

**An. A. Gromyko<sup>1</sup> (1932-2017),  
Al. A. Gromyko<sup>2</sup>**

**THE Footholds OF THE INTERNATIONAL ORDER**

In what direction is the world going now, at what point of international relations and world politics do we find ourselves, why do many of us feel uneasy or alarmed?

Confrontation dominates in relations between the great powers, and growing rivalry at best. More and more hot-heads hype up the topic of such confrontation's inevitability. It's required to keep the coolness of judgments in this environment. One of them is that even after all reductions of armaments by Russia and the United States in recent decades, their military power as, by the way, the power of other nuclear-weapon states is so great, that it would be irresponsible to the highest degree and even a crime to think that the mankind can survive World War III.

The world community lives and acts in the environment of persistent seeking, even chase after world order concepts, many of which originate on the diplomacy's and social sciences' horizon and then are quickly forgotten. This search is inseparably connected with the change of the power balance in the world politics, which in its turn is a whole set of important factors. Many of them are often forgotten. For example, about the strength of law, about the role played in the world politics by the United Nations and the UN Charter, no matter what.

The UN Charter is a small book when you hold it in your hands. But what about its importance? If you want it, the UN Charter is the child of May 9, 1945. It is an inalienable part of the Victory Day, defeat of Fascism, of

<sup>1</sup> Soviet and Russian diplomat and scientist, specialist in American studies, African studies, and foreign relations. Dr. Sc. (History), Cand. Sc. (Law), Professor. First secretary, counsellor of the USSR embassy in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (1961-1965). Minister counsellor of the USSR embassy in the USA (1973), minister counsellor of the USSR embassy in the German Democratic Republic (1974). Director of the Institute of Africa of the USSR Academy of Sciences (1976-1991). Corresponding member of the USSR AS (1981). Head of the Politics Evaluation Center, Senior Research Associate of the Institute of Africa of the RAS (2003-2010). Since September 2010, Professor of the Faculty of Global Politics, Lomonosov Moscow State University, author of an advanced course on history and work of the United Nations Organization in modern times. Ambassador Plenipotentiary and Extraordinary, Class 1. Awarded with the Order of October Revolution, Order of People's Friendship. Laureate of Russian State Prize (1980), Vatslav Vorovsky Prize (1985). Member of the Creative Union of the Artists of Russia.

<sup>2</sup> Director of the RAS Institute of Europe, corresponding member of the RAS, Chairman of the Coordination Council of Professors of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Political Studies), Professor of the RAS. Author of more than 150 scientific publications, including monographs: "Political Reformism in Great Britain", "Modernization of the Party System of Great Britain", "Images of Russia and Britain: Reality and Prejudices", "Building Good Neighbourliness. Russia in the Territory of Europe" (co-author), "Ten Years of Negotiations Better than One Day of War. Memories of Andrei Andreyevich Gromyko" (author and redactor), "Memories of Nikolai Shmelev" (editor and redactor), "21st century Europe. New challenges and risks" (editor and redactor), etc. Chief Editor of "Modern Europe" journal. Chairman of the Council of Experts of the Institute of Linguistic Civilizations and Migratory Processes of the Russkiy Mir Foundation. President of the Association of European Studies of Russia, member of the bureau of the Department of Global Problems and International Relations of the RAS, member of the Scientific Council of the Security Council of the Russian Federation and the Scientific Council of the Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs. Head of the Department of theory and history of international relations, Institute of International Relations and World History, Lobachevsky Nizhny Novgorod State University. Honorary Doctor of The Paisii Hilendarski University of Plovdiv (Bulgaria) and Voronezh State University. Laureate of the Prize of the National Science Support Foundation (2004, 2006).

the Army, which was considered invincible before clashing with the Soviet Army.

Currently, the world lives in the grip of two forces: international relations are threatened with chaos, which threatens all of us; the second force is the growing interdependence of all on all. Chaos is growing "somewhere there", in the Near and Middle East, in North-East Asia, on the big expanses of Africa, but the whole Europe shudders, risks for Russia are increasing. The Old World feels giant pressure because of the inflow of refugees, terrorist acts against Europeans and sometimes arranged by Europeans, become more frequent and bloodier.

The nation-state institute serves a foothold besides sufficient armaments and peaceful settlement of disputes, inadmissibility of the use of mass destruction weapons. The world politics is still made mostly by states, though it's beyond question that new players joined big politics in the 20th century besides them, first of all, transnational corporations and big non-governmental organizations. However, the process of many states' disintegration goes on in parallel, sometimes pushed by external "well-wishers". But surely not always. A wide-spread reason is inability to efficiently handle freedom acquired in the second half of the 20th century and manage with the legacy of the colonial past, overcome problems gotten as a result of disintegration of the Ottoman Empires and European empires.

