

THEORETICAL ISSUES

UDC 327, LBC 66.4(2Rus)

© Osipov G.V.

Political blackmail – the eve of the global catastrophe



**Gennadii Vasil'evich
OSIPOV**

RAS Academician, Director of the Institute of Socio-Political Research of the Russian Academy of Sciences (32A, Leninsky Avenue, Moscow, 119991, Russia)

Abstract. The article by the leading Russian sociologist and political scientist, who has been studying Russia-U.S. relations for decades, raises an acute issue concerning the necessity of immediate cessation of confrontation between the U.S. and Russia and transition to joint control over the processes going on in the world, and establishment of the multipolar model of the global community.

The author provides numerous examples of interaction between the superpowers and the newly emerged countries, former Soviet republics; he shows that particular threat comes from the quasi-states of the former USSR, who seek to fuel the U.S.-Russian confrontation for their own selfish purposes. This policy was manifested especially clearly in the actions of the “Maidan” authorities in Ukraine, who launched the armed terror against its own people in the East of the country to accommodate the U.S. interests and the NATO alliance controlled by this country. The author believes that the response of Russia to such hostile actions of the USA and their Ukrainian proteges should be adequate; it should be composed and peacekeeping, but when the “red” line is crossed – hard and adamant.

The author believes that, in connection with the existing situation, the issue of myth-making is coming to the fore. One should be more resolute in reviewing the myths that have nothing to do with the truth, in particular, those concerning the “unbreakable Slavic unity”. The historical memory of inter-ethnic relations between the Russians and their neighbors should be restored in full, without ignoring the facts that are “inconvenient” for the mythology. It is time for Russia to abandon (at least temporarily) its missionary work and selflessness in its relations with Eastern European neighbors, and start building these relations solely on the basis of mutual benefit and respect of mutual obligations.

Key words: globalization, confrontation, intergovernmental relations, threat to the world, catastrophe, mythology, blackmail, superpowers, self-sufficiency, sanctions, aggression, partnership development, convergence, messianism, well-being, tradition, culture, paradigm.

In the late 20th – early 21st century human civilization has undergone certain qualitative changes inconsistent with the *old system of governance*. Current public administration that is based on a trial-and-error method both on the national and global scale is fraught with unpredictable social, economic, political and geopolitical consequences. These effects, according to scientists, can be *irreversible* for modern civilization. Under the circumstances, any experiments on countries and peoples must be excluded entirely.

Who poses a threat to peace and international security?

According to a poll conducted in November – December 2013 by the WIN/Gallup International, 54% of Russians consider the United States a dangerous country; 24% of the people of the world think the same. Those countries that are marked by world ideologists as “hotbeds of evil and threats” are much less dangerous in the opinion of the world community. Only 8% of respondents believe that the threat to peace is coming from Pakistan, and 6% think that danger nests in China. 5% consider Iran, Israel, Afghanistan and North Korea potentially dangerous countries. According to global estimates, only 2% of respondents think that Russia is a threat.

15% of citizens in Western Europe, 25% in Asia, and 33% in the Middle East regard the U.S as the dangerous country. The largest number of people, who consider the U.S. to

be dangerous, is in Pakistan (44%), Serbia (45%), Turkey (45%), Argentina (46%), Bosnia (49%) and China (49%).

Commenting on the survey, **Andrei Milekhin**, President of the research holding Romir, Coordinating Director of the WIN/Gallup International in Russia, the CIS and Eastern Europe, believes that its results reflect the real situation in the world in recent years.

“Granted, the West maintains (so far!) its economic and military advantage. However, the process of regionalization of the world is gaining momentum. “The unified center for global control” has proved ineffective and threatening to humanity. It will inevitably give way to multipolarity” [IA REGNUM. 12.08.14].

Of course, it will surrender peacefully, without confrontation. Any serious conflict between the two world superpowers can instigate a world war III.

