

**RUSSIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES
INSTITUTE FOR SCIENTIFIC INFORMATION
IN SOCIAL SCIENCES**

INSTITUTE OF ORIENTAL STUDIES

**RUSSIA
AND
THE MOSLEM WORLD
2010 – 8 (218)**

Science-information bulletin

The Bulletin was founded in 1992

**Moscow
2010**

Director of publications L.V. SKVORTSOV,
Deputy Director of the Institute for Scientific
information in Social Sciences
of the Russian Academy of Sciences (RAS)
Founder of the project and scientific consultant –
ALBERT BELSKY
Editor-in-Chief –
ELENA DMITRIEVA

Editorial board:

OLGA BIBIKOVA
(First Deputy Editor-in-Chief),
ALEXEI MALASHENKO,
DINA MALYSHEVA,
AZIZ NIYAZI
(Deputy Editor-in-Chief),
VALIAHMED SADUR,
DMITRY FURMAN

CONTENTS

“Contamination” by modernization. (Editorial column of magazine “Peace and Politics”).....	4
Nikolay Shmelev, Valentin Fedorov. Russia – the West: The conception of limited requital (the opinion of economists) ...	11
M. Vagabov. The Islamic factor in contemporary geopolitics.....	29
Kemal Argon. Strategies for Interreligious and Inter-Muslim Dialogue: A Proposed Methodology.....	42
Nikolay Medvedev. What impedes the ethnic-political stability..... in the North Caucasus?	48
Z. Ashimova. Kazakhstan in the system of integration processes in Central Asia	58
S. Chernyavsky. The Russian priorities in Central Asia.....	62

“CONTAMINATION” BY MODERNIZATION.

(Editorial column of magazine “Peace and Politics”)

The modernization of the country, which was proclaimed by the president of Russia in the end of 2009 and which should start in 2010, gave rise not to a single meaning of Russian society. The wide specter of opinions on the present modernization’s substance testifies to it: is it a serious trend aiming at positive impact on future of Russia or a specific “modernization glamour” of Russian politics?

Many people remember rather questionable results of two last examples of state modernization – Gorbachyov (perestroika) and Yeltsin “democratic market Russia”. Not less questionable attempts were made beforehand – Kosygin reform, ended with Brejnev “stagnation”, Khrushchev “corn demarche”, Stalin industrialization and collectivization – at the expense of many human victims and resulted in impressive technical-technological and social achievements, “Lenin economic policy” etc.

Against the background of this “modernization horizon” it is worth mentioning that all these campaigns, having high “potential of renovation”, soon lost “modernization drive” and failed... Exactly therefore the president of Russia by declaration of the new modernization initiative assumed actually a great responsibility. It is necessary, first, to determine the substance of the term “modernization” to see the essence of the changes, initiated by the power. Regretfully,

the definition of the process as usually in Russia was not made, leading to turmoil and raising different interpretations.

Abroad the theoretical discourse on modernization started in the 1960s-1970s and keeps to be unchanged up till now. The need of rapid industrial development to reduce the gap from the state-leaders is fixed quite clearly within its framework. In this sense they explain the definitions “modernization of Germany and Europe for the post-war period” (on the basis of American Marshall plan), “modernization of post-war Japan”, “modernization of Korea” or present “modernization of China”.

Up to the last economic crisis there were no doubts on the principal world leader for everyone to be tantamount to its position: this position was occupied by the USA. Therefore nobody mentioned “modernization of American economy” either in western mass media or western scientific works; they talked about it only lately, which serves as an important (indirect, though) evidence of the fact that America lost its status of the unquestioned world leader... However, one should stress that despite tectonic image changes, the USA remains the leader of the world development, the example, which still is used by other states of the planet for testing their vectors of development.

One may suppose that president D.Medvedev has based his conception of new Russian modernization on such industrial-technical and technological essence. Consequently, exactly “technological” part started to prevail in discussion of Russian modernization problems. Actually global objectives are being stressed: to make our railways the best in the world, to make our locomotives to be the fastest, our rockets – to be capable to move for the longest distance ... Nobody avoids the new information bugbear – nano-technologies. Only some people are aware of what it is, but all people seem to believe that just they are able to solve any internal Russian problems. Naturally, the

coolest lads, headed by universal A.Chubais, are engaged in nano-technologies and implement some super-modern projects.

It is evident that the meaning of common people about modernization is reduced to certain views, fixed by advanced commentators. According to “Levada center”, they perceive modernization in the following way: a) technological break-down, perceived as renewal of obsolete industrial equipment and purchase of technique and technologies in the West – by 37% of respondents (although only 22% of them think that the allocated means will be used and not embezzled; b) creation of the legal state, liberated from interference of the state in economy, and of a political system with competition – by 23% (only 11% believe in possibility to achieve this result); c) moral renaissance of the country – by 10% (i.e. the moral renaissance of the country is not included in the list of priorities!) ...

Russian society perceives modernization mainly as a new notion, characterized by fast communication by means of mobile telephones... The negative features of former examples of modernization are forgotten. The guiding role of the state is associated with thoughtful implementation by the leadership of efficient programs aimed at reducing technological backwardness of Russia from the highly developed western powers.

As a whole, this is a normal process. But a more significant sense is often hidden behind the chorus of discussion of the modernization theme: modernization in technical sphere is impossible without “modernization” of the man himself! It means that the most modern technique will not replace the man himself. What this man will be like? What kind of notion will prevail: the wish to create, to invent or the wish for destruction? This is the main problem, which is actually meant in the course of modernization’s discussion.

Modernization is proposed for the co-citizens as a “macro-ideology” of national development, i.e. as a specific ideological nucleus, which is able to transform all aspects of life of Russian society... This signal stresses one more that the ruling power perceives the universal law: no country is able to ensure its progress without a powerful idea. However, the attempts to fix the connection between two most significant priorities – modernization and national idea – failed, alas! In Soviet times, people perceived themselves as parts of a great and mighty entity, which would protect them and would share happiness and misfortune. At present, we lack it. Why we do not feel the ties between ourselves and our Russia?

Regretfully, this subject is not being discussed. The discussions on modernization and distribution of grants are concentrated on applied spheres and inventions as well as on natural sciences. Given the rightness of such approach, one should not help ignoring the fact that the social sciences were kept in the background: in Soviet times exactly these sciences were given and played a rather honorable role, which maintained to a certain degree the phenomenon of the surprising Soviet unity.

The contemporary situation clearly demonstrates as follows: it is very dangerous to put to the background the issues of philosophy, history and social science as a whole. The example of our near neighbors is extremely significant: fascists are proclaimed national heroes, elderly fascists calmly arrange marches in the capital streets, and monuments to Soviet soldiers are being exploded. This anti-Russian rude ideology is effective... In this situation Russia should not exist without the mighty ideological shield, “becoming dusty” with social sciences.

Without humanistic component of national development’s ideology it is impossible to get the man-creator, motivated by service to

Motherland. This problem can not be solved by any admonishment or forceful methods. The ever-lasting struggle against corruption, for instance, is well known. But the result is nothing... And this is the direct consequence of the ideological vacuum in the country!

If one agrees that there is no alternative to modernization idea, one should comprehend that the process should start from the man. It is necessary to change the stress on technologies for the man and to proclaim Russians as the principal subjects of national modernization. Everybody should understand: modernization is carried out not for modernization but for the benefit of the man of the XXI century, possessing certain characteristics and qualities... In the middle of the XX century A. Maslow proposed this approach and introduced a ridiculous notion of “good man”, whose motivation was determined by “Maslow’s pyramid”. In essence, the similar model was used in the course of creation of “Soviet man”.

The new Russian modernization should include the complex of technological (modernization of equipment, change of technologies etc.) and social (change of the man and of the social institutions’ system) components. This approach was used by the countries, to which we want to come nearer. The West (Europe, North America) and the states, accepting western orientation (Japan, Taiwan etc.) first created (in the second case – mastered) the main values of liberal culture, having formed the needed “human factor” and industrial capacity, and further gradually changed social institutions. As a result, the demolished feudal hierarchy was replaced by a legal state (not obligatory democratic; even America today is often called an empire). The legal state guaranteed functioning of an open market, formation of civil society and protection of new the man, who did not depend a lot on the power, but who was fully responsible for his destiny... Given this logic, the policy of Russian modernization should start to make

investments in “human capital” and only further to develop technical-technological infrastructure, social sphere etc. But we again strive for inventing our own “Russian wheel”.

As far as we again have chosen “an original” way, according to mass media, the West with certain skepticism evaluates the campaign proclaimed in Russia. The West regards as a special detail of the Russian internal political initiative the wish to raise the banner of technical progress and in this way to motivate society for achievement of significant tasks. The West does not want and can not believe in our modernization, since it does not see an idea, which is able to neutralize the internal Russian contradictions. This will not make it possible to shape the coordinated policy, which would unite the elite and the people to support the common aim, the western experts think.

It is easy to see that for the last years the West made some changes in the policy carried out relating to Russia, having become softer. But it is an illusion. The seeming softness of the West covers the might power and unwillingness to reconcile with the Russia’s ambitions to keep to some extent its leading capacity for the XXI century. Antagonism is seen in all directions – not only in the sphere of technologies but also in the information, intellectual and ideological spheres. It seems that this dispute will go on for the first half of the XXI century.

What does modernization of Russia mean for the West? It means the loss of markets, of the chance to make investments in its own technologies by selling them to Russia... Knowing it, the West not only expresses its skepsis to the ideology of Russian modernization but also in all ways tries to brake it and to dissolve it in pessimistic information. The West understands well: the wisely oriented modernization is able to transform itself into the starting point, which may be used by Russia to strive efficiently for its renaissance. One could hardly wait for

assistance of the West to the Russian spurt: one should sooner expect a mighty and well-planned opposition in order to discredit and to ruin the Russian modernization program.

In order to prevent it we should give a maximum specific definition of our modernization, include in it with obligation, jointly with technical-technological and social-economic aspects, “the human dominant”. In other way, the basis of technical modernization should become “modernization of human factor”, motivated for flourishing Russia, being responsible for it and being sure of its creating forces and human abilities. According to the words of the responsible revolutionary classic (V.I. Lenin), the idea, having been mastered by the minds, will be realized definitely. Only under this condition the banner of modernization will be raised by many Russians – from the tinsmith, still being far from nano-technologies to the Kremlin elite. And then we will get the concentrated human energy, capable to move mountains and to overcome any hindrances on the way of modernization development.

History shows as follows: it is impossible to invigorate such country as Russia by means of pure pragmatism. We need a dream and the lofty aim, realizing motivation to action, to creation via common sense of every one’s belonging to the united Russian society. Some kind of “contamination by modernization” should occur in order to put a comprehensible human substance into this movement perceived in parameters of the common national idea and the state’s mighty spurt forward. We have some time to occupy the deserved place in “the world orchestra” and jointly with other leading countries to determine the perspectives of the world community’s development. However, there is not a lot of time to squander time, since it is fraught with great risks, which may question existence of Russia in general.

By some indications, it is possible to say that the technological modernization of the country has started already. It is evident that such campaign may not be realized for one or two years: the normal modernization is a permanent process, which resembles to some extent evolution. Therefore it is a naivety to intend to make ‘the last and deciding’ break-down in modernization process in 2010. The Russian modernization is still a kind of sphinx, waiting for its ideological interpretation and decoding. It depends not only on the president of Russia, whether it will become “glamour whimsy” or will transform into a real and efficient program of actions. Everybody with the urge towards great deeds not only for the name of the country but also for the benefit of every Russian should take part in this work. If it takes place, modernization of Russia will become the reality. Any other approach to the issue will reduce it to “political glamour”.

There is no other way out...

“Mir i politika”, M., 2010, N 2, p. 3–5.

Nikolay Shmelev,

academician, the director of the IE of the RAS

Valentin Fedorov,

professor, ex-governor of Sakhalin

**RUSSIA – THE WEST: THE CONCEPTION OF LIMITED
REQUITAL (the opinion of economists)**

It is beyond doubt that until today
the central point of American strategy
is encirclement and weakening of
Russia

Egon Bahr (Die Zeit, 2008, N 47, s.5)

Lately, after the new USA Administration coming to power, a small hope for the probable essential amelioration of international

political climate started to grow. The talks on opposition and counter struggle diminished, while the discussions about mutual action and cooperation augmented. However, the mankind so many times was deceived by its hopes, that till present no country may (and should) give up strengthening its defense potential. The enormous risk exists of a probable catastrophe due to some reason (or as ill luck would have it).

