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**EUROPE:**

**NATO MILITARY BUILD-UP,**

**WITH NO ARMS CONTROL**

Russian Institute for Strategic Studies has a motto: “Better to tell sour truth, rather than sweet lie”.

So, what is the reality in terms of the European security?

By artificially creating the Ukrainian crisis and using it as a pretext for military buildup, the leading members of the Alliance have enhanced their military potential and increased their military activity, especially near Russia.

The European security edifice has always been constructed with the help of several formidable blocks. However, in its today’s structure there at least three weakest elements that are shaking our common European home.

**Slide 2/** These are: continuous emplacement of the US Ballistic Missile Defense System (BMDS), adding by the Pentagon more tactical nuclear weapons (TNW) and the supremacy in NATO conventional forces in Europe. Taken together, such elements are undermining the security throughout the entire European space.

As to element No 1 – the US BMDS – there is a lot of information about it. So, there is no need to enter into specific details now.

But there are three alarming circumstances that are either neglected or underestimated.

**Slide 3/** **Factor** **A.** The BMDS silos **Mk-41** that will appear in Rumania and Poland in 2015 and 2018 respectively will house not only defensive interceptors capable of knocking down the ICBMs, but land-based cruise missiles and hypersonic missiles that are **offensive weapons**. These systems will be aimed at Russia. Russia does not have such capabilities near the USA. Last August Danish Defense Minister Nicolai Wammen said that Copenhagen had agreed to join the US BMD system. The latest NATO summit in Wales (September 2014) urged more nations to take part in this missile defense shield that can be both defensive and offensive.

**Slide 4/ Factor B.** In 5-6 years timeframe a radicaldeterioration of the BMD issue will take place between Moscow and Washington when **overall quantity of the US strategic interceptors will exceed the number of Russian strategic nuclear carriers up to 3 times bigger (2400 missile interceptors vs 700 deployed Strategic Offensive Arms or SOA carriers)**. It would lead to temptation of the USA to deliver the first nuclear or conventional prompt global strike vs Russia and lately to protect itself from Moscow’s retaliation. So, a strategic stability will be radically undermined.

**Slide 5/ Factor C.** Very soon the BMDS arms race will embrace the entire globe. **95% of all US BMDS assets will go to the World Oceans.** Under the Sea Law Convention combat vessels can sail at high seas freely, without any restrictions. **Slide 6/**While currently the US Navy has 30 BMDS capable ships, by 2041-43 it will have 84 such naval platforms of Ticonderoga-class cruisers and Arleigh Burke-type destroyers – each having up to 30 interceptors on board in the average. The distribution of 30 Aegis capable ships between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans is currently respectively 14 to-16.

**Slide 7/** By refusing to pull back its **tactical nuclear weapons** from Europe, the USA has increased their numbers and modernized 13 its storing sites on the European continent. Except the USA, no any other nuclear-weapon state deploys nuclear forces outside its national territory. It is a violation of the (Intermediate Nuclear Forces Treaty) INT both by the USA and by five NATO nations who have let the US TNW to be deployed on their territory. Russia does not have its TNW near the USA.

**Slide 8/**Three types of the US tactical nuclear bombs namely B-61-7, B-61-11 and a new one B-61-12 are considered by the US State Dept and the Pentagon as “strategic” if they are carried by strategic bombers B-2A and B-52H. These TNW are to be used against Russia. Russia does not have the same nuclear capabilities in the vicinity of the continental USA.

**Slide 9/**Europe is stockpiled by excessive conventional weapons: shortly before his retirement, the US Admiral James Stavridis claimed that NATO collectively possesses 24,000 combat aircraft and 800 blue-water Navy ships. This cannot be compared to either Russia’s military capabilities or to the Collective Security Treaty Organization.

Russia has decided to suspend her participation in the meetings of the Joint Consultative Group (JCG) on the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE).There are a number of reasons for Russia to look negatively on the CFE Treaty, which include: it has been ratified by only Russia, Belarus, Kazakhstan, and Ukraine, but not a single one of the treaty’s NATO signatories; it contained various types of artificial restrictions with regard to Russia, such as the limitations set by the Flank Agreement, and three Baltic states refused to become parties to the treaty when they joined NATO.

In addition, throughout the duration of the treaty, its Western signatories have been opposed to issuing a definition of the term “substantial combat forces” in relation to this arrangement, intending to someday move to augment their conventional weapons and armed forces in the zone covered by the treaty. Another disadvantage of this accord was also that it did not apply to naval forces or their activities, at least in the seas bordering on the European continent.