The blackmail on the part of third countries is no less dangerous to the world and it is a serious problem in the relationship between the United States and the Russian Federation. This blackmail can be described, without exaggeration, as a path to *global catastrophe*.

The essence of the problem is as follows. The greatest geopolitical catastrophe, planned by Western intelligence agencies led to the collapse of the USSR. The United States of America claimed leadership in the unipolar world, and the U.S. Government disregards the two aspects of contemporary international reality.

The first is huge stockpiles of weapons of mass destruction, sufficient to destroy all life on the planet. The second is the growing claims of old and new emerging countries concerning the high level of the quality of life, corresponding to or, at least, approaching the socio-economic realities of the so-called developing countries.

But do the new countries have any objective basis for such claims? Experience shows that out of more than 190 nation-states that are current UN members and that form the modern civilization only few can be defined as truly self-sufficient.

The leading countries, to which we include Russia and the United States, have become such not only due to the presence of vital resources like hydrocarbons, natural gas, metal ores, coking coal, mineral fertilizers, etc. on their territories, but also due to a high level of technological and economic development.

Countries that are not self-sufficient economically and, therefore, politically, can not survive on their own. They have to look to the leaders of development in one way or another. This situation gives rise to new complicated problems for the leading countries themselves.

Confrontation between the great powers, which is largely negative in its essence, is provoked by those very countries that have not established themselves in the market of global division of labor and trade, and that can offer only political services to one superpower in its confrontation with another superpower.

This can be said not only about the former Soviet republics, but also a number of other

countries in Europe, Africa, Latin America and Asia.

While the USSR existed, its republics, except for Belarus and Azerbaijan, were subsidized largely at the expense of Russia; and now it is very hard for them to break off this habit, despite the fact that they have become independent nation-states. Therefore, Russia is experiencing continued pressure from the CIS nations and the former Warsaw Pact allies. They threaten Russia with plans to deploy NATO bases on their territory, and even with outright aggression, as it was during an armed invasion of South Ossetia by Georgia, when Russian peacekeepers, whose immunity was confirmed by the mandate of the UN Security Council, were killed together with Ossetians.

The U.S. is also blackmailed by unceasing demagogic appeals to defend “young democracies” from the “hand of Moscow”, by demands to supply modern arms and “humanitarian aid”. There emerged a new, outrageous in its shameless cynicism, pattern of building relationships between “independent” countries and superpowers – Russia and the United States, when these “independent” countries beg their overseas patron for political and even military protection and at the same time, demand that Russia give them economic privileges in exchange for dubious promises that they will slow down their movement in the Western direction, postpone their accession to NATO, back Russia in minor international issues, etc.

International security problems created over and over again by Eastern European and other “independent” countries for the whole

world community are quite comparable with the effects of growing religious extremism, primarily Islamic fundamentalism.

Blackmailing the U.S. and Russia could lead to a military conflict between the superpowers and, consequently, to a geopolitical catastrophe. In the case of U.S.-Russian military conflict there would be no winners, because the military actions between the superpowers will destroy all life on Earth including simple organisms. **Political blackmail is the eve of a global catastrophe. Political blackmail must be outlawed.**

It is time for the U.S. and Russia to reconsider their relationships and the principles, the methods of control, which they were guided by in their domestic and international policies, and to build new methods that would be clear and complying with mutual interests and modern outlook.

First of all, it is necessary to abandon the practice when one's allies are encouraged and even forced to confront the geopolitical rival. The U.S. in its global political game with Russia does not need to play the cards named "Poland", "Czech Republic", "Georgia", "Syria", "the Baltic States", etc. But Russia should also be more careful and correct in building its partnership and allied relations, in particular, with a number of Caribbean countries that are leaders in Latin America. These countries, although located in close proximity to the natural area of U.S. national interests, show obstinacy bordering on aggressiveness toward their Northern neighbor. So far, the obstinacy is verbal, but it is well known that battle of words often provokes hot conflicts.