The process of the review of military doctrine, of its adoption to new international and internal realities is going on in Russia. The probable significant changes seem to affect all possible types of conflicts: large-scale, regional and local wars, as well as limited international and internal armed conflicts. At present, we may allow ourselves to speak about the unthinkable formerly notions – about principal changes in approaches to an eventual probability (or improbability) of a large-scale war. It is worth discussing this issue first of all from the economists' point of view. In its time, the arms race between the West headed by the USA and the USSR, ended with the collapse of the latter. As soon as the military technique was relatively not complicated, the Soviet Union was able simultaneously to maintain civil industries. At that time this support was also not sufficient. But the situation deteriorated greatly after achievement of the strategic parity of armed forces. The growing military capacity with due account of radical quality renewal demanded colossal material and financial means. These unproductive removals from the gross product rendered lifeless economy and had a negative impact on the level of living of the population. The dissatisfaction in society was growing due to deficit of primary goods. The economic hardships were caused directly by the super armament of the country and by the forceful opposition to the West. The indexes of economic situation at that time are common knowledge. By profession, economists are the first people to see ruinousness of the military budget but according to the shaped tradition

are the last people to take part in military-political discussions. The members of the general staff, in their turn, not once slipped on “water melon peel” of economy.

The danger of illusions

Following collapse of the USSR some Russian circles shared illusions on further relations with the USA without any problems. They thought that owing to elimination of the main ideological factor of divergence and cessation of antagonism between socialism and capitalism there was no reason for confrontation of the USA with new Russia, which for the beginning carried out the complimentary policy relating to the transatlantic power. The pro-American national politicians were guided by the devise – what is good for the USA is good for Russia. Our country, as V. Putin said, made the concessions of the colonial type. For instance, it took obligation to inform the West about dislocation of Russian forces on its territory beforehand and unilaterally.

However, the illusions soon dispersed. The friendly position of Russia was considered as its weakness, its readiness to play the second part. Step by step, the USA increased its priority, including geopolitical priority. The USA possesses abroad over 800 military bases and spends on armaments 4% of its gross product, while the average index makes 2.5%. The “most successful military union in history, as they called NATO in the West, approached directly to Russian borders, and this process goes on, taking into account the intention to include into the alliance Ukraine, Georgia and other countries, in perspective. At the same time, the achieved agreements are violated, while American leaders and their European supporters are not embarrassed by logical failure of facts’ connections and of explanations.

Analyzing activities of the USA, one can not help coming to the following conclusion. The USA has fixed the following long-term

objective: the liquidation of Russia as an adequate military rival, as an equal player, able to deliver a responsive mortal blow. The authors share the words, pronounced by Egon Bahr. Of course, the feelings in the USA are not uniform. However, there prevail the aspirations to ensure protection in all cases by making Russia unable to function in terms of military actions. This is the consensus of the American political elite, irrespective of party affiliation and the name of the president, irrespective of peaceful declarations on intentions to annihilate nuclear depots in the world. As it is considered, the present conditions create favorable chances for achievement of this objective due to internal and external difficulties of the post-Soviet Russia. Russia is being forced to start a new arms race, which it will not stand and which will be fraught with catastrophic consequences for it.

Some Russian experts consider the issue merely in military terms: “Russia in future war will confront the problem of its survival”, “War is on the threshold!” “How can Russia withstand a probable large-scale war?” N. Kosolapov, a known Russian scientist, thinks that the war between the USA and Russia is possible at present in technical and political-psychological terms, that the two countries approach by degrees the threshold, when they risk being closer to such war than it was in times of confrontation between the USSR and the USA.

From the economic point of view the military-industrial complex represents a great burden for society and state. The proportional expenditure for new devices of the scientific-technical progress, later transferred to civil industries, is very big in comparison with civil production, in other words, in terms of goods’ amount the military ruble is unable to compete with the outcome of civil sectors of national economy. Otherwise, the disproportional amount of armament in the Soviet Union (“Upper Volta with rockets”, by the known definition) would have been made it the most advanced state in the world in terms

of science and technology. The lofty words about creative role of military expenses are not pertinent. As a classic political economist of the before last century mentioned, the military expenses represent the direct deduction from the national wealth, as if each sac of grain is thrown into water. The PR campaigns of the Defense Ministry do not and can not change anything in this respect.

The short variant of the present text was published in newspaper “Izvestia” (19 May 2008) and caused its discussion. One of the opponents, I.P. Korotchenko, presented the widely disseminated “convincing” argument for the benefit of military-industrial complex: “In 2007, the Russian military industrial complex earned in the external market at the expense of arms deliveries and services the sum of \$ 8 billion. What “heavy burden for state and society” we speak about? Should we propose to kill the hen, laying golden eggs?” But it is not so simple. The mentioned \$ 8 billion is not a trump card, this is not a profit but a general income of the sale. But what are the expenses and the profitability rate? The lobbyists keep silent.

The authors’ approach to the ever-lasting discussion about pluses and minuses of militarization is as follows: should the military expenses of the state budget be used for the peaceful economy and technical-scientific research, the efficiency of economy will be raised. A participant of the mentioned discussion in “Izvestia” (08.07.2008) said: “ In general, the defense industry is a need and not a locomotive. It may be a locomotive only in the determined for leap sectors (cosmos, nano-technologies, quanta computing), since in this case concentration of resources is allowed, which is impossible for producers of goods of mass consumption. But the mechanism of transfer of defense technologies to the mass production civil goods is a must. However, in this case we lack it”. The author is right, when he stresses the need of military allocations. But as far as concentration of resources is

concerned, by means of the wise state-private partnership it is possible to create it at any rate in civil industries.

It is worth mentioning another aspect of the arms' export. The export of arms brings profits for one party and financial expenses for the other party. The leaders of such trade (the USA, Russia, Germany, France) first get payment for their deliveries and then become uneasy for different reasons – lack of stability in some or other region of military actions, poverty in the countries, which have bought arms. Exactly the most developed countries of the world are responsible for this. Not a single summit of “the Eight” ignored this problem but no further steps were taken.

The stake for militarization as a force of progress represents a grave economic mistake, which, unlike some other mistakes of specific government, is not liquidated by spontaneous market forces according to the scheme: unbalance-balance-unbalance; it forms a permanent burden for national economy. This “worm in the apple” may not be discovered by any mathematical methods.

The accumulated experience teaches various parties in a different way. The USA is sure in success of its scenario and may not be stopped by negotiations and proposals to reduce the level and speed of armament, may not be made change its mind by peacemaking policy; the Russian leadership does not want to participate in the large-scale competition, elaborates the plans of asymmetrical response.

One should not be a military expert and examine secret documents of the General Staff in order to see: a challenge has been accepted, and the total and global restoration of the military might of Russia goes on. All types of arms are taken into account, the patrolling is effected around the world. Military manoeuvres are practiced with foreign participation, for example military sea training jointly with Venezuela in 2008. Many projects are projected to implement military

renovation. Such position might be supported, but there are constant questions: “What is the price? Will it keep within the framework of asymmetry? Will asymmetry itself be enough to frighten off a potential aggressor? Etc. The logic of forceful competition in case of life or death of countries and civilizations will change perceptions of proportionality of attack and defense. The asymmetrical response means omission of certain phases in the arms race, direct modernization of the arsenal. Asymmetry of the one party will inevitably cause asymmetry of the other party, and this process will transform in the same arms race we wanted to escape.

One should not expect another trend of developments as long as the conception of mutual guaranteed annihilation prevails – “the party, which strikes the first blow, will perish, being the second”. It supposes a massive response by means of strokes directed against the most significant centers of the enemy on the whole territory of the country: many military, demographic, industrial, administrative, financial objects. Given the worst outcome, they should transform into a radioactive desert. The enemy is not worried, whether the country would be restored afterwards. The logic is clear: the more horrible is the perspective – the more chances exist for peaceful coexistence. However, keeping by rockets the constant aim at the USA territory, its foreign military bases, submarines, air planes and, probably, in future cosmic spirals is an excessive burden for the country, being backward in terms of all main economic indexes. At the same time, the expensive struggle for Arctic comes to the forefront. America has an advantage of the support, given to it by its allies, including 27 members of European Union. The countries of the Eastern Europe increase their military expenses (higher than average in the world) paying in this way for Atlantic solidarity. The gross product of “Seven” surpasses by 15 times

the Russian index (by parity of purchasing power), the share of Russia accounts for less than 7%.

It is impossible to expect any positive changes of principle for Russia in future with due account of consequences of the destructive financial-economic crisis. One should take into account the interpretation of the facts made by foreign experts, who negatively review modernization of armed forces in Russia. They accuse Russia of aggressive intentions. Simultaneously, these experts accept in a positive way the growth of military expenses in the USA, which surpass the corresponding Russian expenses by 15 times (according to western sources, in 2007: \$ 546.80 billion and \$ 35.37 billion). Such are the quantity data, keeping aside the quality issue, which is a special subject to review. Preservation of military parity not only with the USA but also with the West as a whole would mean the repetition of the past: economic deprivation of Russia (deficit of goods, lines, mobilization economy), as it was in the Soviet Union. The outcome will be the same. “The USSR produced rockets like sausages”, as Khrushchev said, but weakened every year. Comparing with the former period of time, the demographic factor makes despondent, and the number of draftees in our country diminishes by 70-75 thousand people every year. The development of information technologies, being the core of the contemporary military affairs, leaves much to be desired.

It should be perceived that Russia is not powerful enough to be guided by the idea of comprehensive strokes. But there is no way to accept pacifism and to give up arms’ modernization. Otherwise, the enemy will get the upper hand with his bare hands. It is necessary to watch other countries, gaining strength. China spends on its army much more than Russia. Let us not forget Japan with its great military expenditure. According to SIPRI, in 2007, the share of the world military expenses, possessed by different countries, was as follows: the

USA – 45%, Great Britain and China – 5% each, France and Japan – 4% each, Germany and Russia – 3% each.

The coming multi-polar world will not be a dream-world of common happiness.

What kind of military doctrine Russia needs today

It is necessary to change the type of defense thinking. The defense doctrine of the Russian Federation, adopted by the Decree of the president of the RF on 21 April 2000, as it is noted in the preamble, is the document of the provisional period and its provisions may be defined more exactly and may be supplemented with due account of changes of the military-political situation etc. One should note the concern of some Russian military experts about our military science. They use rather explicit words: “it does not correspond to modern demands”, “decline”, “the military practice started to take the lead over military theory”.

At the same time, it is necessary to greet the new Conception of foreign policy of the Russian Federation, approved by the president of the RF D. Medvedev on 12 July 2008, which says that “Russia will not let itself be involved in confrontation, which spares no expense, including new arms race, destructive for economy and pernicious for internal development of the country”. The analogous provisions are contained in the strategy of national security of the Russian Federation up till 2020, signed by the president of the RF on 13 May 2009.

It seems that the number of the objects of a potential enemy, chosen for delivering strokes, should be reduced to minimum and should not be only military fortifications. It will sooner be not they. The roster will conclude the most important national centers, including the capital; and probable destruction of these centers with great demographic losses would be the deterrent factor for the country, which prepared some pernicious act. The big cities are the vital nerves of any

state, including banks, electric networks, computer networks, transport lines etc.

There is no secret in this matter. On the contrary, everybody should know beforehand the destiny of the objects-hostages in case of an eventual war between two powers. The sense of the strategy's review consists in the following: abstaining from participation in the costly arms race and having no chance to get the upper hand over the USA, Russia would concentrate all its efforts in a few geographic targets with the guarantee of their disappearance from the Earth. These targets may be reviewed – x, y, z. During the nuclear rockets' epoch, the total guaranteed protection does not exist, and hegemony is not yet monopoly. In other words, the party, which strikes first, will not rest safe. The USA will confront the marginal choice: on the one side, is it admissible to let these heavy losses, which will ruin the survived nation and will undermine its defense capacity to the benefit of other "rogue countries", since the latter will use this opportunity to square accounts with the transatlantic power. On the other side, the USA will have to understand the uselessness of attempts to overcome Russia without unleashing war. The inevitable repetition of 11 September 2001, enlarged by 10 000 times will be a too high price to start military aggression, forced by the great power ambitions and Messiah self-conceit, and will push the American White House to take a reasonable decision.

The legend about David and Goliath does not suit in this case. Another option is needed. Let us imagine a giant, preparing for the battle with a weaker enemy. The outcome is known beforehand —the giant will win but will lose an eye, a hand or a leg, and therefore it is quite logical, that the giant will ask himself: do I need it? Being wise, he will not begin this fight. And if he starts it, the normal wisdom will be lost. At present, there is no need in the general approach, when all

flesh and lifeless objects on the other side will be annihilated, since there are no forces to do it, but the selected target with coefficient of maximum efficiency is needed. It is worth mentioning the meaning, expressed in magazine “USA-Canada”: in practice, the explosions on the USA territory of two-three Chinese nuclear bombs of mega-ton class would result in general panic and total disorganization of the state governance. Given diplomatic tone of the author, it is possible to add that the similar consequences would be the outcome of explosions of other national origin.

The analogy with “big brother” appears due to the fact that European countries are very vulnerable and are connected with the USA by article 5 of the Washington treaty of 1949. The NATO Europe with its hundreds of American nuclear bombs (from 200 to 350), by the way stored under inadequate conditions, should comprehend that, letting involved itself in a conflict, it would get from “the bear” (as Russia is called sometimes) the inevitable retribution, and therefore Europe is interested not in arms escalation (the American usual pastime) but in deterrent of armament and Americans.