As for the outside pressure with the goal to reformat these or those states, deprive them of a part of sovereignty or fully subjugate, the people of the countries, which are experimented on, start resisting this process as an answer. This phenomenon requires special attention. For example, announcement that a number of states are social outcasts can be a method of such disintegration, after which, in essence, it's possible to do everything you wish with them. Radicalization of the society is a response to intrusion from the outside, extremist and terrorist organizations come to the foreground. The example of Libya is demonstrative. It's possible to destroy a state, but destroyers have not thought up anything except restoration of the same state instead of it. Even where there is no efficient and viable state in practice as in cases of Kosovo, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Abkhazia or South Ossetia, the great powers prefer to call their de facto protectorates states again.

Another example of a nation-state's strong resistance to the policy of its desovereignization is the modern history of the European Union. The idea to delegate a part of sovereign authorities to supranational structures has its convincing reasons, first of all, understanding that it's required in today's world to unite efforts for solution of transregional and global problems. But after the supranational bodies of authority are established, they as any bureaucracy start not only reproducing themselves but strive for expanding their authorities. The "uprising" of Euro-skeptics in one of the leading EU member - the UK - and the following Brexit became the result of this governing. Those who think it to be an accidental phenomenon are mistaken. There are no accidents on these scales in history. It's possible to arrange

a "melting pot", which is certified by the history of many empires and countries, but only within the framework of federations, quasi-federations and multinational states. But it turned out too much even for the EU to arrange a "melting pot" from the already existing and mostly old states.

After the terrorist attack on the twin towers of the World Trade Center in New York, an extremely harmful slogan "you're either with us, or against us" again won in the world politics, i. e. the slogan that is in no way in conformity with the force of law based on the UN Charter. Even such a loyal to the United States organization as the EU encountered a nearly blatant dictate, including Washington striving to use its national laws extraterritorially to promote American business interests on the international scene.<sup>2</sup> This example serves another one, in this case negative proof of the fact that nation-states go on calling the tune in the world politics. And those, who seek to create new subjects of international relations based on refusal from the nation-state concept, can't oppose that effectively.

Socioeconomic factors are not frequently discussed now. But terrorism is impossible to destroy not only because it is often terrorism of individuals or small groups of extremists, origination of which it's difficult to follow. The problem is that terrorism is fed by the constant information about well-being of ones and sufferings of others.

Where does such fanatical devotion come from, such ineradicable wish to fight as a member of terrorist organizations? It's impossible to buy everyone, isn't it? Yes, there are a lot of mercenaries, professional fighters loving the business. But there are no less of those among the fighters who grew up in poverty, who long ago lost all hope to achieve anything in a normal way, uneducated people but in a rage because of injustice in the world, including those revenging deaths of relatives and people close to them as a result of actions of various international military coalitions. It's not possible to justify the acts of terrorists but it's necessary to understand their motives, otherwise it's impossible to really fight this phenomenon.

Hence the "new populism" phenomenon, including Euro-skepticism - the direct consequence of the unexpected phenomenon for the welfare state. Unexpected because from the point of view of neoliberal economic theory and practice of the period of Thatcherism and Reaganomics, it still seemed not long ago that magic recipes for solution of the problems of economic crises, inflation and unemployment had been found.<sup>3</sup> But then it turned out that the neoliberal globalization model requires replacement. In some aspects it helped development of global markets in the 1980-90s in the interests of big masses of the population in post-industrial countries and in a number of emerging countries, including China, but by the second half of the 2000s it exhausted its performance potential, became an obstacle for substantiating the world becoming polycentric with a respective, more just economic basis. The world financial and economic crisis of 2007 - 2009, its consequences became a striking evidence for that.

The next foothold. We've been celebrating the great Victory Day on May 9 year after year. But only experts remember two other dates: June 26, 1945 - the date when

the Charter of the United Nations Organization was signed, and October 24 - when the Charter came into force (the United Nations Day since 1947). This is the formation, the start of the new world order with the UN and contemporary international law as the nucleus. With the benefit of a hindsight at our times, we are again convinced that the war was won surely first of all to liberate our country and other states from Nazism but to no less extent for establishment of new rules for global co-existence based on the force of law, embodied in the UN Charter.

It was no easier in some aspects to establish the UN by peaceful means than defeat the enemy with arms. Thank God, there were no military victims in this political and diplomatic battle. But this victory of the common sense and wisdom of the winners, undoubtedly, saved the world, first of all Europe from new uncountable misfortunes and tragedies. Andrey Gromyko, the head of the USSR delegation in Dumbarton Oaks and later in San Francisco after Vyacheslav Molotov left for Moscow (Molotov headed the Soviet delegation from April 25 to May 8), did a lot for that.