Some initial strokes of a new road map of diplomatic relations between Russia and the United States have already been drawn on a clean sheet; and in order to continue this "cartography" that is crucial for the whole world, we should show respect to those steps towards our country, which were made by the administration of President B. Obama.

I have no intention to lessen the services of Russian diplomacy in general and the President of the Russian Federation Vladimir Putin in particular. They helped to prevent external aggression of NATO against Syria, to conclude long-awaited agreements with Iran, which not only lowered the threshold of nuclear threat in the Middle East, but also took Iran, the leading Middle Eastern power, out of humiliating economic isolation costly for Iran's economy. Again, for the sake of fairness, I note that it might be that the U.S. did not provide definite support to Russia's peaceful initiatives, but at least it showed reasonable willingness to refrain from strong-arm conflict that could lead to a tragic finale in the geopolitical confrontation between the great powers.

Not long ago all diplomatic activity and enforcement actions of the USA in the Middle East were carried out solely in the interests of the state of Israel and pro-American Saudi Arabia and Qatar. Now the Obama Administration is showing the Arab majority in the region that it will take into account their interests as well. Skeptics would likely to argue that "it is known where the road paved with good intentions leads". I would answer: "The one succeeds who tries; and the road, hard and dangerous as it may be, will rise to meet the one who walks it".

I am well aware that the changes in the U.S. politics, and often not the changes themselves, but, rather, a vaguely expressed *predisposition* to them, are so limited in every aspect and disguised from their domestic and world “hawks”, that perhaps, only the veterans of American politics, such as your humble servant, can notice these changes. I agree that geopolitical micro-concessions, which I am talking about, are dictated largely by protracted crisis phenomena in the U.S. economy and in its financial sector.

At any rate, for us it is important that American establishment, consciously or under the circumstances, albeit with obvious irritation, begins to realize that the role of the world’s only center of power and development, which was objectively assumed by the U.S. after the USSR had left the world arena, is going beyond the means of the first power in the world.

Granted, the global crisis has affected all nation-states without exception, so the rise of a second superpower is not expected in the foreseeable future. Nevertheless, both China that is steadily enhancing its key economic indicators and the Russian Federation that is restoring its unique power persistently and successfully will inevitably challenge America on the world stage. (Here it is worth recalling the series of meetings, which President V.V. Putin held November 28–29, 2013 in Sochi with developers and manufacturers of new high-precision weapons; a strict and clear task was set before them: to ensure in the shortest term the provision of the Armed Forces with the sufficient number of weapons, which will make Russia invulnerable to any aggression).

And they are followed closely by India, Brazil, and Indonesia. And of course, one should not forget about Japan that has survived phantasmagoric natural disasters with amazing firmness and nobility.

The international community is moving toward a multipolar world slowly, halting and backtracking, but moving anyway. Moving toward the situation where a permanent dialogue, rather than force pressure, becomes the main form of dealing with global issues. Although this road is long, we have to prepare ourselves for a new world political configuration right now.

The transition to a qualitatively new partnership between the two great powers, which was scientifically grounded by Pitirim Sorokin, a great American sociologist of Russian origin, in his work “Mutual convergence of the United States and the U.S.S.R. to the mixed sociocultural type” [*Pitirim A. Sorokin. 1961*], does not mean to harm third countries in any way. Moreover, a trust relationship between them will give a major impetus for many other countries in finding constructive solutions to their socio-political problems on the basis of the free democratic choice of market relations and real opportunities.

However, despite the efforts that Russian President Vladimir Putin makes to mitigate the confrontation between Russia and the United States of America in the international arena, this confrontation will not relent significantly. After making a step toward us, our American partner Barack Obama, as a rule, makes two steps backward or sideways. A typical example is the civil war in Ukraine, which was prepared, provoked

and supported by the U.S. and its globally dependent EU nations, although they are doing it reluctantly, often under coercion. They support America neither for the benefit of Ukraine, nor for the benefit of Europe, but only to annoy Russia. Is that decent?