The main problem in relations between Europe and Russia is caused by Europe’s consent to submit to the USA, while Russia does not want to become someone’s protectorate. Russia has global thinking, but Europe adopts servile attitude, irrespective of the good or bad consequences. The enlargement of the European Union does not change anything in this respect. Only the size of the territory, GNP and population augments, while dependence on the USA remains. The law of transition from quantity to quality fails in this case. The inequality between the Old world and the New world is not a pleasant fact for Europe, and they prefer to avoid discussion about it, like members of the high society do not intend to speak about their sickness and disability. Europe is such disable entity in the Western Alliance.

What is the actual military strength of Europe? The crux of the problem consists in military disablement of Europe. In this field it does not correspond to the challenges of the XXI century and therefore has to ask for protection of the USA. Protection from what? First of all, from Russia, which could not be cured from genetically predetermined aggressiveness, as it is considered on both sides of the Atlantic Ocean. Therefore they promote in all ways weakening of Russia, all actions directed against it. Consequently they give a hostile reception to actions of Russia itself, if it protects its own state interests. A kind of absurd occurs: any country may have its own state interests, while Russia should renounce them, if it wants to please somebody. The concessions, made by the Soviet Union and new Russia in this sphere are not comparable with anything else. What did it receive in exchange? The response is as follows: the stronger pressure on the part of NATO and European Union. Russia, as a complicated power, should not retreat but should demonstrate its actual force, instilling the rest of the world, mildly speaking, into respect. Otherwise, Russia will disappear.

Dependence of one continent on the other continent should not be regarded as an order in the spirit “up-down”. There is no need for it, although the relations between them are rather complicated. Some difficulties come across. But the coincidence of civilization values is the pledge of organic union of the USA and Europe. The experts often value the differences between them for the benefit of Europe, noting its self-dependent and progressive role in settling one or other issue. Adequately taking into account the attempt “to whitewash Europe”, it is necessary to mention that the question is some aspects of world politics, the details. Europe does not question the leadership of the USA. Europe only claims for an initiative of the confirmed retreat from the agreed position. One should disagree with D. David, Executive director of the French Institute of International Relations, who wrote that Europe was

placed between stupidity and Russia. Europe is an ally of the USA, and one may not refute this fact. In its time, the Soviet Union's policy tried to unearth Europe from the USA, playing on nuances of contradictions between them, but failed. Nevertheless, such intentions have not been outlived up till present: exactly to convince and to gain Europe to its side ("Russia needs to use contradictions between the USA and Europe..."). This approach has no perspectives and provokes suspicions relating to Russian intentions to bring in a split in the western world.

It does not mean that Europe does not deserve the attention to it as to the High Contracting Party, that it is more feasible to have a deal directly with the USA over the head of Europe. The exceptional military weakness makes Europe more sensitive in foreign policy, and, hence, it is more receptive to arguments and other points of view. It represents for Russia a specific channel of influence on the USA, of softening transatlantic positions in the difficult dialogue between Moscow and Washington. Europe will never take action against its protector, but it has the right to express his own view. It does not aggravate the USA situation, and more so, as Europe does not have a unanimous opinion on the existing realities, and the USA is able to select for itself the needed point of view.

Henry Kissinger's caustic remark is well known: what is the telephone number of Europe to call and to get its opinion on different matters? In this case, European Commission and its president, the parliament and other organs of EU are not taken into account. In response, the European politicians, acting according to the principle "A Roland for an Oliver", might ask, whether and to what extent the USA was a European country? In this case it would be insufficient to make references to the united civilization roots. The USA has acquired in its aggressiveness the new quality, which distinguishes it from European

Union to the detriment of the USA. Without striving for a paradox one may say that the USA, being not a European country, is at the head of the European continent and represents the telephone number to call in order to get some consultation. With good reason one may suppose that nothing will be changed in principle in the visible perspective after establishment in EU of two new posts.

The USA celebrates its triumph in relations with Europe, having broken it. On its historic way, the USA not once confronted strategic enemies, but Washington scored successes. First it was England, further Germany and Japan, which finally became allies, depended on the USA, later it was the Soviet Union. At present, its not easy counter-partner is Russia, which urges towards its restoration. China gradually becomes a principled rival of the USA, with an unclear outcome of this counterbalance. Perhaps, in future Europe may change its patron, acting according to the principle: He who is stronger, is the civilization friend or even civilization ancestor.

In terms of continents' categories, unlike Europe, Asia represents by itself a self-dependent sector of the world space, where there is no association like European Union, but where the USA does not enjoy the status of the highest instance, which is the unshakable rule for all European capitals. The appraisal of the conception of limited requital demands to keep silent about high moral against the background of universal danger to be subject to multiple annihilation in hour when X. Moloch does not profess vegetarian views. If one wishes, he may cover with shame any noble deed. For instance, in Norway they created the world depot in Spitsbergen Island, which guarantees preservation of agricultural seeds in all cataclysms, including nuclear war. Given some irreversible thinking, one may pronounce "the conviction": it is necessary not to prepare for the war but to fight for peace all over the world. At the same time, articles and books about potential assault

contain words about “guaranteed destruction”. All discussions about war lack moral criteria. Otherwise, it should be necessary to forbid international arms trade, like narcotics trade, since it is unmoral to profit on death and fear.

In his time, State Secretary of the USA A. Haig said that there were things more important than peace. The question is that exactly the potential aggressor would consider what things were more important than peace: the humanitarian wars (NATO against Serbia because of Kosovo), the far-fetched pretexts (the attack of the USA against Iraq)? This list of arms brandishing may easily be enlarged, citing as an example the USA.

Is America changing military strategy?

It is worth paying interest to the reconsideration of military strategy in the USA itself. Up till present, it is considered to be feasible the maximum destruction of the Russian living space. However, in April 2009 the report was publicized under the title “From Counterforce to Minimal Deterrence: A new Nuclear Policy on the Path Toward Eliminating Nuclear Weapons”. The authors (three persons) mention the excessive surplus of the accumulated nuclear weapons and the consequent danger for the USA itself, they appeal to the authorities to re-target nuclear rockets, having reduced their number, from former points to 12 most important economic objects, namely, the oil-refinery plants, the enterprises of ferrous and non-ferrous metallurgy, the energy stations (in Omsk, owned by Gazprom, in Angara, owned by Rosneft and others). Probably, to be more exact, this indication seems to be keeping these enterprises at point, as beforehand, since they had been already chosen for it by the military structures of the USA. The authors proceed from the following perspective: Russia would become a demolished country in economic terms with limited losses of the population. They cite the number of over a million of direct victims

(killed and wounded). Is it not a more “humanistic” approach in comparison with the former approach? Was destruction of headquarters of the mentioned concerns was planned, if they are located in Moscow? Further, following destruction of oil and gas enterprises and of other sensitive for the country targets, would a blow be delivered against the military forces, would the hostile party take into account a probable response by means of nuclear rockets? What will be the final number of victims? What about the notorious soldier’s boot, which should go through the enemy’s territory to consolidate the victory? This is not a complete list of questions. It should be mentioned that the joint ventures, partially owned by concerns of American allies, FRG as an example, are probable targets. Nevertheless, this is an evident option, which differs from the doctrine of total war up to the last soldier or citizen, to the last nuclear weapon.

In his time, Mao advised the Soviet leadership to be not afraid of war against the West: let million and millions of own citizens perish, but the socialist paradise would flourish on the capitalist site of fire. The mentioned conception of limited requital will create for the West a similar picture, and it would hardly choose the blasphemous bloody option, despite the pathologic hatred to Russia. In its time, the conception of limited punishment was known in Europe; the Soviet Union, according to it, was doomed to great losses. Thus, it is not quite a new idea in the international policy. It has not de-facto disappeared. Let us put a question: why France, withdrawn by Charles de Gaulle in 1966 from the military structure of NATO with the consequent evacuation of the Alliance headquarters from Paris and closing of its military bases in the country, still preserved its concentrated nuclear force? France needs it not to gain victory, not to die mutually with a potential enemy, but it needs it to demonstrate to the enemy its significant capability to get even with such enemy. On the initiative of

president Sarkozy, in 2009 France returned to the military structure of NATO, but it does not change anything in this respect. Many countries, if not most of them, maintain relations as the stronger partner to the weaker one, while the weaker partner, possessing no aggressive intentions, does not want to disarm.

Another example, being insignificant, shows, nevertheless, that this conception functions. For instance, Czechia was ready to meet the wishes of the USA and to locate the radio-location station of the anti-rocket defense. The local population of the territory, chosen for installation of the equipment, protested, since it did not want to be a victim of unforeseen circumstances. The same may be said about Poles, who live on the territory, where Americans want to install their anti-rockets. It is easy to imagine the appearance as a mighty factor for the benefit of peace of the anti-war movement in the transatlantic power, particularly in the centers, doomed beforehand for a tragic destiny.

* * *

In all likelihood, it is high time for Russia to think about the practical feasibility of the conception of unequal requital. It is an uneasy decision, since it is difficult to coincide it with our usual thinking. The mentioned military doctrine of the RF in one provision almost coincides with our presented position. For instance, in point 8 it is said that in contemporary circumstances the Russian Federation proceeds from the need to ensure to cause the fixed damage to any aggressor (a state or a coalition of states) under any conditions. The question is, how to comprehend the fixed damage: the total annihilation of the aggressor or any other variant?

Savings in the arms race may successfully be coincided with the other direction – extension of the foreign oil and gas pipeline system, which brings great economic benefits but creates big concern of the West. The share of Russia in the gas import of 27 countries makes 42%,

while for some countries Russia is the only or almost unique supplier: Slovakia – 100%, Finland – 100%, Bulgaria – 100%, Lithuania – 100%, Latvia – 100%, Estonia – 100%, Romania – 94%, Austria – 82%, Greece – 81%. Evaluating the general course of the present Russian leadership, English magazine “Economist” considers that it intends to rewrite the end of the cold war. If the West perceives the Russian deliveries of oil and gas as a threat to itself and if it calls company “Gasprom” a new strategic weapon, it is up to the West to have this point of view. As it is known, Poland, referring to Russia, made the proposal to create a kind of “Energy NATO”, capable to use forceful means. The creation of an international oil and gas infrastructure is an expensive affair, but in circumstances of the world unpredictability these investments may be regarded as specific defense expenses, while specification consists in the received real profits. Evidently, the extension of this sector of external economy should be limited by the reasonable framework. Creating a threat for the West (in western terms) plus getting payment for it is a rational policy, is it not so?

Probably, someone may ask: why the military inequality a priori is determined for Russia and why it is assumed that the West (the USA) is able to disband Russia, while Russia is not capable to disband the West? Then it will be necessary again to tell the same old story and to repeat the arguments from the beginning, stressing the core: Russia will fail in terms of economy in the process of high tech militarization and as a result of industrial weakness, depopulation, drop of the share of Russians and unsettled national question will sink into oblivion without war. The chance of preserving Russia consists in fulfillment of the principal aim – to avoid the unproductive economic surcharge, an unenviable fate of the country and to ensure its salvation.

“Sovremennaya Evropa”, M., 2010, N 1, p. 5–17.

M. Vagabov,

doctor of philosophic sciences,

Head of the Center for Islamic Studies

of the North Caucasus (Makhachkala)

**THE ISLAMIC FACTOR IN CONTEMPORARY
GEOPOLITICS**

The influence of Islam on society not only preserves but also rises in the contemporary world. It is worth analyzing the main reasons of the growing influence of the Islamic factor on contemporary geopolitical processes. The main reason, to the author's mind, is the steady growth of the economic potential of Muslim countries. It has achieved a very great scale in balance of the world economy. At present, the Islamic regions possess the most significant sources of energy resources and capitals (particularly in the oil producing countries). Without them the world would become today similar to a paralyzed creature, since the energy resources are not only the most important strategic economic factors, but also the factors of military capacity of contemporary states. In this sense, we may consider the Islamic countries as the generators of world economy. Formerly poor deserts in the Near East and North Africa have transformed into the mightiest resources' bases of the world significance.

The Basin of the Persian Gulf alone possesses two thirds of the discovered oil reserves. By the end of the XX century, the incomes of Arabian states, received by oil exports, succeeded hundreds of billions of US dollars per year, i.e. "the golden billion". The capitals of the oil producing states of the Muslim East, kept in Muslim banks, give them big dividends and represent a significant factor of economic development not only of these countries. Only five oil producing countries of the Muslim East (Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Libya, the Emirates of Persian Gulf, Iran) keep assets in foreign banks for the sum

of more than \$ 500 billion. These astronomic profits partially are used by many oil producing countries of the Near East and the North Africa to support the existing regimes and forms of governance and to some extent promote the growth of Islamic fundamentalism and radicalism.

