

**Sergei Markov**  
**Director of Institute for Political Studies, Moscow**

Thank you chairman, than you initiator, organizers. I will of course be speaking Russian. Dear colleagues, it is no longer enough to say that the world has changed after September 11<sup>th</sup>. Even a blind man can see that the world has changed. Historically speaking it changed mainly after the bipolar system fell apart and a new system emerged. The role of international institutions has also changed. In this regard it would be reasonable to portray this new role that international institutions now play.

Let's start with NATO. Its primary objective used to be the protection of Europe from Soviet tank armies and such. Is this necessary now? No, it is not. The second role, I would call it geopolitical, was formulated by cynical politicians back in the 40s, it sounded like this: to keep the Russians out of Europe, the United States in and Germany down, so that it wouldn't, god forbid, start a third world war. Has the situation changed? I would say that not entirely. The Europeans and the Americans are both still interested in maintaining US presence on the continent, though the necessity to keep Russia out of Europe is obviously gone. The question regarding Germany should be the topic of other discussions, but since the potential of Germany is large and perhaps the largest in Europe, it is able to break up the European security system. It seems that it is the task of the weak to find by any means possible a strong leader. So in this regard NATO is still useful. Its' third role is that it served as a stability block in the bipolar system of the Cold War era. The two blocks, the Warsaw Pact and NATO, stabilized the world system. Sometimes they got involved in conflicts, such as wars in Vietnam and Korea, but these conflicts in a way also helped stabilize the system. Has the situation changed in this regard? On one hand it has: the bipolar stability no longer exists, on the other, as you know colleagues, there is such a term in science called "institutional inertia", meaning that, in our case, the organization that has won, cannot disappear. Its large bureaucracy remains. And it cannot be taken apart by inner forces. Only a powerful external force can do the job. But no such force exists today. So this is another reason why NATO will cease to exist in the future. There is only one thing left: to find it a good/worthy job that it could occupy itself with.

Now a few words on how the role of international institutions in general has changed. To me it seems that the logic here is the following... am I speaking too fast for you to translate? No? Ok. So as I was saying, the main role of international institutions during the Cold War was not to let regional conflicts develop into a global thermonuclear war. The main prevention tool here was the Security Council, in which each member had a veto right. This veto right was only a juridical formality as it was obvious, that the USSR, Great Britain, France and China held the "de facto" veto right: they could hit anyone with their nuclear muscle. And the outcome would be catastrophic. So the international community decided to create the Security Council in the UN where each member would have a juridical veto right. Today this type of nuclear threat no longer stands. So in a way the Security Council is no longer needed, well, the veto right anyway.

To my mind each international organization should find its place in the new world political system and start playing a new role. It seems to me that they are eventually

taking and accepting these new roles, though perhaps at this stage unconsciously. The institutions are taking up more and more of a problem-solving role instead of their previous one: to paralyze the actions of opposing blocks. Humankind now faces many problems, which in order to be resolved demand the cooperation of these institutions. But what are these problems? What are the decisions that should be made? What are the strategic goals? Since there is no clear understanding of these goals, the organizations are blind in their activities on the international arena. So, why are these goals not clearly set? There are several reasons for this: first, political and social sciences are in disorder. Obviously the communist theory has lost its role, as well as the anticommunist theory, meaning sovietology, which failed not only to predict the fall of the Soviet Union but even to describe it properly. The conception of transitology is also not well developed. So at this point it is hard to grasp these goals, as not enough money is being invested into social sciences. There are also moral causes for such a lack of goals: our civilization is in a moral crisis, and this ideology of political correctness, when a pervert is defined as someone with non-orthodox biological needs, as you understand, is a barrier to setting such goals.

Aesthetically speaking the same problem exists. As you know the dominating conception here is postmodernism, with its main principle, as Dostoevsky put it: everything is allowed. So if you ask me: where is this chaos of values, of ideology coming from? Partly from the absence of strong leadership. This is understandable. In the past, leaders got used to living under nuclear deterrence, a system shaped in the 40s and 50s. In the years following nothing changed and the leaders were living in a static environment. Their only task was to uphold it. Then, all of a sudden, a freebie era began for the western leaders. The Soviet Union was gone and they could do whatever they wanted. They faced no serious challenges. Now there is such a challenge. So new leaders must emerge. The most likely to fit this role are Putin, Bush and Bin Laden. These leaders will have each their own proposals for the world. I have expressed this idea before: if Putin and Bush don't come to an agreement, then another, meaning Bin Laden will seize leadership.