We note that direct confrontation between the USA and the Russian Federation is observed infrequently, since there are virtually no serious geopolitical reasons for such confrontation. Geographically Russia and the United States are located on different continents and have no common land borders. Both countries are fully self-sufficient and their economies do not depend on the level of import-export relationship. We have no claims against each other in retrospective; on the contrary, the history of relations between our countries and peoples is a history of effective cooperation and military brotherhood during the periods critical for the international community. Suffice it to recall that in World War I (the Great War as it is called in the West), and in World War II, the Russian Empire and the USSR, on the one hand, and the United States of America on the other, were allies.

The peoples of Russia and the Americans have similar traits of character: friendliness, openness to the world, patriotism that are intertwined, sometimes quite peculiarly, with messianic aspirations.

Let me recall that uncertainty and increased propensity to conflict has emerged, first of all, because the new so-called “developing countries”, at least many of them, are trying to build their prosperity by using the contradictions between the USA and Russia.

One can understand the logic of Georgia, seeking by all means to keep Abkhazia within the borders of the single state. Having created a recreational and tourism cluster on the Black Sea coast of Abkhazia, the Georgians can live off the money coming from European tourists and almost do not have to work. But why should the Georgians thrive at the expense of the territory belonging to the Abkhazian people? Especially since it is not Abkhazia that was historically part of Georgia, but it is Georgia that was part of the great Abkhaz State. One can understand Ukraine according to the same “logic”.

In reality, we should not forget that Kiev has never been a Ukrainian city, and Zaporizhian Sich joined Russia voluntarily, seeking a refuge from invaders from the South and West, from Muslim and Catholic countries.

Central and Western Ukraine was occupied by Poland for a long time and, most likely, would have still remained under that oppression, if not for the intercession of Russia.

Ukraine in its present form was outlined in the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk. The country even comprised part of the Voronezh and Kursk oblasts of Russia. After the denunciation of the Treaty, V.I. Lenin decided to preserve that ungrounded extension of the Ukrainian territory. Thus, the South, East, and much of the West of Ukraine never were Ukraine, with the exception of the troubled time at the end of World War I and Bolsheviks’ manipulations with the boundaries of the former Russian Empire. And despite this, the Russian Federation supports the integrity of the Ukrainian state.

But Russia cannot ignore the interests of 11 million Russian population of Ukraine and be indifferent to the attempts of Banderists to deprive our compatriots of their sovereign rights. Their *traditions, culture and language* must be preserved!

There was absolutely no logic in the transfer of Crimea to the Ukrainian SSR. It was a voluntaristic decision made by N.S. Khrushchev, who flirted with the political party association of Ukraine in order to get support in the struggle for power in Moscow. The behavior of the leaders of the USA and their satellites resembles that of the famous character from a book by Ilya Ilf and Evgeny Petrov, “whose whole being protested against stealing, yet it was impossible for him not to steal”.

It is well known that political ideas of the Ukrainian leadership in the modern period were as follows: Russia is to provide the industry and 30 million Ukrainian population with almost free gas, otherwise, Ukraine would lease Sevastopol, the city of Russian glory, to the U.S. Navy rather than to the Russian Navy. And what we see here, concerns not so much economic benefits (pragmatic Americans would not overpay a cent to their allies), as another attempt to humiliate and insult the Russian people.

The majority of the Ukrainians understand that sooner or later the issue of misappropriated territories will come to the fore, so in order to keep them, Ukrainian leaders are persistently stirring up Russophobic attitudes among the population, especially the youth. At the same time they do everything to join NATO and to strengthen their aggressive encroachments through the power of this aggressive military-political alliance.

One can also understand the viewpoint of the United States of America. They suffered humiliation from us, when the Soviet Union deployed its nuclear missiles in Cuba, when it successfully supported anti-American regimes in Nicaragua and other countries in Latin America, Northern and Central Africa. America has never forgiven those mortifications and is now trying to take revenge.