The notions of “Islamic fundamentalism” and “Islamic radicalism” in scientific and particularly in publicist literature are regarded incorrectly as synonyms. In essence, they refer to the same object from the opposite sides. Analyzing these notions, academician E.M. Primakov writes: “ To understand the future Muslim world and its mutual relations with the other part of humanity it is especially significant to distinguish Islamic fundamentalism and Islamic extremism. The first, like any other religious fundamentalism, stands up for religious education, observance of religious traditions in every day life. The second trend aims at forceful dissemination in the country and abroad of Islamic model of the state, of Islamic rules of behavior in society and in family. It uses exactly forceful measures”.

Beyond question, at present the oil producing Muslim countries by their economic capacity have a great impact on formation of world politics and international relations. Just the rise of “Islamic factor” worries much the USA and other western countries. The aggressive actions against the oil producing Muslim states and other acts of interference under various pretexts on the part of western powers, particularly the USA, testify to it. In the past, the USA carried out its activities under the slogan of Monro doctrine (“America for Americans”), while at present in contemporary circumstances the strategic line of the American policy is expressed by the thesis that the whole world should be under the influence of the American authorities. Ignoring all norms of international law, the USA imposes its policy on other sovereign states from position of force. The aggression against Iraq under pretext of the alleged rescue of the mankind from the

weapons of mass destruction by S. Hussein regime is a clear example of such policy. The far-fetched pretext for the overthrow of the objectionable regime of S. Hussein covered the genuine objective of the USA and its allies – the urge towards capture of the richest oil fields. The events in Afghanistan show the benefits get by western countries from the struggle against terrorism.

The policy from position of force is based on the might of the American power. The USA takes actions in the same way as in its time the ancient Rome did whatever it liked with perfect impunity. The attempts to install a one-polar world despotic regime took place in the world history beforehand but failed. At present, one state is not able to act in such way without negative consequences for such state, which is evident to the USA. American people themselves protest against the USA aggression in Iraq. It is not accidental, that one of the first promises made by president B. Obama was withdrawal of American forces from Iraq. At the same time, the USA aggression against Iraq resulted in the growth of Muslim identification, of tendencies to Muslim solidarity against western countries.

The rise of Muslim population in the world is another essential objective component of “Islamic factor”. Officially, the number of Muslims occupies the second place after Christians (Muslims – over one billion, Christians – about 1.5 billion). The rates of rapid growth of Muslim population in comparison with other confessions are explained by the following reasons.

First, in Muslim countries there exists a high birth rate, and, hence, the enlarged reproduction of the population, comparing with the Christian world. The social doctrine and moral of Islam promote large families with many children. Islam disapproves artificial interruption of pregnancy. And it is the reality, despite the low level of living in many Muslim countries.

Second, the growth of Muslim population is promoted by the polygamy, allowed by Koran. Sometimes in such families the number of children of one father succeeds one hundred. The polygamy in Islamic world, thanks to improvement of well-being in the recent time, becomes a way of life. For instance, bin Laden is the seventeenth child in the family, consisting of 52 children of his rich father.

Third, the number of Muslims in the world increases greatly as a result of proselytism. Primarily, it concerns the Central and the Southern African tribes, which professed paganism until recent time. Under present conditions, rich Muslim countries render them material assistance on condition that they adopt Islam. Islamic missionaries teach them the basics of Islam free of charge. This phenomenon is characteristic not only for Africa but also for other continents of the world, including America. The number of local Muslims in the USA surpasses one million. They are mainly Afro-Americans, who adopted Islam as their historically traditional religion. This process is conditioned by some economic, ideological factors and by missionaries' activities. Proselytism as a process actually lacks to such extent in other religions. Overpopulation, poverty and unemployment in most African countries cause Islamic proselytism and migration of Muslims from these countries to European and other rich states.

At present, the quantity of Muslim population only in Western Europe rose by more than 20 million. According to the Central Institute of Islamic Archives, 33.4 million Muslims live today in Europe, and this community annually grows by 6.5%. In Russia there live 25 million Muslims, represented by indigenous peoples of the Volga Basin, Ural, Siberia, the North Caucasus, people, coming from the Middle Asia and the Trans-Caucasus.

The analogous rise of the quantity of Muslim population goes on not only in Europe but also in Asia, Australia, America. Six million

Muslims live in the USA, including 4 million of emigrants and their descendants. Out of two million Americans, who adopted Islam, most are Afro-Americans. The first known Muslim religious community in the USA was organized in Ross (North Dakota) in 1900. In 1934, the first mosque was erected in Iowa. According to various data, the number of foreign Muslims-students in America makes from 200 to 800 thousand persons.

The attributes of Islam penetrate these countries jointly with Islamic migrations to these countries. The cult buildings are built, Muslim educational institutions and centers of Islam propagation are established, various Islamic organizations (from peaceful elucidative and cultural to radical and extremist organizations) are created. The so-called “migration Islam” promotes consolidation of the Islamic factor not only in the countries, where migrants live, but also in the world as a whole. At present, it has been transformed into a powerful force of social-political life in western countries, creating sometimes the hotbeds of radical religious fundamentalism. The religious extremism threatens today western countries on the inside. The actions of radicals often engender conflicts of the ethnic-confessional opposition. The recent terrorist acts in England, Spain, France and other countries of Europe prove this growing trend. For instance, 112 Islamic centers exist in the FRG. An experimental school, attached to such center, for teaching children from 14 countries functions in Munich. The centers are charged with providing food for Muslim communities according to shariat rules. There exist special cattle breeding firms and magazines.

The constant presence of Muslim communities in western countries, their participation in public-political and scientific activities promotes improvement of mutual understanding between the West and the East. On the one side, this aspect of life contributes to better ethnic-confessional tolerance, inter-cultural communication. However, on the

other side, radical Islamic groups appear among Muslim communities. Thus, one may consider Muslim migration as an important feature of contemporary geopolitical transformations. If the Muslim population continues to grow and develop in such tempos, while such objective conditions keep in the world and tend to rise, the quantity of adepts of Islam in 50 years will attain 2 billion people.

Fourth, the geographical environment of the Muslim world is an element of “the Islamic factor”. The vast Islamic area embraces the space from the Pacific Ocean – Indonesia, the Philippines, China in the East – to the western coasts of the African continent, the Atlantic Ocean, i.e. encircles the eastern hemisphere of the planet from end to end. The geographical position is an important geopolitical characteristic of “the Islamic world”. The Muslim world occupies very convenient regions of the Earth with the richest natural resources, climatic conditions, centers of ancient civilizations, perfect recreation zones, transportation connections between the West and the East etc. Finally, all this contributes to consolidation of Islam’s positions, reciprocal influence of various civilizations of the East and the West, rise of the international influence of Islamic ideology and way of living.

Like objective elements, “the Islamic factor” includes in itself certain subjective characteristics. The question is the attitude of Muslims to the canons of their religion. The quantitative index of religion’s adepts is rather formal. The world census of the population according to religious adherence has not been affected. The published contemporary data is not adequately substantiated and does not correspond to reality. Such statistics is based on the formal traditional theological method of dividing the countries of the world to Buddhist, Christian and Islamic adepts. For instance, England is a Christian country, and the whole population formally is regarded as Christians. The same statistical approach is used in other countries as well. The

churches' hierarchy applies this incorrect method. The quantitative indexes are not the most significant. And the more important place in consciousness, psychology and daily life is occupied by the faith, the attitude of believers to their religious obligations, observation of religious dogmas and cults.

It should be mentioned that adepts of Islam more thoroughly observe their religious obligations. The supporters of Christianity and Buddhism often observe religious rules indifferently, without enthusiasm and efficiency. It is particularly characteristic for the Christian youth. It is caused by the change of views in its consciousness. New traditions, raised by present realities of life replace old traditions. Every year, the number of temples, theological educational institutions is being reduced, the quantity of theological departments and the correspondent contingent of students diminishes. Former world-known theological educational institutions, such as Cambridge, Sorbonne and many others, have transformed into the centers of world science and culture. This situation exists mainly in western Christian countries. The exclusive situation characterizes Orthodoxy in Russia and in former post-Soviet Christian space, where there exist special regional features, engendered by political and other conjunctive provisional reasons.

Quite other accidental picture exists in the Muslim world. Muslims in the whole world express their close adherence to their religion, irrespective of the place of living. There are many objective and subjective reasons, mentioned above, which explain it. The number of Muslim believers succeeds the half of all believers of the world, taken together. Thus, the actual quantitative and qualitative prevalence of Muslims in the world has a direct significant impact on formation of the world politics and regulation of international relations.

One should not forget that the Muslim world is a conditional notion. At present serious contradictions remain among Muslim countries with different trends of Islam, rest in their internal and external policy, in forms of state governance. There are different attitudes to the issues of direct concern to the Islamic world. The events in Iraq, unlike former events in the Muslim world, discovered a significant trend to Islamic solidarity against the aggressive political course of the USA and its allies. The aggression of the USA and its allies against Iraq was not supported even by such partners of the USA, as Saudi Arabia and Turkey.

The Islamic dogma itself may be considered as a main subjective factor. Within Muslim society Islam is regarded as the universal theory, a symbiosis of religious and secular entities. Except Turkey, in all Muslim countries Islam and its organizations are not separated from the state, school and mosque. In contrast to many western countries, where religion is separated from state, in the countries of the East Islam remains a universal identification factor in spiritual life of society.

After disintegration of the caliphate, the Muslim world went through a deep social-economic and spiritual crisis. However, after the period of colonial yoke and centuries-old stagnation Islam woke up as an extinct volcano. For the last decades, the large-scale social-economic and spiritual changes occurred in Islam. First of all, they are: the wave of national-liberation, anti-monarchic revolutions, the Arabic-Israeli conflict, the revolution in Iran (1979), the aggression of the USA and its allies against Iraq, Afghanistan, the events in Kashmir, Kosovo, the Middle Asia, the North Caucasus, Indonesia, the USA, Spain, England, France. These events are not similar in terms of their social-political aims and characteristic, they differ in forms and substance from each other. "The Islamic factor" unites all these events. The analogous

processes go on also in other regions of the planet, and the Islamic region of the world is not an exception in this respect.

However, the events, unleashed in the Muslim region, differ from all analogous by the fact that Islam played in them a significant either positive or negative role. Both progressive leaders and leaders of radicalism and extremism. Either these or other see in Islam settlement of all issues of the contemporary world. Since its origin and up to present, Islam rests one of the most politicized religions of the world. Any political action, if not explicitly, then implicitly correlates with this dogma, and this dogma itself at the present stage transforms into a political doctrine to a larger extent than for the centuries-old historical period. These events are brought to life by the deep objective economic and ideological reasons. Therefore many social-political movements in the Muslim region are unfolded under the banner of Islam. It comes forward as a universal subjective factor either for support or opposition to all events, which take place in the world of Muslims.

The growing influence of “the Islamic factor” in politics causes greater interest in the problem of reciprocal connection between religion and politics in the new independent countries and in the world as a whole. It is quite logical that Russians are interested in these phenomena. The similar processes go on not only on the territories near the border but also within the Russian Federation, in the regions, where adepts of Islam live. This is proved by the movement, headed by bin Laden, embraced the regions of not only the Muslim world but also many countries of Asia, America and Africa. Like in time of movement “Muslim Brothers” and of its ideologists brothers Said and Mohammad Kutb, Maududi and others, this international association of radical Islam sets itself as a unrealizable object the establishment of the universal Islamic order for all times. Despite utopia of their plans, they are not limited with their declaration but urge towards their realization

by means of the created wide world network of their supporters, by committing terrorist acts, by actions, directed against the constitutional authorities in various countries, by the appeals for the idea of Muslim exclusiveness, by intolerant attitude to heterodox believers etc. The ideologists of the so-called wahhabyy trend in Sunni Islam are particularly active in this respect.

The logical question rises: why after the prolonged stagnation the role of Islam grows unexpectedly in the contemporary world? Why both liberal and conservative forces in the Muslim world in order to attain their social-political aims appeal to the canons of Islam as to a panacea?

This phenomenon was engendered by deep objective and subjective historic, social-economic and spiritual causes. The analysis of the principal reasons, promoting consolidation of Islam in the contemporary world, and description of the roots of this process are discussed below. The interference of western powers in internal and external affairs of Muslim countries caused radicalization and politicization of contemporary Islam. The western politicians keep the old approach to Muslim countries as to the former colonial properties, causing the protest of peoples of these states. Religion in this case functions as a force, which unites its followers. At the same time, western countries deliberately sow discord in Islamic environment in order to prevent formation by Muslims of their united serried front. This method of approach is a geo-strategic line in the foreign policy of the USA and western countries. At present, exactly the solidarity of the Muslim world frightens the West. To prevent it in any case, the West artificially creates conflicting situations among countries of the Muslim world, although at present there exist a lot of contradictions also within the Muslim world itself.