Now let's look at this from another perspective. As Marxism taught us: the main trend in the world political process shapes the main contradictions of the modern era, meaning the contradictions of the global market that is being formed. Not everyone is a part of this market. Though it controls almost all of the world's resources. Along with this trend, a global information network and a common cultural environment are formed. It is not out of the ordinary that the same music will be playing at discotheques in Shanghai, Buenos Aires, Moscow, New York, Los Angeles, Paris and their movie theatres will be showing the same movies. In such circumstances a global decision making or "governing" body is formed. At its first stages this "government" is a network of institutions, the main decision-makers on the international arena. Today, for example the World Bank and the IMF make decisions, which concern everyone. NATO also makes decisions, which concern everyone, such as the deployment of troops in Yugoslavia. NATO is a key element in this "government". It is possible to say that a global "federative empire" is emerging. And to our "empire" thinkers in Russia I could say: don't dream about building an empire as the soviet one was, but begin to take part in forming a global empire that is only for now under American leadership. So, to conclude, NATO will play an important

role in the future, because it occupies its niche on the world political scene and this niche will not disappear.

Now a few words on world terrorism. To my mind, world terrorism and political Islam are kind of an analogue of socialism of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. And the demands of antiglobalists and of terrorists are similar to those of socialists in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. They all demand equality in resource distribution. However there is another aspect. With the expansion of the cosmopolitan culture the national cultures form a wave of resistance. Therefore I think that this "new socialism" should be dealt with as the old one. Meaning suppression of radical forms and at the same time various programs of its adaptation to our society. May I remind you that the socialist demands for the right of strikes had seemed unreal. A capitalist would say to the workers: "I bought all of the machinery with my own money. You say that the money I pay you is not sufficient, and I say that you can always go and find another job if you want to, no one is holding you here. But then you seize my machinery." Such actions by the workers were perceived as savage-like and unacceptable. But later the right for strikes had been accepted. What is now perceived as impossible: the freedom of movement without visas from third world countries to developed ones, will actually once become reality, under the pressure of terrorists and so on.

Now I would like to say a few words on NATO and give some specific proposals. To my mind NATO will start to undergo serious change.

There are several reasons for this. First, since the fifth chapter is no longer so important, as well as the nuclear weapons aren't so important, the organization will develop into solely a political body, like the newly created "twenty" is solely a political structure. Speaking of this "twenty", it should be joined by other countries, such as Ukraine, and others. It will be a body that makes decisions on the use of force. Though I think that it will develop according to what they call the law of Parkinson, which states that an organization works well if it consists of up to 15 members. Then, eventually others want to join, and it is difficult to refuse, so they join. So the meeting sessions become long and boring and there are strange speeches made by people who have already forgotten what country they represent and what the capitol of that country is. In such a situation the most influential ones (representatives of US, Great Britain, France, Germany, Russia and others) get together apart from the rest, say for example at lunch, and decide on all the important issues. The same will happen to NATO. Secondly, NATO is an organization, which makes decisions on the use of force to maintain the world order and maintain its zone of responsibility, which will now extend to include the entire world.

Thirdly, the main opponent of NATO today is its bureaucracy. It is still living by the rules of the cold war, and still thinks that Russia is its main opponent. They're still paying attention to what types of pass-cards to give to Russian generals in Brussels. Therefore I think that there should be a shift of power within NATO itself, from the bureaucracy to the leaders of nations-NATO members, accountable to their voters. Because only these leaders are the ones who can bring new energy into the organization and set new goals for it. Finally, NATO as an organization should become more durable, and acquire more authority. It should become a structure open only for democratic nations, with few exceptions, such as Turkey. This country is not a democracy, but is very important, as it

serves as sort of as a link between the Muslim and the Christian world, between the North and South and is an example of the westernization of an Islamic nation. So this exception is very important.

But there should be no exceptions for Latvia and Estonia. I will be frank and say that this does not concern Lithuania, because it is a democratic country unlike Latvia and Estonia. These are two countries where a regime of apartheid is built and one third of the population has no civil rights just because it is Russian. You might ask me: "Why aren't Russians leaving then?" And I will tell you that this is typically what supporters of apartheid would say, like they did in the case of the South African Republic. Even taking into consideration that the standard of living is higher there, that doesn't mean that no apartheid exists. So the position on Latvia and Estonia should be decisive: all citizens who were living in these countries before 1991 should be granted all civil rights and the Russian language should become officially recognized, since up to a third of the population speaks it. Only on these conditions can they be accepted into NATO. This in no way concerns Lithuania, which is a democratic country. With this, I would perhaps finish, since my time is up. Thank you. Perhaps my speech has been a bit provocative, but I think that the time has come for provocative speeches to be made because we need serious changes. Thank you.