Simultaneously, the U.S. is experiencing the period of radical change in weapon generation. Against what enemy does America intend to use the latest weapons? Definitely not against Russia! But the U.S. cannot abandon the production of weapons anyway. Its military-industrial complex is the most powerful industrial and economic factor, the most important social component of the American economy. Even a partial reduction in weapons production will lead the country to a serious unemployment, reduction of economic growth, stagnation and inevitable crisis that would hurt the most vulnerable segments of the population. Thus, this criminal arms race, this road to nowhere, is continuing.

We are not saying that the train of American military-industrial complex, rushing at full speed, has to be stopped abruptly. The idea is to help our American partners to re-orient their powerful economic potential from the task of destruction to the task of creation.

Take, for instance, the participation of American corporations in the creation of the so-called “corridor of development” proposed by Russia, the concept and initial estimates and substantiation of which were prepared by the Russian Academy of Sciences.

This global transport corridor, complemented by powerful fiber-optic communication lines and developed infrastructure, would cover the Eurasian and North American (with the prospect to continue in South America) continents with a life-giving artery of high-speed communication, modern logistics and modern information systems. Its creation and subsequent development and maintenance will require millions of highly-skilled and well-paid jobs. The “corridor of development” will provide the Russian and American economies and their business partner states with guaranteed orders for decades.

But in addition to the land “corridor of development” stretching throughout Russia, we have another important strategic project that consists in the development of the Northern Sea Route at a qualitatively new technological and logistical level. This project will open the gate to the Russian Arctic, the richest and most promising depository of global hydrocarbon reserves.

It will also make the water transport route from Europe to Asia much shorter and considerably less expensive. If currently it takes more than one and a half months to travel along the most favorable route from European ports in the Baltic States to the Pacific region through the Suez Canal, then the trip along the Northern Sea Route will take only 21 days!

It is very important that all of our partners and opponents in the world community understand that Russia fundamentally rejects confrontation with the U.S., the leading power in the world. Yes, we oppose the desire of American elite to impose on all

the other countries the policy of post-modernization based on a limited sovereignty, sharp reduction of economic activity in these states, de-territORIZATION and abandonment of an independent foreign policy. Russia cannot agree with persistent attempts of the U.S. to accelerate the transition to a unipolar world in order to establish its world domination and submit other countries and peoples to its uncontrolled dictate.

The Americanization of the modern world, which is declared by the U.S. foreign policy as the most important global trend of world development, finds no support on the part of the Russian Federation and will find none of it in the future.

But we do not accept another extreme – the anti-Americanism, which had found its most vivid expression in the statement of A. Parfrey: “Wheresoever you may be, death will overtake you, even if you be in strongly built towers” [Parfrey Adam. 2003]. Russia’s foreign policy considers this extremist tendency a serious threat to world security, the threat that in some cases becomes dramatic and anti-human.

The status of allies in the World War II brought together the peoples of the Soviet Union and the United States of America. Our “today” originates in our victorious year of 1945. Neither the common citizens nor the establishment of our two countries must forget about this in any case.

Russia and its American partners have much in common, many similar problems that require urgent solving. For instance, global *non-proliferation* issues, whether it is nuclear weapons or the latest traditional military systems, dangerous biological

experiments (human cloning, genetically modified food), terrorism and racial extremism, aggressive forms of religion (Wahhabism, the Taliban, totalitarian sects), drug trafficking, moral perversion (pornography, sodomy, prostitution, organ trade), etc. **In principle, only Russia and the United States are able to solve these problems by uniting and targeting their efforts.** No other country on the planet has either political, or economic, or military capacity to do that. **The understanding of the situation should strengthen the responsibility of the two countries for the fate of the world.**

The Russian Federation and the United States of America are not only the centers of power of the human civilization, but also the leading countries in scientific research. It is science, as the basis of the modern worldview, as a significant (along with religion and art) source of the development of moral imperative, that can respond to increasingly expanding and deepening challenges of modernity.

Not much time is left to show it. Therefore, I urge supporters and helpers, of which I am part, of a new cardinal rapprochement between Russia and the United States to act in the national interest of Russia and the United States, in the interests of all mankind.