The contemporary Islam is characterized by the growth of reformation ideas and modernization trends, particularly in the problematic fields of social-economic and political development. All of them were subject to theoretical comprehension. For instance, Ayatolla Homeyni proposed Iranians the way - “neither West, nor East, but Islamic way”. Others proposed the way of “Islamic socialism”, “western way of development” etc.

In the eye of believers Islam still remains the panacea from all social evils, the unique universal deliverer from their consequences. Therefore all novelties could be introduced only on the basis of compromise between religion and new political programs. The Islamic reformation ideas with their models of “Arabic socialism”, “Islamic socialism”, “Muslim socialism” and others appeared in this way. For the period of the 1960s – the beginning of the 1970s, these models became quite fashionable. The central idea of these essentially utopian theories was as follows: substantiation of identity of scientific socialism and Islam, compatibility of scientific socialism and Islam in their foundations. The support and substantiation of new orders had extended repercussions in the Muslim world, promoted consolidation of ideological positions of religion. But these ideas afterwards, particularly after disintegration of the socialist camp and the Soviet Union, lost their perspective, and these states confront the challenge of choice in the way of further development in difficult circumstances.

Numerous Muslim associations and movements, differed in their objectives and tasks, perform significant subjective functions of “the Islamic factor” in integration of Muslim interests in world politics and international relations. Of all social-political events in the XX century, occurred in the Muslim world, the victory of Iranian revolution under the banner of Islam and guidance of Shiite clergy had a great impact on resurgence of Muslim identity, solidarity and enthusiasm of religious

feelings and senses. This victory over the shah regime had a great response in the Muslim world, irrespective of adherence to Shiite or Sunni and attained its culmination.

The aggressive actions of the USA and its allies against Iraq and Afghanistan, as was mentioned, became a significant factor of raising the spirit of Muslim solidarity. It should be noted that not all Muslim leaders approved the regime of Saddam Hussein, particularly after aggression of Iraq against Kuwait. This action, taken by the Iraqi president, was disapproved in the Muslim world. It gave western powers the pretext for interference in internal Arabic affairs. The West, particularly the USA, for a long time waited for a convenient moment to start military actions in the Near East. S. Hussein actually provoked “Storm in desert”. At that time, many in the Muslim world started to regard S. Hussein as an aggressor and the USA and other countries as a repairer of justice in the Arabic world etc.

But, in contrast to former events, the further actions in Iraq had different repercussions not only in Muslim countries and in the world as a whole. For the beginning, Iraqis were reticent observers of these events, rendered only minimum assistance to S. Hussein during military actions, waited for American “democratic reforms”, “liberation from the regime” etc. This reaction was particularly characteristic for Shiites, who make the majority of the population of Iraq. As a result, it became an illusion, since the aggressor had quite different objectives. The new stage of struggle against foreign aggressors started in Iraq; it transformed into the large-scale Sunni-Shiite resistance, supported by many Muslim countries. Finally, it resulted in the growth of influence of “Islamic factor” in world politics.

The Islamic renaissance is based exclusively on Arabic oil, characterized by its inexhaustible reserves. Saudi Arabia claims for the role of the spiritual leader in the Muslim world. The kings of this

country not once declared that it was the Motherland of Islam, Muhammad, caliphate, while its holy centers (Mecca and Medina) were located on its territory. However, the question is not the greater historic services of Saudi Arabia than of other countries for Islam. The essence is as follows: for the period after the Second World War, particularly for the last years, Saudi Arabia became one of the richest countries not only of the Muslim world but also of the whole capitalist world. Its annual profits, given by selling oil and gas, account for several hundred billions of US dollars.

For instance, the financial assistance on the part of richest petrodollars countries, primarily of Saudi Arabia, to the countries of Africa and Asia usually is accompanied by conditions for free propaganda of Muslim dogmas and Muslim way of living. There are about seventy countries, receiving assistance of Saudi Arabia: in Africa – 38, in Asia – 22, other countries – 10. The assistance is rendered by Saudi Arabia through “Saudi Foundation for Development”, which for the period from 1975 to 1992 gave financial support to 273 projects in various countries. The assistance, rendered by Saudi Arabia in 1989, achieved the amount of 1.171 trillion American dollars. For 1990, Saudi Arabia occupied the fifth place after the USA, Japan, France and Germany in terms of absolute amount of rendered assistance.

Thus, the above enumerated objective conditions and subjective factors in the final account promote more efficient dissemination of Islam influence and consolidation of its social-political positions in the contemporary world. Obviously, there exist also other reasons of promoting the rise of the “Islamic factor” role in contemporary geopolitical transformations. However, the complex of the noted factors had and has now a great impact on consolidation of Islam positions in

the region of the Muslim world, in world politics and in international relations.

*“Severny Kavkaz v sovremennoy politike Rossii”,
Makhachkala, 2009, p. 61–73.*

Kemal Argon,

Political scientist

STRATEGIES FOR INTERRELIGIOUS

AND INTER-MUSLIM

DIALOGUE: A PROPOSED METHODOLOGY

In the article the author describes the practice of utilizing interreligious and inter-Muslim dialogue with small Muslim groups as a strategy device by minority Muslim organizations. The purpose of the dialogue using small Muslim groups is determined as follows: to foster improved relations with non-Muslim (Christian) communities, mainly in western countries, to foster and enhance relations between minority Muslim communities, finally to revivify Muslim communities themselves. The inter-Muslim dialogue is supposed to result in an intellectual advancement and spiritual stimulation of the parties involved in this dialogue. The long-term success of the inter-Muslim dialogue entails an important modality of inter-religious dialogue, most often Christian-Muslim in western countries. According to the author, small groups can be used in inter-religious dialogue with non-Muslims, promoting relations between minority Muslims and non-Muslims and ensuring the position of Muslims in minority situation at a given time. In the course of discussion the intention is to maintain Islamic authenticity and credibility in Muslim communities with the help of traditional Islamic science and methodology, which should combine the

final project ideas with contemporary concepts of methodology and organization. The combination of traditional Islamic sciences with contemporary sciences is necessary to be relevant to contemporary context, particularly for Muslims in minority situations. In this respect, as the author stresses, there is a need for optimal positioning of small Muslim groups and the corresponding projects among Muslim communities in the local milieu, which means as follows: a small group strategy for Islamic resurgence includes an efficient assessment and response to the local environment as well as provisions taking into account realities in the community.

The proposed methodology for using small Muslim groups consists in a series of six steps providing for assessments of interreligious dialogue in actual practice in North America. This methodology is elaborated in the article of Frank Gilmore “Formulation of Strategy in Smaller Companies”, published in the “Harvard Business Review on Management” in 1975. As was noted in the article, the sophisticated concepts of formulating corporate strategy hold little promise for smaller companies, where strategic planning is actually more of an art than a science: judgment, experience, intuitions and well-guided discussions are the key to success for strategy formulation in small companies. As with smaller American companies, the author assumes that small Islamic organizations will not employ the complex and expensive strategic methodologies of larger organizations. The first follow of Gilmore’s method of formulating a strategy for small Muslim organizations as distinct unions is outlined in six steps: (1) record current strategy, (2) identify problems, (3), discover the core elements, (4) formulate alternatives, (5) evaluate alternatives, (6) choose the new strategy.

The first step of this method will be recording the current strategy, i.e. the strategies of existing Islamic movements, which

depend on their geographical location and origin, intellectual history and unique individual historicity. Assuming that all minority Muslim organizations, immigrant and indigenous, need help with resources of manpower and finances, the experiences of minority Muslim organizations are assumed to be insufficient in their present form for achieving Islamic resurgence. Times and circumstances change and new strategies will have to succeed. Small Muslim groups present an inexpensive option, which offer innovative ways to utilize existing manpower resources

The second step is to identify problems. It can be discerned that many minority Muslim organizations have intellectual and strategic limitations in their leadership and in their membership of most non-scholars, mosques and Islamic institutions are almost always limited in terms of finances and manpower. The minority Muslim communities have resource limitations and remain divided for historical and political reasons. The background for constructing a strategy for Islamic resurgence must assess the existing problems as a starting point before elaboration of realistic prospects for overcoming the problems of Muslim communities.

The third step is the process aimed at discovering core elements of the problems, needs and concerns. The comprehension of the core elements of the problems, inhibiting resurgence of Islam would be a matter of ongoing research and discussion for Muslim scholars and activists, using small Muslim groups and engaging various leaders, scholars and activists. The major category of core elements subject to research should be identified as follows: there is a need to bridge the gap between traditional and contemporary Muslim intellectuals. The analysis of core elements and later formulation of solutions and alternatives is the sphere of the forum, where traditional and contemporary Islamic scholarship can meet.

The fourth step for formulating solutions and alternatives will require that groups of scholars, leaders and activists would accomplish the bridging of the gap in their proposals. The proposals of strategic alternatives should be for interesting and relevant resurgence projects and activities, and the process of formulation and project innovation is critical if community members are to be involved. Possible examples of such projects can be different genres of interreligious dialogue, construction of mosques and Islamic centers. In this process a multitude of small Muslim groups will operate performing one or multiple functions in relation to minority Muslim communities and institutions.

The fifth step should be devoted to evaluation of strategic project alternatives. The question is the choice of the needed strategy: the “business-as-usual” strategy or “do-nothing” alternative is not recommended by the author. The recommended choice includes evaluation of the different new resurgence projects and new choices. The strategy formulation should include an evaluation and selection of associated projects and activities that would carry out the formulated strategy. And some kind of strategic and task control should ensure that chosen resurgence projects are accomplished and the desired outcomes would be achieved.

The sixth and final step is devoted to choosing and applying the new strategy. The choice of the new strategy should take into account both choices of resurgence projects and positioning of small Muslim groups. The small Muslim groups can shift or alternate between being closely or distantly associated with existing minority Muslim communities and movements. This positioning of physical proximity will have a logistical effect on probable cooperative projects and inter-Muslim dialogue between small Muslim groups and minority Muslim communities. Originators and sponsors of small Muslim groups will be able to re-evaluate alternatives and choose new strategies.

The positioning of small groups for engagement will go on by means of adaptation of the six-step method, subject to be reiterated for reformulation of the adopted strategy as necessary, to establish and reposition multiple small Muslim groups in variable proximity to local minority Muslim communities. The “source” of these small Muslim groups benefiting minority Muslim communities can be one or several minority Muslim communities or an outside organization. Critical for success is the quality of Islamic scholarship, of innovative resurgence projects, of inter-Muslim dialogues.

The strategic control of small groups and dialogue across minority communities is a must to ensure that small Muslim groups achieve their intended outcomes. Small Muslim groups, including geographically dispersed and independent groups, which implement their own strategies for Islamic resurgence, should rely on informal controls by phone and mail and traditions, as well on formal and informal strategic controls (written doctrines, guidelines and budgets) to implement their organizational strategies for Islamic resurgence. A mix of controls (formal and informal, doctrinal and financial) may shift amongst these components. The doctrinal and financial controls may be redesigned as necessary and being a product of the six-step strategy methodology.

The author mentioned some studies of American experts, including the chapter by Kurshid Ahmad in “The Blackwell Companion to Contemporary Islamic Thought”, entitled and describing the “World Situation After September 11th, 2001”, as well as the work of Jane I. Smith wherein she described several models of inter-religious dialogue in North America that were attempted. All models, as the author thinks, represent differentiated choices of methodology for inter-religious dialogue. There is a “Dialogue to Come Closer Model” of inter-religious dialogue which entertains a hope that Christianity and

Islam will come closer and look at commonalities, leading to a de-emphasis of differences and a re-emphasis on mutuality and sharing. These models may also be used for planning and programming inter-Muslim dialogue, formulating projects and activities for Islamic resurgence in contexts of small Muslim groups. Muslims engaging in inter-religious dialogues, which they find opening up greater understanding of truth and leading to trust-building, should find established better relations with members of these communities.

The author stresses that qualitative assessment of projects and strategies is important to describe the results of the internal methodology's use in small Muslim groups to achieve advances in Islamic scholarship and implement resurgence projects. As an example of an Islamic scholar recognized internationally for his efforts in Islamic resurgence is mentioned Khurshid Ahmad of Pakistan, who emphasizes the integrity of the Islamic value framework, Islamic methodology, maintaining Islamic authenticity, and respecting the moral fiber of the religion while being able to encounter, without feelings of inferiority, western culture, western thought and western values. Muslims must be in position to protect the moral, ethical and intellectual fiber of Islam, to achieve and maintain integrity of their own Islamic value system, methodology and credibility. Tariq Ramadan is another example of a contemporary scholarly opinion on the needs of the Muslim community in Europe. Small Muslim groups can be elite (scholarly) or non-elite (activist) depending on the needs and purpose of their establishment. Ramadan, citing Yusuf Qardawi, notes that it is not feasible to have individual Muslims performing *ijtihad* and not feasible for jurists individually and alone to master all the necessary sciences to deal with the problems of Muslims in contemporary society. To achieve the methodology proposed by the author the elite groups bringing together multiple scholars might use

the proposed methodology in planning small groups to augment the elite methodology described by Tariq Ramadan and Yusuf Qaradawi, as well as of a third opinion of the British Muslim scholar Abdul-Hakim Murad. Murad opines that the new agenda needed by American communities should not finish in Islamic liberalism as this would lead to an attenuation of faith and its resources for dealing with extremism are limited. The right approach is to return to the spirit of the tradition and quarry it for resources enabling a capacity for courteous conviviality.

