The humanitarian assistance provided to these countries is regarded by their leaders and population as an obligatory duty of developed countries and becomes an object of political speculations and the direct struggle of mafia structures and local national elites. Local resources are not being developed, and everything available and that is brought is being spent without improving the situation as a whole;

- the emergence of great numbers of unemployed, illiterate and poor population and the lack of reasonable and competent leaders capable of and having the possibilities of implementing large reforms and national programmes aimed at settling the existing situation in their countries inevitably push the population of these countries and regions to irresponsibility and the search of the way out in nationalism, extreme fundamentalist religions, extremism and war. Taking into account the mentality of local elites, their ambitious stand, and the drive for armaments, military technologies and direct attempts to have their own nuclear weapons, all this is more than dangerous. Humankind cannot ignore the threat of a demographic growth of relative stability into chaos;

• one of the aspects which aggravate the situation is the wave of 'new' nationalism initiated by the present-day geopolitical changes and the elimination of the world's political bipolarity. This 'new' nationalism has become manifest with the disintegration of conglomerate countries of 'socialist' federations (the USSR, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia) accompanied with armed conflicts. Russia is also at the stage of threatening disintegration. Analysis of disintegration processes shows that they all have a quite similar scenario. The political struggle for national self-consciousness and national self-determination by legitimate means leads to the power of leaders who set as their aim the acquisition of first national and then state independence by the given nation, country and region. As a rule, the central authorities do not react adequately to this danger.

The first stage of the disintegration drama leads to the failure to comply with the laws of the former central authorities, the emergence of national governments and parliaments, the replacement of all former power structures by new national legitimate and non-legitimate bodies, and the adoption of national constitutions and laws. Then the term 'indigenous nationality' appears and the process of ousting the non-indigenous population first from bodies of power and then from homes, lands, territories is initiated (for example, in Estonia and Latvia this process is being put into effect by quite legitimate and constitutional methods). This is already the beginning of genocide and the full disintegration of a conglomerate country. This immediately brings about the disintegration of international political and economic ties, which, in its turn, leads to the paralysis of the economy and the impoverishment of the population. The cause of the crisis is always explained by the intrigues of external and internal enemies. At this stage the international community does not react to this situation at all or reacts to it passively and indefinitely.

At the second stage there is a change in the status of internal borders, and there appear customs and one's own armed groups. Genocide against the non-indigenous population develops into the national policy, and mass migration, riots and armed conflicts begin. The international community begins to seek convulsively the ways out of the crisis but the 'process has already started' and the situation is not controlled by anyone and anything. Everyone is paralysed by panic and cannot do anything.

At the third stage demands are made to redraw external frontiers, including those incorporated in the system of peaceful international treaties. This is, certainly, the main threat to peaceful coexistence but the world community is not ready either to rebuff this danger.

It is quite apparent that whereas in Czechoslovakia the 'divorce process' went on peacefully and did not call for serious external efforts, in Yugoslavia the world community has found itself in a deadlock.

In case of the disintegration of Russia the world community runs the risk of finding itself not in a deadlock but in a profound crisis with quite predicable catastrophic consequences. As we see it, the lack of a conceptional model of the development of civilization as a whole and the failure on the part of public opinion and political leaders of the West who are and are living now in the atmosphere of the already achieved comfort and security to understand the inevitability of drawing their countries into this awful spiral and the inevitability of adopting unpopular decisions entailing large expenditures do not leave a trace of optimism and even a chance for stability and prosperity for all of us.

On the whole, the achievement by the countries of Eastern Europe and the CIS of their main strategic task, that is, the implementation of social and economic modernization, is impossible by merely economic methods without solving democratization problems and rethinking the nationalities question. In the CIS-countries and Russia itself the nationalities questions is present in the following forms.

- As liberation from 'Soviet' and 'Russian' dominance, as the basis for winning 'real' national independence.
- As awareness by a nation of its readiness for political and economic modernization.
- Renunciation of national sovereignty, and as conditions for democratization and integration within the CIS and Russia.
- The equality of nations as a guarantee for the democratic set-up of a multinational country.
- The nationalities question as a problem of state set-up and the acquisition of new federalism by Russia.
- As a territorial problem (the problem of frontiers).

- As a problem of the balance of rights and duties of national and ethnic minorities within a multinational country.
- As the problem of choice between national and nationalistic integration.
- As a problem of struggle for power and influence between new national elites.