The Russian Federation is ready and open to this kind of cooperation, which has been voiced many times in the statements and clearly defined initiatives of the President of the Russian Federation V.V. Putin, in the statements of the Foreign Minister of the Russian Federation S.V. Lavrov and other top officials of the Russian Federation. But are American partners willing to support us in this

noble aspiration? As we can see, most often they are not. Selfish interests of American business, the desire to “bend” Russia, to force it to accept the role of the driven one in the international political configuration now and then win over sanity and commitment to a non-confrontational development of relations with natural partners of the U.S.

America has shown such attitude in relation to the crisis in Ukraine, which the vast majority of the Russian citizens consider their personal emotional pain. For them the tragedy of the neighboring brotherly people, who had been living in friendship and unity with the Russians and other peoples of Russia for centuries, is a personal tragedy.

Western leaders, having provoked a civil war in the South-East of Ukraine, tried to oppose the Slavic peoples once again and forever. Dostoevsky wrote about this: “They (*the Slavs*. – G.O.) will begin their new life by asking Europe – England and Germany, for instance – for guarantees and protection of their freedom, and even though Russia will also be part of the concert of European powers, they will do this precisely as a means of defense against Russia. They will certainly begin by announcing internally, if not openly, that they are not obliged to Russia in anything, but on the contrary, that they barely escaped Russia’s ambition thanks to interference of the European concert when making peace... [Dostoevsky F.M. 1877].

Overseas politicians see Ukraine, currently engulfed in civil war, as a prospective buffer area turned into a NATO military base, a raw materials supplier and a provider of cheap labor for the United Europe. That is why America, together with Europe established

in Kiev a government that advocates the ideology of neo-fascism in its most vile Banderist version. That is why they are so stubborn in their determination not to see the atrocities of gunmen of the Kiev junta in Odessa, Kramatorsk, Slavyansk and other towns and settlements in the South-East of Ukraine. That is why they ignore the convincing evidence of modern and effective Russian tracking systems that are watching over military actions in Novorossia and that prove clearly and unambiguously that the Ukrainian army is responsible for the crash of Malaysian Boeing 777. That is why they are trying to shift the blame for the committed atrocities on Russia without producing even the smallest proof to this cause, but with the use of the entire range of political demagoguery, blackmail, intimidation of civilians and pressure on the media.

What should the Russian government and society do in such a situation? The only answer is: *act adequately*. If the U.S. does not understand and take into account Russia's position with regard to Ukraine and other complex political, economic and defense issues, the Russian Federation will have to take a strong stand and make itself totally independent from the influence of third countries, even if they have such colossus as the USA on their side. Avoiding confrontation, Russia will have to build its relations with the world solely on the basis of market principles and rationality. Without belligerent rhetoric and threats, our country should at least temporarily renounce its historical messianic role, abandon charity and unilateral assistance to those partners who have already expressed contempt and even hostility toward our country. In response

to the sanctions imposed by the U.S. and their satellites, Russia introduces its own sanctions, the consequences of which can affect Western economy very badly.

Having taken such a tough position toward the outside world, and mainly, toward the U.S., which is the leader of the Western ideology, Russia must focus without delay and most seriously on its economy, finances and agriculture, with the goal of rapid and radical improvement of the social situation.

The success of our future development is impossible without changing its paradigm. First of all, Russia's leadership should completely eliminate certain remaining factors that drive the reforms to destruction.

In the contemporary history of the post-Soviet period Russia yielded to the pressure from the U.S. and the West several times, and each time there was deception and lie. One has only to recall the statement of M. Gorbachev: "I believe Chancellor Kohl: there will be no eastward expansion of NATO". As a result, Russia was forced to retreat because it was devastated after the ill-considered radical reforms of neoliberals inspired by American and Western politicians.

The present-day Russia is not what it used to be 20 years ago. Russia has risen from its knees! And now we must not cave in on the crucial principal positions, otherwise we can fall to our knees once again and stay that way for a long time, if not forever.