The proposed methodology is a strategic tool, which may be utilized by various Muslim organizations and movements as they find beneficial to their own local Muslim communities and to others, Muslim and non-Muslim. The concept of the legitimate use of small Muslim groups to benefit Muslim communities cannot be necessarily limited to western context.

*Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs, Abington,
Vol.29, N 3, September 2009, p.355-367.*

The abstract prepared by L. Khitrov.

Nikolay Medvedev,

doctor of political sciences (RAGS at the President
of the RF)

WHAT IMPEDES THE ETHNIC-POLITICAL STABILITY IN THE NORTH CAUCASUS?

The two main state methods of contemporary political science and practice have been shaped to exert influence upon ethnic-confessional minorities, which as a rule are connected with the conflicts generating situation in the states with poly-ethnic composition of the population:

1. The forceful method (assimilation) is the purposeful activities of the authorities aimed at washing out ethnic-cultural peculiarities of small nations. It is the conception of cultural unification, conditionally called “melting pot”.

2. The consensus method – method of “patch-work quilt” – supposes creation of the system, which takes into account the interests of ethnic-confessional groups and communities on the basis of their autonomous development with simultaneous soft integration of various political interests at the level of the federal state.

Obviously, the problem of ethnic-political tension consists not only in the sphere of legitimate or illegitimate securing the powers among federal, regional and local authorities, but also in the position of regional and federal bureaucracy, as well as in social-economic, cultural and confessional conditions of living of various ethnic groups and communities in the North Caucasus. But the question is that the model of centralization of power (“power vertical”), shaped in contemporary Russia, does not blend with the realities of political process, characterized by the multi-aspect conflict of groups of interests (ethnic-political, economic, ethnic-territorial, ethnic-confessional). “The power of force” is unable in general and more so under conditions of limited resources (economic, military resources and resources of police) to cope with functions of state governance and regulation of various spheres of public life, when poly-ethnicity and confessional ethnicity become actually the only and real opposition for the functioning Russian authorities. The question is also that it is practically impossible to involve the leaders and bearers of ethnic-confessional interests in the process of taking political decisions. Without consensus procedures of the authorities and of all ethnic-confessional groups they have to apply the only- forceful – method of reciprocal action and positioning of their interests.

It should be noted that “neither ethnicity (belonging to a certain ethnos), nor confession (denomination, belonging to certain religious confession) as such are not the reasons for a conflict. The existence of ethnic and/or confessional differences between social and political groups in principle should be the cause of the conflict. The ethnic conflicts are caused by alienation of some ethnic group from political power or, on the contrary, by concentration of power (political, economic, financial) in the hands of any ethnic group, by fears for its identity or by the intention of a state body or of a part of society to use ethnic-confessional factor in political struggle.

According to the Russian secret services, the total amount of the terrorists’ profits account for more than \$ 100 million. As a whole, in various forms the financial support was given to illegal armed groups from 40 countries. The main sponsors of Islamists in the North Caucasus became five countries of the Persian Gulf: Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates, Oman, Qatar and Bahrain. Among others, the following organizations rendered such financial assistance: “Brothers Muslims”, “Islamic World”, “Center for Struggle against Unfaithful”, “Jordan Committee for Assistance to the Chechen Republic”, “Lamaat-i-Islami”, “Al-Haramain”, “Hezb-ut-Tahrir”, “Pakistani Committee of Solidarity with Chechnya” and others. Foreign minister of the government of movement “Taliban” (created by the CIA of the USA jointly with Pakistan) mullah Vakil Ahmad Mutavakil in his time admitted that while “many Muslim states rendered financial assistance and sent arms to Chechnya, but concealed it”, talibs “made public declarations about their support, given to the separatists”.

The financial assistance was rendered to the fighters in Dagestan and Chechnya by the representatives of the North Caucasian Diaspora in the USA (in the states New Jersey, Illinois and Maryland). The assistance was rendered through charitable, religious and educational

organizations. Over 50 pro-Islamists public non-commercial organizations were registered in the USA, which collected voluntary benefits and money donations for “financial and humanitarian assistance” to Chechnya.

Various Turkish religious organizations and foundations, enjoying official status, on the request of the leaders of the Chechen emigration, got permission from the government of Turkey for establishment of “Committee for Solidarity with Chechens of the North Caucasus”.

The Trans-Caucasus has the direct border with the most painful point of Russia – Chechnya, as well as with other republics of the North Caucasus. Russia is interested very much in preventing from the territory of the Trans-Caucasus of any support (of officially sanctioned, of agreed silently or of any other), given to the forces of separatism in the North Caucasus. Therefore it is a vital need to maintain the adequate relations of Russia with Georgia and Azerbaijan, providing for efficient measures to prevent use of the territories of these states for the hostile objectives against Russia. It is difficult for Russia to ensure security and competitiveness of shipment of Caspian oil and gas, of other transportation routes without regulation of regional, ethnic and military conflicts in the Caucasus.

And much concern is being caused by the negative trends, related to the rise of religious extremism, terrorism and narcotics trade, as well as by potential conflicts, which may be the result of territorial, ethnic and social contradictions. Militarization of the region also threatens Russia. Therefore the strategy of Russia in the Trans-Caucasian direction should be closely connected with its national interests, with its urge towards preservation in the Caucasian and the Caspian regions of Russian economic presence and political influence in any forms.

On the large part of the territory of the North Caucasus the czarist, the Soviet and the Russian laws always functioned in specific forms and were observed, if in principle they did not contradict the norms of common law (adats). The leading political role always belonged to the first person of the national-territorial entity, although the leaders of former autonomies never came against the directions of the Center. The relatives, national, clan, kunak, tape connections prevailed in the organs of governance. The priority in development was always given to the main cities, while rural districts with the majority of the population were ignored. Therefore the specific economic models of the Caucasian republics in new time demanded great investments from the federal budget. It was the result of the general depression in industrial, agricultural and tourist sectors. The difficulties were aggravated by the high birth rate, unemployment, while former “shadow employment”, which alleviated difficulties in the past, transformed into organized criminality, creating “jobs” mainly outside the region.

The deep-rooted destitution and low level development of society facilitated there, unlike other Russian regions, development of small-scale corruption, which affected not only the authorities but also became the way of life for the population of the North Caucasian republics.

The proclaimed by new Russia democratic principle of equality of citizens, as well as the new election system, the new state national policy, leveling ethnic peculiarities of territories and living there citizens, first of all, had an impact on indigenous peoples of the Caucasus and small aboriginal ethnoses, which lost the guaranteed representation in organs of the power, the chance by quota to study in higher and high special educational institutions of Russia etc. These circumstances became the reason of emergence of many small

nationalist organizations, protecting their national-ethnic interests and more often than not coming out as an opposition to the authorities.

The principal wealth of the Caucasus – land – became the apple of discord in the sphere of inter-national conflicts not only due to the return to the age-old lands of the deported peoples' descendants but also because these lands became the plots subject to free buying and selling. The development of market relations in the land ownership results in ousting from traditional settlements of representatives of national minorities (not only small nationalities but also Russians, mainly Cossacks) in the North Caucasian republics. The frequent reshaping of the borders in the North Caucasus during the czarist, the Soviet and the new times finally muddled up the situation, i.e. belonging of the territories to one or other subject of the Russian Federation (in the South Federal District). This situation became the reason of their reciprocal territorial claims, which caused, in turn, international and territorial conflicts.

Some other most urgent problems of the North Caucasus may be also be mentioned: a great number of refugees and forced migrants, the uncontrolled migration processes, leading to aggravation of international relations; the accelerated Islamization and dissemination of radical trends of Islam (wahhabism); the problem of separated peoples; the local conflicts in bordering Trans-Caucasian states; the activities of a number of ethnic-national regional and international organizations, having a negative impact on shaping public-political feelings of peoples in the North Caucasus; obviously, the smoldering military conflict in the Chechen Republic.

Nevertheless, the main feature of the situation in the Caucasus consists in the moderate pro-Russian position of the political elite and the majority of the population in the Caucasian republics. Despite numerous claims to the Center, they do not perceive their territories'

destiny outside Russia, outside the common political, legal and cultural space. And the example of Chechnya does not cause a great urge towards imitation of it. The factor of ethnic territory acquired a special urgency in contemporary circumstances for the process of the internal political development in the region. The borders, fixed in the Soviet times, are strictly guarded, having become an attribute of ethnic self-identification and, consequently, the reason of probable inter-ethnic conflict in the region as a whole.

Each subject of the Russian Federation in the SFD has its territorial claims to its neighbors: the Republic of Ingushetia claims for the Prigorodny district of the North Ossetia. Up to the present time, the Prigorodny district is mentioned as an administrative-territorial entity in the constitution of the republic in the article about administrative-territorial composition. The constant discussions go on about demarcation of borders of Dagestan, Stavropol kray. The Cossacks claim for two districts of the Chechen Republic (Shelkovsky and Naursky, which formerly belonged to Stavropol kray). The borders have not been finally regulated between the Republic of Ingushetia and the Chechen Republic, between Chechnya and Dagestan there appear from time to time land disputes in mountainous district for the choice of pastures for cattle. The fighters assault from Chechnya to Dagestan was caused by their intention to annex and to add to Chechnya the territories of joint settlement of the repressed Chechen-Akins and the deported peoples of Dagestan (Avars, Dargins, Laks, Kumyks, Lezgins, Nogai). For several years the leadership of Astrakhan region made claims for some districts of Kalmykia. Kalmykia claims for some lands in Dagestan. Some political forces in Krasnodar kray insist that Republic of Adygeya should join the territory of kray. The problems of Nogais, Lezgins, Ossetians, divided by the borders of different state entities, tend to aggravate. Particularly acute is the problem of divided peoples

in South Ossetia due to the Ossetian-Georgian military conflict. The Cherkessian ultra-nationalists nurture plans of creating “Great Adygeya”, a federal state, opposing Russia and including Kabarda, Cherkessia, Adygeya, Abghazia and other territories, populated by peoples of the Adyg group.

In turn, the national elites’ very negative reaction was caused by the idea of creation of provinces in Russia, for instance, of creating within the SFD two provinces: Black Sea province, including Krasnodar kray, Adygeya and Karachaevo-Cherkessia, and North Caucasus province with the center in Stavropol, including Stavropol kray, Dagestan, Republic of Ingushetia, Chechen Republic and Republic of North Ossetia – Alania.

T. Dzhabrailov, the head of the State Council of Chechnya, made the proposal to unite the republics of the North Caucasus in one kray with the capital in Vladikavkaz. In the past time, Kavkaz kray, consisting of six provinces, existed as a united entity within the Russian Empire till 1917. The territories of the Trans-Caucasus also were included in Kavkaz kray. After the end of the civil war in January 1921 the Bolshevik government approved creation of Gorskaya (Mountainous) republic. But it disintegrated already in September of the same year: Kabardins were the first to leave it, and they were followed by Balkars, Karachais, Cherkessians and Chechens. In July 1924, Ingushetia and Ossetia stepped out of it. The common capital Vladikavkaz was left under “central subordination”, while Gorskaya republic was liquidated. At present, the question is actually about this Gorskaya republic, which existed for a short time. This proposal was provoked by the territorial disputes among the North Caucasian subjects of the Russian Federation. As an interim option, Ingushetia and Chechnya were proposed to be united into one entity.

Thus, the main reasons of negative development of ethnic-political situation in the North Caucasus are as follows:

- the subversive activities of separatists aimed at provoking inter-ethnic conflicts;
- the rising ethnic separation of the title nations under the cover of building their own statehood and self-determination of peoples;
- the change of the traditional inter-ethnic balance in the republics of the North Caucasus (in power structures, in business, in national-ethnic composition of the population) due to the outflow of Russian speaking citizens for the benefit of the title nation; hence, aggravation of the tension in relations with other Caucasian peoples, making numerical minority;
- the lack of thoroughly elaborated federal national policy in the North Caucasus;
- the unstable political and social situation in the region;
- the uncontrolled migration processes and related criminalization of some ethnic Diaspora;
- the corruption, theft and squandering of the state means by organs of local self-government and the state power;
- the incidental type of measures, taken the state bodies and organs of local self-government for counteractions against extremism on the ethnic basis;
- the high level of unemployment and, consequently, low level of living of the population as a nutrient environment for shaping crisis' inter-ethnic processes in the region.