Undoubtedly, a reasonable solution of the entire package of national problems, for instance, in Russia depends, first and foremost, on cautious, persistent and well-defined actions by all State structures in relation to the pursuance of Russia's national and domestic policy. These actions are still to be elaborated. The lack of well-defined priorities and persistent actions in these spheres is the main barrier on the way of Russia's way out of the political crisis. In our opinion, the main direction of overcoming by Russia this crisis is its adopting the model of the federation of territories (lands, gubernias) as the main model of its State structure in stead of the existing conglomerate federation of national autonomies and Russian territories. The chief barrier on the way to switching over to such a model of federation at the present time is opposition to this idea on the part of the already existing bodies of representative power (the power of Soviets) both in the autonomies and territories (regions and areas) of Russia itself. Therefore, without changing the power system of Soviets and switching over to the municipal structures of administering state affairs locally, Russia will never solve either its national or economic problems and, on the whole, will not be able to accomplish its strategic task related to the social and economic modernization of the country, that is, will be doomed to failure of democratic reforms with all ensuing consequences for itself and the entire world.

In the sphere of general policy and security

The assertion that after the disintegration of the USSR and the Warsaw Treaty the world has become more dangerous has become already a political axiom. An axiom is also the fact that the danger of a global military, all the more so, nuclear conflict is becoming, in the main, speculative.

As we see it, the main challenges to the security of civilization in the sphere of politics and military problems are linked up, first and foremost, with the fact that the security system which was established for solving cold war problems and consisted of the opposining military-political blocs (NATO and WTO) collapsed so suddenly and rapidly that this created a situation under which the predictability of the consequences of this change has merely disappeared. There appeared the situation of a deadlock both in the sphere of the security of Europe and the world as a whole. The disintegration of the Warsaw Treaty and the USSR has led to a situation when many countries of Eastern Europe, Asia and Africa which were in the sphere of their influence are not controlled now by anyone. It is hardly to predict their policy in the sphere of security. Thus, for example, the countries which have been formed on the expanses of the former USSR are only seeking the form of their statehood, do not have precisely formulated concepts of their policy in the sphere of military security, and are building their own national armed forces on the basis of troop contingents and hardware which they have got from the former Soviet Army. Even such a military giant as Russia does not have a precisely defined new state frontier and its own military doctrine which corresponds to political realities. What about Russia itself? What is its security? What is its influence on the security of the CIS and the world as a whole? Certainly, there is still a lot of problems which are of concern for the world community but the destiny of Russia can also determine to a large extent the destiny of the world, and everybody understands this. I shall deal only with the military aspect of the problem.
Russia did not have its own Armed Forces since the formation of the USSR, that is, since 1921. Therefore, after the disintegration of the USSR in 1991 and the winning by Russia of its own statehood, only in the summer of 1992 the formation of the Armed Forces of the Russian Federation was declared. At the same time Russia gave status to its armed forces only after the national Armies were formed in the Ukraine and Byelorussia. Looking briefly at the history of the confrontation of NATO and the WTO, I must say that before 1989 the Soviet military doctrine provided for the following scenario in case a war breaks out in Europe: by a strike of the troops of the fronts of the first strategic echelon (units of Soviet troops in Poland, the GDR, Czechoslovakia, Hungary and the national armies of these countries) along several strategic lines to inflict a defeat on the troops of NATO in Europe

and during the 15 to 20 days of the operation to practically put the FRG out of the war and reach the borders of France and Spain. In case of need the troops of the second strategic echelon would enter combat actions. These troops would develop the strategic success and, if needed, would carry out operations to reach the Channel and the Atlantic Ocean. The second strategic echelon would consist of the units of forces in the Baltic area, in the Ukraine, Byelorussia, Moldavia, etc. The internal military areas of Russia itself such as the Moscow, Volga area, the Ural, and Siberia military areas would play the role of preparing strategic mobilization reserves. Taking these designs into account, appropriate units of forces of the WTO and the USSR in peace time would be built, manned, armed and trained. Fortunately, these designs were not and will never be materialized any longer. But precisely for this reason when the WTO and the USSR disintegrated and Russia won its sovereignty there arose a situation when the most efficient, well-manned troops fitted out with the latest in combat equipment found themselves outside Russia itself. Chief bases and storehouses, command points, communication centers, airfields, and main ports in the Black and Baltic Seas have also found themselves outside Russia. All earlier elaborated operational and mobilization plans have proved unnecessary. The contingent of draftees has been reduced drastically. The strategic nuclear forces were divided into four parts, and the bulk of the most modern strategic missiles stationed on the territory of the Ukraine and part of the Black Sea Navy fell under its juridiction. There was the need of relocating huge amounts of combat equipment and personnel from Germany, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary and the Baltic countries to the territory of Russia where there were no adequate barracks for soldiers and homes for officers and their families. It was necessary to practically create anew the system of command and material and technical supply of troops and work out new operational plans. In addition, there was no legal legislation foundation for the functioning of Russia's Armed Forces which suddenly found themselves on the territories of practically all independent countries of the Baltic area and the CIS, and in a state of economic, functional and legal uncertainty. Despite these tremendous difficulties, at the present time all these problems are being solved more or less successfully. Unfortunately, two most important problems are being solved now with a great difficulty. This is the construction of houses for the troops which are being withdrawn and reduced, and work on a new military doctrine of Russia. The lack of housing for officers and their families increases the destabilizing potential in Russia's political life, which in itself is dangerous for the course of democratic transformations pursued by the President of Russia. The lack of Russia's military doctrine (or fundamentals of Russia's military policy) does not allow to give a definite answer to the question: which army is needed by Russia and for the achievement of what tasks? And this, in its turn, does not allow to determine the scale and the amount of requisite military equipment for supplying the army, which, in its turn, makes it impossible to carry out a reasonable conversion of the military industrial complex and does not allow to demilitarize the economy and even the public consciousness of Russia.