Comprehension of the post-war history raises an extremely important issue of sovereignty and independence. It's clear that there can be no independent foreign policy without sovereignty. Because of that subjugation of the foreign policy to interests of someone else leads to sovereignty's blurring, gradual actual subjugation of one state by the other. Such states can say as it was usually done that they take decisions guided by their free choice and responsibilities of allies, but really there is exactly subjugation at the back of it.

Surely, sovereignty does not mean autarchy, on the contrary, the most active foreign policy and interaction with the widest circle of international relations subjects are required for its assertion. But the state should clearly understand where its national interests end and the interests of the others start. At least, such a behaviour is typical of the great powers that have no reasons to pay for providing their security by cessation of a part of their sovereignty in favour of the "big brother".

The footholds of not just order but law and order are surely the principles on which the United Nations Organization is based. Everything can be changed, any norm can be improved, but the principles achieved through sufferings of the mankind in the course of World War II and in its epicenter - the Eastern front in Europe - should be left as they are. But if you start shattering these principles, doubt them to accommodate some here-and-now profits or chasing the former greatness, or you start using the UN to settle geopolitical accounts with other members of the Security Council, only dismantlement of the international security system can be the outcome of such a policy. And that happened in the recent quarter of the century at the rates unseen even in the Cold War period. And that was notwithstanding a sincere, though naive wish of Russia in the 1990s to inline in the West's channel, and then notwithstanding its striving in the beginning of the last decade to establish mutually advantageous partnership with the United States and their allies.

The world politics balances between the rule of law and the rule of force. Fragile relation of tough military force and force of compromise, diplomacy characterizes the state of the world politics and international relations. And we should acknowledge that diplomacy and "soft power"

<sup>1</sup> Literally: "You're either with us, or you're on the side of the terrorists", see, e. g.: <https://iz.ru/news/252080>

<sup>2</sup> <http://tass.ru/ekororaika/4770649>

<sup>3</sup> Booth R. *The Death of Inflation: Surviving and Thriving in the Zero Era*. L.: Nicholas Brealey Publishing; New Ed edition, 1997.

are currently on the defensive. Relations of the East and the West go on downhill and no serious breakthroughs are seen in the foreseeable future.

China is also meant under the East, and not only Russia. Today, the confrontation of Washington and Beijing is not as strong as in case of Moscow. But actually the American military strategy as well as the economic strategy are directed at long-term confrontation exactly with the Middle Kingdom. Recently, the attention of the whole world was mainly drawn to the conflict of the United States and Russia. But for serious analysis of American behaviour we should not forget that the main opponent for the United States ideologically is communist China, the state with the one-party system and one fifth of the world GDP and not Russia that switched to capitalist rails long ago and the economy of which is incomparably smaller. We'll mention that the defense budget of China (more than US\$ 150 billion in 2017) already exceeds the Russian defense budget several times and it appears that the gap between them will increase.

The inability of the great powers to return political trust to their relations seems unallowable luxury with really global for the mankind problems of utmost importance and threats as the background. It can't be said that the state of affairs is absolutely hopeless - let's remember the Lavrov - Kerry diplomatic channel. But how many times their agreements, first of all related to the state of affairs in Syria, were torpedoed by other American departments? The previous United States administration in the end of its term did everything possible to send Russian-American relations to a dead-end, having no scruples about any mean methods - let's remember mass expulsion of Russian diplomats from Washington just before the new 2017 year.

"The Skripal case" became the new chapter in anti-Russian sentiments in the West, accusations of Russia in this

case reached the scales of absurdity and trampling upon diplomatic norms unseen even in the Cold War. The UK after the USA plunged in the very depth of anti-Russian hysteria on its own free will. They are trying to drag as many states as possible after them into this whirlpool, appealing to Euro-Atlantic solidarity. As if solidarity means blind pursue of any absurdities and political mystifications.

\* \* \*

One can hear often: "Well, why do you, Russians, blame the West for everything?" This argument is wide off the mark. Western politicians are not blamed in Russia for everything but they are blamed because one should not act like a bull in a china shop on the international scene. One should not accuse Russia with an occasion and without a pretext. One should not turn another big power into a punching bag because of the internal political war in the United States or the desperate situation and T. May in the UK. The status of other great powers is acknowledged in Russia, they are considered important partners in solution of many global problems. If Western partners think that Russia is wrong in something, this is not a reason for blackening it. Russia does not act in this way.

Moscow comprehends both the potential of the country and limitations of its opportunities. Russia acts much more carefully, prudently and verifying its steps on the international scene than those eager to start a new cold war against it.

What are we seeking to prevent and what are we seeking to achieve in the today's environment? World War III should be prevented, and a balanced and stable global regulation system should be achieved. Is it possible to solve these tasks in the environment when the idea of a "new Cold War" is escalated? The question is rhetorical.