The poly-confessional composition of the population has a certain impact on the internal political situation in the North Caucasus, where the peoples profess Christianity, Islam, Judaism, which are often interconnected with traditional pagan beliefs. The Russian population, including Cossacks, some Ossetians, Kabardins of Mozdok and a small

group of Karachais confine themselves to Orthodoxy. A small part of Cossacks sticks to Old Belief. Since Soviet times, in the North Caucasus some Russians, a small group of Karachais adhere to Protestantism, mainly Baptism. Armenians of the North Caucasus traditionally are monophysites, who adhere to Armenian-Gregorian Church. The mountainous Jews and a part of Tats are Judaists.

The complexity of religious situation is determined first of all by the fact that the region is the buffer between Europe and Asia, the border between the Christian and the Muslim civilizations. At the same time, the traditional organization structures of these two confessions are subject to the constant pressure on the part of adepts of radical religious trends within these religions.

In this respect, the most revealing is the situation of Islamic confession, which is characterized by the split between adepts of traditional “people’s Islam” and followers of mazhab-hanbalits, more precisely, of its wing – wahhabies, or salafits. The extremist wahhabyy organizations, connected with the underground military bands in Chechnya and coordinated by the united center for the role of the power regional structures; the network of the so-called “fighting jamaats” exists throughout the North Caucasus as a whole. Hattab started to shape it. He created on the territory of Chechnya the so-called institute “Kavkaz”, where the youth from neighboring republics mastered basics of wahhabism and was trained for waging the terrorist war as shotfirers.

At present, these jamaats are concentrated in Dagestan, Chechnya and Ingushetia. Others exist in Kabardino-Balkaria and Karachaevo-Cherkessia. The fighting jamaat (“Nogai battalion”) exists in Neftekum district of Stavropol kray.

Thus, the analysis of Russia’ policy in the Caucasus for the period of several centuries as well as of the contemporary practice of realization of national-state interests and security of the Russian

Federation demonstrates that the North Caucasus is the sphere of vital significant interests of Russia, being the buffer zone, hindering dissemination to its territory of negative factors and events, such as inter-confessional and inter-national conflicts, export of narcotics, arms, smuggling etc. The main role and significance of the North Caucasian region for the Russian state consists exactly in this sphere. However, the Caucasus may not belong or be a part of the state, which is weakened politically and is subject to systemic public-political and economic crises. Since this region itself has a conflicting potential, it will logically strengthen and disperse its own political and economic crises to other regions of Russia. Hence, this circumstance supposes the need to elaborate and to realize its efficient state policy, aimed at ensuring constitutional legality and legal order in the North Caucasian region, security of citizens, state and public institutions, liquidation and exclusion of escalation of crises based on inter-ethnic and inter-confessional basis, irrespective of any plausible pretext.

“Politicheskaya regionalistika i etnopolitika”, M., 2010, p. 5–14.

Z. Ashimova,

candidate of sciences (economy) (Kazakhstan)

KAZAKHSTAN IN THE SYSTEM OF INTEGRATION PROCESSES IN CENTRAL ASIA

Five sovereign states were established at the territory of Central Asia within the bounds of the former Union Republics after the USSR dissolution – Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan. Any of them has never existed independently. The republics of the region are united with public education, science, culture and administrative governance inherited from the USSR. They

are connected to transport and energetic infrastructure. Central-Asian people speak closely related languages and are being developed on the base of the common cultural-historical heritage. So, one can say with certainty that Central Asia is relatively newly established international region without inherent consistent system of the international institutions and organizations, each of important non-regional factors (Russia, USA and EU states, China, India and the Islamic states) impact on defining boundaries of Central Asia in their own way.

It's notably that at the beginning of XXI century the central-Asian countries managed to overcome catastrophic recession in economy after the USSR dissolution. Moreover, one could observe that the economy was firmly on the upgrade during several years allowing exceeding the total indexes of the soviet period in some countries.

However, the achievements of Kazakhstan's economic expansion were even significant against a background of a successful development of the other central-Asian states. Today Kazakhstan's gross domestic product considerably exceeds a total gross domestic product of four other countries of Central Asia. So, it's well-grounded that Kazakhstan's leadership began speaking about its possibilities for Kazakhstan's economic strength changing into a resource of the whole region development. Official Astana began realizing a strategy to extend bilateral and multilateral cooperation with the neighbors in order to solve such problem besides setting a precedent for a successful overcoming inertia of the post-soviet recession and improving the image of Central Asian region as a whole.

So, the initiative from Kazakhstan in the president of Nazarbaev was one of the logical steps in developing integration processes in Central Asia. As Nazarbaev stressed now even the largest states understand that it's impossible to live isolated from the other under globalization so Kazakhstan approves intergovernmental associations

as communities being equal in rights where the relations are being made on mutual respect and with regard for interests. Therefore, the efforts to establish Central-Asian Union of the states were the result of putting forth the diplomatic efforts of Astana as many general characteristics of a development and a deep interdependency make the countries of Central Asia the part of the common economic and socio-cultural area. In 1998 the Central-Asian Union was changed into Central-Asian economic community but in 2001 – into Organization of Central-Asian cooperation (OCAC). OCAC was united with the other organization of the post-soviet states – EAEC in four years because of Uzbekistan's joining.

One should note that some experts suppose that Kazakhstan is nevertheless a main “key to Asia”. As early as in 1997 the President of Kazakhstan N.A. Nazarbaev declared about Kazakhstan's ambitions concerning the country's changing into “central-Asian snow leopard” by analogy with the Asian tigers and besides pointed out the national egoism lack in such aspirations. The leader of the state especially noted the direct interest of the Kazakhs in the success of modernization neighbor projects in the region having declared that “he (the Kazakhstan snow leopard) will be united in his aspirations, victories and failures with his brothers nursed by one mother – the Uzbek, Kyrgyz and the other central-Asian snow leopards and will be proud of their growth and achievements”. So, the country clearly declared about its intention to promote a progress all over the whole Central-Asian region as far as possible from the very beginning of its development according to the course of the country development in the national strategy “Kazakhstan-2030”.

One should especially note the meaning of the real changing of Kazakhstan into “regional locomotive” of economic development in Nazarbaev's speeches during the last years. According to the leader of

the Kazakhstan state our country having a strong economy and a stable political system is capable of supporting the analogical aspirations of the whole region making progress directed at rightful participation in global economy. Not abstract desire to help somebody imposes a responsibility to Kazakhstan but a clear awareness of that fact that isolated wellbeing in “common house” can’t be by definition but its real successful development can’t be without a stability, security and wellbeing growth in the neighboring countries. In this connection N.A. Nazarbaev underlined that “today Kazakhstan has possibilities for foreign investments, to increase turnover, to improve the life of common people all over the region. Kazakhstan, in its turn, is interested in economically and politically stable and prospering Central Asia in order to have the favorable external conditions and capacious marketing outlets of production”.

The reason for that is that Kazakhstan has the dual position in the system of the international relations as it simultaneously belongs to the Turkic world and has a religious community with the Islamic states, the historical roots and psychological peculiarities of the national spirit causing its belonging to the East. However, Kazakhstan also belongs to the West as the euro-belonging of Kazakhstan is caused by the demographic and political factors and a type of the secular state establishing. One can justify Nazarbaev’s desire to see Kazakhstan as a country being developed according to global economic trends and having concrete “niche”, let it be small but its own in the system of the world economy and being capable of adapting to the new ones.

Kazakhstan positions itself as a leader among the countries of Central Asia and its superiority doesn’t give rise to special questions. It isn’t officially articulated but everybody knows who the leader is in Central Asia today. Besides, one should note that adapted conception of Kazakhstan’s foreign policy confirms the following strategic line –

“development of integration processes, first of all, within the framework of EAEC and SOC. However then, just OBSE and CAEC traditionally laid stress on bilateral cooperation where one named the main partners as Russia, China, CIS countries, USA, EU countries and also Japan, India, Turkey, Iran but not Kazakhstan’s cooperation within the framework of Central Asian countries.

So, one should note that Kazakhstan is of special importance among the countries in Central Asia who tries to be the central-Asian leader and keep balance between the big players in the given region – Moscow, Peking, Washington and others however, more directed at carrying out its own multi-vector policy than at developing integral mutual relations of Central Asia with the other countries. Astana’s interest in progressive development of the neighbors is based on understanding that successful long-term economic development is impossible without favorable regional surroundings. It’s known that the situation of the surrounding region has an impact to business atmosphere estimation in every individual country. So, Kazakhstan is directly interested in that there would be the stability and wellbeing in Central Asia.

“Voprosy gumanitarnykh nauk”, M., 2010, N1, p. 260–262.

S. Chernyavsky,

doctor of sciences (history)

THE RUSSIAN PRIORITIES IN CENTRAL ASIA

It would seem that headlong increasing globalization of the world economy helps, at last, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan to find own way in life having removed their former “spatial isolation” and especially as because one can observe a concrete adaptation of Central Asia to the new rules and conditions of

coexistence in the international community. The participation of the region countries in the international division of labor gave them an opportunity to connect to telecommunication systems, develop their own technologies, get transnational corporations involved into developing their economies, make structural reorganizations of financial and bank systems, attract investments and improve the population literacy by advanced educational program adopting.

However, global financial-economic crisis amended poorly. It brought to that socio-economic situation in all the region countries is characterized with serious crisis phenomena though a character and their forms are different and depend on economic system development. The national budget in all the states of Central Asia is formed as a rule with a great deficit; price policy isn't coordinated with purchasing power of the population and marketability and one can observe a high ratio of inflation, crisis in banking sphere, stagnation increasing of industrial sector of economy and decline in growth rate of national gross product. The distinctions of the economical crisis in some countries are associated only with a specificity of industrial development of the national economic systems and a level of the market reorganizations.

Kazakhstan being characterized with the largest level of the market institution development, powerful industrial complex, advanced banking system and the great investment resources suffered more than the other countries of Central Asia from a financial crisis. Advanced banking system of the country integrated into the world market using actively the modern forms of mortgage crediting, investments in the securities market, development of stock market was financially shocked more than the other countries of Central Asia. As a result Kazakhstan has serious problems associated with insolvency of mortgage credit

borrowers, their mass bankruptcy, bank profitability decreasing and loss of capital value placed in the securities markets.

Uzbekistan, on the contrary, avoided many problems associated with the world financial crisis as its economy is less integrated into the world markets, is closed and based on a real sector with a poor banking system. Uzbekistan avoided a financial crisis owing to the national economy control and a poor coordination with speculative capital though it didn't save Uzbekistan from growth rate of inflation, lower growth rate of national gross product and solvent consumptive demand decreasing.

Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan suffer from a system crisis being characterized with a deep decline in all economic sectors. There are the highest rates of inflation in these countries: 26,6% and 29,8%, correspondingly and the lowers growth rate of the growth rate of the national gross product – in average about 6% (the worst results in CIS countries). By that one should note that the index growth of the national gross product is of a gross increase for the account of price rises and increasing of trade and commission economic sectors. The industry of these countries can't withstand competition with the foreign producers and the national market yields to import goods more and more decreasing its production. High inflation worsens the problem of decline in growth rate of the real economic sector of Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan. One of the main ways to come out of a recession for the countries of Central Asia is investment attracting, preferably the Russian ones as many western countries exhausted its investment possibilities investing in their own economy saving from the world financial crisis. The degree of integration of the Central Asian region with Russia is also higher so the Russian factor is more than obvious to overcome the crisis.

What is the present Russia's position with respect to Central Asia? What are its priorities? It concerns not only the abstract corner of the world but the considerable part of the former USSR territory of entirety containing about 4 millions square km having the population more than 50 millions of people (the Russian compatriots are 7 millions among them). Russia isn't indifferent to fortunes of nations of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan by virtue of the historical development and long-term living together. But it lays its special claims to foreign-policy course of the Russian Federation In Central Asia and causes the necessity to make purposeful and constant adjustments. As for a strategy the foreign policy of Russia in the region is directed at achieving purposes stated in Conception of foreign policy approved by the president. It concerns such problem solving as:

- Non-admission of alternative security system forming in Central Asia without Russia's participation and counteraction to the attempts to consolidate the position of the third countries;
- Position expansion of the Russian capital in the key industries of the Central Asian countries, free transport corridors and communications providing including fuel-energetic;
- All-round human rights and interests protection of the Russian citizens and compatriots and position strengthening of the Russian language and culture of Russia's people;
- Consolidation of many-sided structures with Russia's participation and their key importance improving for stability and security at the southern boundaries.

Foreign-policy efforts of Russia in Central Asian region are concentrated on three main trends –bilateral cooperation, multilateral cooperation on security and economic integration. The Russian party adheres to the following priorities to develop bilateral cooperation.

The Republic of Kazakhstan is the main military-political and economic partner of Russia in Central Asia. A strategy of our mutual relations is defined by the geopolitical position of Kazakhstan, its large economic and resource potential, the unique cosmodrome “Baikanur” meaning for Russia and 4 millions of the Russian population. Bilateral contacts are notable for the active multi-aspect cooperation, solid contractual legal framework (more than 300 contracts and agreements are signed). The main documents – Treaty of friendship, cooperation and mutual assistance dated by 25 May 1992, Declaration of eternal friendship and cooperation oriented at XXI century dated by 6 July 1988.