The situation of military-political instability is being aggravated by the newly emergent territorial claims, the nuclear ambitions of the Ukraine and Kazakhstan, and the emergence of a lot of armed non-State and pseudo-State units which fulfill the tasks of new national elites. All this results in the impossibility of carrying out conversion, in weaker law and order, growing terrorism, the reign of crime and, in the final analysis, in the full moral degradation of society and general military-political destabilization.

On the other hand, this full military-political disintegration is not opposed any longer by anything. NATO and the West European Union, which were established to provide security for their members against the other bloc, have fully lost their functions. For the purposes for which they were set up they are not needed any longer and for the purposes for which they could be used in the existing form they do not fit. What we have is the same conceptional deadlock (maybe with another sign). There appeared the situation when the countries of the Warsaw Treaty and even the CIS are threatening mainly the security of each other and only indirectly West Europe. It should be noted that most often the public opinion of the West is concerned over the dangers stemming from a possible inflow of refugees from the East and the drain of nuclear technologies to the Third World countries and in reality these dangers are not most important. The

main danger is being posed by 'new nationalism' which leads to civil wars and the revision of borders, the irresponsibility of the leaders of new elites, the growing military potential and the ambitions of the 'poor' South. In these conditions the West does not know what to do and does not a possibility for radically countering these new threats. The way out of this deadlock for NATO, the West European Union and Europe as a whole, in our view, is only one: these structures must have as their basic function peace-making actions in military conflicts threatening universal security on the basis of the concept of preventive diplomacy, and building and maintaining peace. For this they need another status, a new political mandate (for example, as a structure of the UN Security Council) and the readiness of the public opinion of the member-countries to understand and favourably consider this new mission. But even if all this is achieved the West alone will not have enough vigour and possibilities to be everywhere at the same time and be the world policeman and fireman. There is a way out of this situation. In our opinion, the manifest desire of some countries of East Europe and the CIS to ensure their national security and their attempts to enter NATO in this or another capacity and use the mechanisms of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe and the United Nations are undoubtedly understandable but not productive. They are unproductive not only because NATO itself has not determined its future as yet and quite justifiably does not want to enlarge the number of its members but also because neither NATO nor the UN are in a position to find out which is taking place now on the expanses of the 'former USSR' and what can be their role, tasks and specific actions. This means that we ourselves are obliged to and must understand everything that is happening in the CIS. But we shall be able to understand this and do something real only when the CIS functions as a capable entity. And this, in its turn, presupposes the adoption by the CIS-members of a Constituent Charter and the formation of CIS leading coordination bodies which have a supranational status. In other words, the present-day amorphous state of the Commonwealth must develop, for instance, into a stable form of the UN regional subsystem which would function according to the UN principles and presupposes the need of setting up, besides other bodies, the Council and the System of collective security which must take upon themselves the solution of the problems of regional security and peacemaking on the expanses of the CIS. There is no doubt that various countries of the CIS are different in their speed in understanding the need of such a step and many of them still have a strong syndrome of fear in relation to 'Russia's imperialism'. Nevertheless, a tendency towards such integration is evident and it has the future. Already now practically all sober-minded politicians and governments of the CIS Member-States see in the economic and military integration the main way out of the crisis and the directions of the socio-economic modernization of their countries.