Kremlin's policy and the statements of the RF President V.V. Putin are encouraging and inspiring in this respect as well.

"Russia over many centuries supported strong and trusting relations between countries. This was the case on the eve of World War I too, when Russia did everything

it could to convince Europe to find a peaceful and bloodless solution to the conflict between Serbia and Austro-Hungary. **But Russia's calls went unheeded and our country had no choice but to rise to the challenge, defend a brotherly Slavic people and protect our own country and people from the foreign threat. Russia stayed true to its duties as an ally** (*emphasis added.* – G.O.).

The Russian offensives in Prussia and Galicia upset the adversary's plans and made it possible for our allies to hold the front and defend Paris. The enemy was forced to turn its attention and direct a large part of its forces east where Russian regiments put up the fiercest possible struggle. Russia withstood the attack and was then able to launch an offensive. The Brusilov offensive became famous throughout the whole world" [*V.V. Putin. 03.08.14*].

Can it be so that there is someone in the post-Soviet space, to whom this historical allegory ought to be explained? Of course not!

The President of the Russian Federation V.V. Putin in his usual reserved, respectful, and non-aggressive manner reminded the lessons of history to those, who have forgotten them. Russia has fulfilled its obligations as an ally.

It is high time, as long as the red line is not crossed, to abandon the confrontation, in whatever forms it may take place between the U.S. and Russia. The blackmail in foreign policy must be stopped by the United States and Russia, who owe it to humanity to develop jointly a new paradigm of world order and management that meets modern social realities.

Cited works

1. *IA REGNUM*. Available at: <http://www.regnum.ru/news/polit/1781607.html#ixzz3AGCm8j1w>. Poslednee poseshchenie 12.08.14.
2. *Vladimir Putin Held a Meeting on Carrying Out a Program on the Development and Series Production of Long-Range High-Precision Weapons*. Available at: <http://eng.kremlin.ru/transcripts/6346>
3. Sorokin P.A. *Harvard University. Mutual convergence of the United States and the U.S.S.R. To the mixed sociocultural type. Memoire du XIXe Congres International de Sociologie*. Translated from English by G.N. Engelhardt, T.I. Shumilina. Edited by I.B. Orlov. Mexico D.F., 1961. Vol. II.
4. Parfrey A. *Allah Does not Love America*. Moscow, 2003.
5. Dostoyevsky F.M. *A Writer's Diary. Article of September–December 1877*.
6. *The Speech of V.V. Putin at the Opening of the Monument to the Heroes of the Great War, August 3, 2014, Moscow, Poklonnaya Hill*. Available at: <http://eng.kremlin.ru/transcripts/22756>

References

1. *IA REGNUM*. Available at: <http://www.regnum.ru/news/polit/1781607.html#ixzz3AGCm8j1w>. Poslednee poseshchenie 12.08.14.
2. In this connection we should recall the series of meetings that were held November 28–29, 2013 in Sochi by Russian President V.V. Putin and the developers and manufacturers of extremely-precise weapons. They set a clear task to ensure supply of a sufficient number of weapons in the Armed Forces as soon as possible, which would make Russia invulnerable to any aggression.
3. Sorokin P.A. *Harvard University. Mutual convergence of the United States and the U.S.S.R. To the mixed sociocultural type. Memoire du XIXe Congres International de Sociologie*. Translated from English by G.N. Engelhardt, T.I. Shumilina. Edited by I.B. Orlov. Mexico D.F., 1961. Vol. II.
4. Parfrey A. *Allakh ne lyubit Ameriku* [Allah Does not Love America]. Moscow, 2003.
5. Dostoyevsky F.M. *Dnevnik pisatelya. Zapis' za sentyabr'–dekabr' 1877* [A Writer's Diary. Article of September–December 1877].
6. *The Speech of V.V. Putin at the Opening of the Monument to the Heroes of the Great War, August 3, 2014, Moscow, Poklonnaya Hill*.