Intensive political contacts are supported between two countries, first of all, at high level. In 2007 there were 8 personal meetings of the presidents of Russia and Kazakhstan and in 2008 – there were also 8 meetings including the state visit of the President of the Russian Federation D.A. Medvedev in Astana 22-23 May 2008. Kazakhstan takes the third position in external economic links of Russia with the CIS countries after Byelorussia and Ukraine. Kazakhstan’s share amounts to 15% in total turnover of the Russian Federation with the CIS countries. Russia’s specific weight in goods exchange operations of Kazakhstan is 24,7%. Production of fuel-energetic complex and machinery-building is the leader in the structure of the Russian export in Kazakhstan. In 2008 a turnover between Russia and Kazakhstan in comparison with 2007 is increased by 19,3% and amounted to 19,7 milliards dollars. The Russian export was increased by 12,1% and amounted to 13,3 milliards dollars but import from Kazakhstan –by 37,8% (up to 6,3 milliards dollars). Turnover of order 40% accounts for the frontier trade. Fuel-energetic complex is the key field of economic cooperation. In 2008 Kazakhstan produced about 70 millions tons of oil, 63 millions were imported. Astana’s plans are to increase a

production up to 80 millions tons in 2010 and 100 millions tons in 2015. Now there are two main ways of its oil delivery for the world market for Kazakhstan. Both of them pass via Russia – it's the Caspian pipeline consortium (CPC) reaching the Black Sea port Novorossiysk and the line Atyrau-Samara. Besides, there is a project on the Kazakhstan oil delivery in China by the pipeline Atasu-Alashan'kou with the initial capacity of 10 millions tons in a year. In May 2008 Russia and Kazakhstan agreed to increase a capacity of CPC from 32 millions to 67 millions tons of oil in a year –during the period up to 2012 in two stages. The cooperation in the sphere of power engineering (energetic systems of Russia and Kazakhstan function in the parallel regime) and atomic engineering (joint development of uranium fields in Kazakhstan), in oil and gas industries (the Kazakhstan oil transit for export via Russia's territory, purchase and marketing of the Kazakhstan natural gas for deliveries for the third country markets and the common project implementation on developing hydrocarbon resources of the Northern Caspian Sea is being developed. The cooperation is also being developed in the space field. Russia leases the complex "Baikanur" located in Kazakhstan. In January 2004 a lease of the complex was renewed up to 2050. A space rocket complex "Baiterek" is being established on the cosmodrome "Baikanur" on the base of bilateral intergovernmental agreements signed in December 2004 and January 2005. Russia and Kazakhstan cooperate in the military and military-technical fields. The Russian armaments are delivered in Kazakhstan and one assists to repair and modernize the Kazakhstan military equipment. Russia leases four military-testing areas at the territory of Kazakhstan. The Kazakhstan servicemen are educated in the Russian military schools. The border delimitation between Russia and Kazakhstan is ended (its length is more than 7,5 thousands km). The

leaders of the states signed a Treaty on the Russian –Kazakhstan state border in 18 January 2005 in Moscow.

The importance of the partnership with Kyrgyzstan for Russia is defined by its geopolitical position in strategically important region and the great number of the Russian population (about 550 thousands people; 15 thousands are from Russia).

The approaches of two countries on urgent global and regional problems and the problems on a development and strengthening the CIS countries, OBSE and Eurasian EU practically coincide. The Kyrgyz party is interested in customs union forming in format of Eurasian EU. A close cooperation is within the framework of SOC. The Russian regions are interested in the direct relation establishing with the Kyrgyz partners. The most active partners of Kyrgyzstan are the partners of Moscow and Moscow oblast, Saint-Petersburg, Yekaterinburg, Sverdlovskoi, Novosibirskoi, Penzenskoi, Yaroslavskoi, Omskoi oblasts, Altai and Tatarstan. The trade-economic contacts are dynamically being developed. Russia is a leading trade partner of Kyrgyzstan. In 2008 bilateral turnover amounted 1,8 milliards dollars. The main goods of the Russian export are oil products (about 70%), machines, equipment, carriers, food goods, chemistry production, wood and pulp and paper goods, metals and metal goods. The Kyrgyz import is clothes, glass and glass goods, fruits and vegetables. Education and science, the Russian language strengthening and keeping in Kyrgyzstan are the priorities in the field of humanitarian cooperation. The Kyrgyz-Slavic University is of great importance in this respect. More than 13 thousands of the Kyrgyz students study in the Russian institutions and the costs for education of 10 thousands among them are completely compensated by the Russian party.

With the republic of Tajikistan Russia concluded a Treaty on friendship, cooperation and mutual assistance, more then 130

intergovernmental, interdepartmental agreements are signed controlling cooperation in political, economic, military, humanitarian and other fields.

Russia is one of the main trade partners of Tajikistan firmly maintaining the leading positions on its goods import in the country. According to data of Ministry of economic development of Russia turnover volume between our countries was increased by 30,3% in 2008 and for the first time it amounted to 1002,8 millions dollars; the Russian goods export amounted to 794,1 millions dollars and import - 208,7 millions dollars. “INTER RAO EES” puts a large joint project into practice in Tajikistan; it concerns Sangtudinskoi hydroelectric power plant construction with rated capacity of 670 MW. Bilateral cooperation is being developed in the military field. In Tajikistan the Russian 201- motorized infantry division is stationed; its units are transformed into 201-russian military base beginning from 1 October 2005 when the intergovernmental Treaty dated by 16 April 1999 came into effect. The parties are interested in further development of the military-technical cooperation. The total volume of the Russian military-technical assistance for Tajikistan amounted to 68 millions dollars in 2006-2008 including about 21 millions in 2008.

Turkmenistan has greatly improved the contacts with Russia in the political sphere including at high level recently. The president D.A. Medvedev officially visited Ashkhabad in July 2008. The president of Turkmenistan G.M. Berdymukhamedov made a working visit in Moscow in April 2007 but there was its state visit on 24-26 March 2009. During his visit the Russians were suggested to take an active part in project implementation in free economic zone “Avaza” in the Caspian region, organize train ferry between the towns Turkmenbashi and Makhachkala and also play the role of a general contractor when building the eastern wing of transport corridor “the North-the South”

(the railway Kazakhstan-Turkmenistan-Iran). Inter-Parliamentary exchange is becoming more brisk. The group of the members of Council of Federation visited Ashkhabad in October 2008 after the visit of State Duma delegation led by G.N. Seleznev (1998) and the group of State Duma delegates (2002). In 2008 a turnover (without taking into account gas deliveries) amounted to 910,2 millions dollars (in 2007 - 453,7 millions dollars). Export -809,9 millions dollars, import -10,3 millions dollars. The main Russian export is machines, equipment and carriers, chemistry production, metals and metal goods, food and produce but import is chemistry production, textile and textile goods and mineral products. Russia continues to be the first among foreign-trade partners of Turkmenistan both by export and import. In 2008 39,2% of the Turkmen foreign-trade turnover was the share of Russia (50,5% of export and 16% of import). The main sphere of economic cooperation is fuel-energetic complex. According to the agreement signed in Ashkhabad in November 2008 gas price amounted to 130 dollars for 1 thousand cbm in the first half-year but in the second half-year 2008 it was increased to 150 dollars and from the first January 2009 one will define it according to price formula on market principles. 121 enterprises with the participation of the Russian capital is registered in Turkmenistan and 120 projects and contracts with the participation of the Russian companies for an overall amount of 331,4 millions dollars and 3,94 milliards rubles. Some Russian companies – OAO “Silovye mashiny”, “Kamaz”, “Mobile systems”, “Itera” and “Stroitransgas” are successful on the Turkmen market.

With the republic Uzbekistan one supports regular political contacts on a higher and at the high levels. 200 Russian-Uzbek intergovernmental, interstate and interdepartmental agreements are contractual legal framework of bilateral cooperation. Two visits on a higher level –A. Karimov in Moscow 5-6 February 2008 and D.A.

Medvedev in Tashkent 22-23 January 2009 resulted in signing the following documents: Joint declaration of the President of the Russian Federation and the President of Republic Uzbekistan and intergovernmental program on economic cooperation for 2008-2012. Russia continues to be the main trade partner of Uzbekistan. In 2008 Russia accounted for 19,1% of turnover of the republic (in 2007 - 29,4%). Uzbekistan takes the fourth place by volume of mutual trade with Russia among the CIS countries. Uzbekistan accounts for 3,8% of the total volume of the Russian turnover with the CIS countries. The main products of the Russian export in Uzbekistan are machines, equipment, carriers (33%), metals and metal goods (23%), wood and pulp and paper goods (23%) but import – machines, equipment, carriers (57%), textile and textile goods (21%), food and agricultural resources. The Russian firms are interested in investing the Uzbek economy. There are 786 joint enterprises in the republic. Investment volume of the Russian party to form their authorized capital exceeds 1 milliard dollars. There are 300 companies with the Uzbek capital in Russia. The national security by means of bilateral and multilateral cooperation with the countries of Central Asia is one of the most important trends of the Russian strategy in the region. One should strengthen the corresponding cooperation because of ungarded state border of Russia under conditions of increasing drug traffic from Afghanistan in the CIS countries, Russia and further in Europe.

The leadership of some states –the members of OBSE had to regard the situation with a sober light because of the events 2008 in the Southern Caucasus. A military threat is real in spite of all the politician talks about peace adherence and frictionless development. So, in February 2009 there was a decision on forming Collective Rapid Response Forces (CRRF) at the summit OBSE in order to establish the united highly professional and efficient grouping of OBSE. CRRF will

allow responding all the threats and challenges more effectively and more strictly. First of all, it concerns sovereignty protection and territorial integrity of states, terrorism, extremism and drug traffic resistance, special operation against organized criminal groups and at last, warning and elimination of backwash effects of natural and anthropogenic emergency situations. The most perspective trend of cooperation strengthening in Central Asia is, according to Russia, entering into multi-aspect economic cooperation, a regional “common market” forming being capable of overcoming mass poverty on the base of stable economic development. Just solving these vital problems can help to form effective democracy in the states of Central Asia and provide their civilized development.

The success of the central-Asian vector of Russia’s foreign policy depends in many respects on that to what extent the Russian party can help its partners to solve effectively their life-and-death problems in economy (water-energetic, transport, food, labor statistics and migration), the national security protection (struggle against criminals, drug threat and terrorism) and humanitarian sphere (secular education). A foreign policy must be a real assistant to solve the national problems. However, as foreign and policy resources are limited objectively they must concentrate, first of all, on problems being life-and-death for Russia. It’s a reliable security in all its perspectives, favorable conditions promotion for economic recovery of the country and human rights protection of the Russian citizens and compatriots abroad. A criterion of the relations with the partners must be mutual sociability to cooperation and a readiness for a real consideration for each other.

Under conditions when there are active “new players” in the region having a considerable financial and military-political potential the Russian foreign policy needs extensive resources. So, as it seems

one should apply the principles of the necessity for additional costs in perspective strategic project otherwise it's impossible to achieve the necessary strategic purposes under intense competition over the post-soviet area.

One should also take into consideration potential Russia's conflicts with the other economic and political players in the given region especially with USA, EU countries and China. It would be counter-productive for the Russian interests to change this region into a new field of confrontation between Russia and USA. For us it would be more preferably to have advance information about the Americans plans in this region in long term in the context of joint anti-terrorist struggle and also a participation in developing and implementation of the major economic projects being profitable for Russia. It's necessary to use the united impact threat of religious extremism being common for Russia, USA and the countries of Central Asia. Therewith one should proceed from the main thing – the most dangerous scenario of the event development for Russia can be destabilization, disorganization of the existing secular regimes, interstate conflicts and religious extremist coming to power.

“Mir i politika”, M., 2010, N 2, p. 87–98.

**РОССИЯ
И
МУСУЛЬМАНСКИЙ МИР
2010 – 8 (218)**

Научно-информационный бюллетень

Содержит материалы по текущим политическим,
социальным и религиозным вопросам

Гигиеническое заключение

№ 77.99.6.953.П.5008.8.99 от 23.08.1999 г.

Подписано к печати 27/VII-2010 г. Формат 60х84/16

Бум. офсетная № 1. Печать офсетная. Свободная цена

Усл. печ. л. 4,75 Уч.-изд. л. 4,2

Тираж 300 экз. Заказ № 128

Институт научной информации по общественным наукам РАН,

Нахимовский проспект, д. 51/21,

Москва, В-418, ГСП-7, 117997

Отдел маркетинга и распространения информационных изданий

Тел/ Факс (499) 120-4514

E-mail: market @INION.ru

E-mail: ani-2000@list.ru

(по вопросам распространения изданий)

Отпечатано в типографии ИНИОН РАН

Нахимовский пр-кт, д. 51/21

Москва В-418, ГСП-7, 117997

042(02)9