The question may arise: is it that a new Warsaw Treaty is being revived again? Is it that there will be a new confrontation of military-political blocs? Is it that there will be a new twist of cold war? We shall put it directly: the danger of relapses in the past exists but only in case if NATO will confine itself only to its regional security, while the CIS Security Council will limit itself to its own security. As we see it, all collisions can be removed if NATO and the System of Collective Security of the CIS will be integrated into a single system of Euro-Asian security and will be guided by a co-ordinated (single) doctrine of direct co-operation and the co-ordination of efforts in the sphere of security under the aegis of the United Nations. In future it is possible to establish also an Asian-Pacific security system. The participation of the great nuclear powers-allies, the USA and Russia, in these systems as guarantors of security and co-operation will lead to the emergence on huge Euro-Asian-Pacific expanses of a real space of security whose role and importance for the future world it is impossible to overestimate. It seems to us that such a model of global security can counter any potential threats and challenges, and can become the foundation for a new world order.

It goes without saying that in present-day conditions it is necessary to improve the structures and the peacemaking mechanism of the United Nations. In our view, the United Nations should not only initiate peacemaking initiatives and try to settle emerging conflicts but also facilitate the elaboration and implementation of a new concept of security. There is the need to improve the legislative basis and the status of peacemaking forces, to be active in sup-

port for Russia and other CIS States in forming national peacekeeping forces, setting up an effective International Tribunal, and determining the status, powers and mechanism of implementing its decisions. In our view, a very important new nuance in the activities of the United Nations and the governments of developed countries must be the co-ordination of all treaties and decisions concerning disarmament, the reduction and destruction of nuclear armaments with the simultaneous elaboration of the world's ecological programmes and participation in them.

There is no doubt that on the way to a new world order tremendous difficulties are in store for us but, as we see it, civilization as a whole, Europe, Russia and the like have no other alternative and we should advance in the 21st century only together, uniting and intensifying by common efforts our peacemaking potential.

Conclusions

A natural question arises: if everything is so bad, what shall be done to make things well?

A scrupulous and systematic analysis of the situation gives the right, however, to the existence of an optimistic view of the possibilities of the way out of the existing crisis.

In our view, the first and fundamentally important step along this way must be the elaboration and formulation of conceptional foundations and the model of the vital activity and functioning of our civilization as a whole. Undoubtedly, the question: for what purpose do we live? is as old as the world and the answer to it was formulated long ago: we live in order to live, to give life to our children and ensure favourable conditions of their life, development and prosperity not only now but in future as well. What is new is the formulation of this objective as the main idea of the functioning of civilization which becomes aware of itself as an alliance and common entity called upon to put these objectives into effect and become their responsible performer. Therefore, if the objective of civilization is a Human Being himself and his future, it means that my son Sasha (he will turn one year) as the personification of the future of civilization is that main object and subject of the activities and functioning of a family, country and civilization as a whole.

What have we, people of our generation, achieved? What shall we leave our children? The main achievement is that we did not blow up the world! This is both much and little. If my son enters life and lives in peace and security, this will be wonderful, but how will he keep his body and soul together and on what resources can he rely? Now in the world development two alternative tendencies are manifest: the first of them is an attempt to sit over till better times in 'one's own entrenchment' and solve exclusively national or regional problems at the best; the second one is the gradual awareness of the need of an organic unity and integration on the scale of civilization as a whole. The formation of a single (compatible) system of ecological, economic, political co-operation and security which would given an effective solution of both regional and specific problems of countries and the solution of general issues of international co-operation, survival and development. It is evident that if the first tendency leads to nothing but versions of the 'iron curtain' and an impasse of civilization, the second one can have the broadest range of possibilities and stages of its development. I remember well the statement made by Manfred Wörner, NATO General Secretary, to the effect that 'Yalta is dead'. Yes, Yalta is dead. The old world order has collapsed but what is the new world order like? All of us are still to answer this question and we do not have much time for the search of this answer.

Therefore, we all are faced with the choice of what way to follow. It seems to me that the main task of our generation now is to lay political and legal foundations, as well as provide economic groundwork for a reasonable future, its foundation, and to make the process of advancement to the reason irreversible. The task of my son Sasha and his generation, basing themselves on the foundation laid by us, is to lead our civilization out of the collapse and create their potential of Reason and other development for their sons and our grandchildren.

The author of this work is modest in his belief that the ideas he has expressed here can become a foundation for an international discussion on the problems which were raised, and a basis for serious development efforts and solutions to be made by the world community, which, in the final analysis, will give us a new impetus and optimism before we enter the 21st century.