**Slide 10/** AtNATO Chicago Summit in May 2012 the **Chicago Triad** has been created in the form of an “**appropriate mix” of nuclear, missile defense and conventional forces.** It was again stamped at Alliance Newport Summit in Wales, last September. The Chicago Triad is referred to the forwardly deployed assets. It is located very close to Russia. But Russia does not have such mechanism near the continental USA.

**Slide 11/** It is qualitatively highest level of military potential and military activity of NATO along the Russian borders. The Alliance Secretary General Jens Stoltenberg publicly admitted that such activity has increased **five-fold**.

Lately, 150 US military bases have been augmented by 8 more military installations, 6 NATO command centers in six European nations (Bulgaria, Poland, Romania and three Baltic states) plus one NATO Naval HQ in Varna (Bulgaria). Two BMD operational complexes will be launched by 2015 in Rumania and by 2018 in Poland.

Recent delivery of the US 120 heavy weapons to Riga including tanks Abrams and armored cars Bradley is regarded as a war preparation. Admission of Georgia, Moldova and Ukraine into NATO will enhance a new confrontation in Europe.

A new rapid reaction force, likely numbering at least 5,000-strong joint ‘Spearhead’ force and ready to be deployed within 48 hours, will be created in Eastern Europe, after a decision by the 28 NATO member states following a summit in Wales last September. On February 5th 2015 NATO Defense Ministers approved new measures to boost their capabilities through a Readiness Action Plan (RAP) that will reconfigure NATO’s existing post-Cold War alignments from the 1990s in order to improve rapid-reaction forces. [[1]](#footnote-2)

The new force will be the vanguard of the existing NATO Response Force (NRF) that began operations a decade ago. The 30,000-strong NRF can take up to a month to deploy. The NATO last Secretary General Anders Fogh Rasmussen said that “This Spearhead will include several thousand land troops ready to deploy within a few days with air, sea and Special Forces support.*”* The Baltic States and Romania have already offered to host the force. Poland, the largest NATO state in Eastern Europe, is expected to house the headquarters.“We must be able to act more swiftly,” said UK Prime Minister David Cameron, whose country said that it will provide up to a quarter of the new force’s troops.

**Slide 12/ Air Forces activity.** Russia has noted the increased U.S. surveillance flights over the Baltics and the expanded **Baltic Air Policing** operation that NATO conducts there from March 2004 from Lithuanian Air Force Base (AFB) Zokniai and Estonian AFB Ämari.

NATO HQ in Brussels has blamed Russia for stepping up its Air Force (AF) activity near three Baltic states by 3 times. But in its turn NATO AF has intensified its air patrols in the air space of Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia by 1200 times if one counts their flights in aircraft-days taking into consideration that the Alliance operation “Baltic Air Policing” is being conducted 24 hours and all year round. Moreover: four types of aircraft used in the operation are DCA – can carry conventional and nuclear weapons. Their aim is Russia. Not Iran or North Korea.

On March 20th, 2015 14 US F-16 interceptor-fighters have arrived to the Estonian Air Force base (AFB) in Ämari together with 300 US GIs. The Air Forces of Finland and Sweden will take part in these exercises. Moscow has expressed its concern over this drills and the fact that this AFB may be transformed into the US Air Force training center and the place for permanent deployment of the DCA capable to deliver TNW (St. Petersburg is only 5 minutes flying time from this AFB). The use of the US air tanker KC-135 in Estonia means that NATO air strike group can operate over very long distances..

Four French jets, either the Mirage 2000 or the Rafale, will be sent to AFB Malbork in eastern Poland on April 28 on a double mission to train the Polish Air Force and to be on standby for air patrols over three Baltic states under NATO command.

**Slide 13/ Military drills.**

NATO is conducting wide-scale war games in the vast area of Europe – from the South embracing the Mediterranean and the Black Seas, the western sector involving the North Sea and the Baltic Sea and three Baltic states and creating a “line of troops” across Eastern Europe, and in the Northern part of the European continent, engulfing the Arctic area. Some new linguistic gimmicks have appeared in Washington: nowadays the East European countries bordering Russia are called “front-line states”. In this case Moscow has serious questions about the potential plans of Americans and NATO led by them..

A general increased tempo of Western military activity (both in the sense of long distance strategic flights and large-scale military exercises), an increase in NATO presence and more exercises in Eastern Europe have resulted in a back and forth of military posturing reminiscent of Cold War demonstrations of force.

Thousands of US troops and hundreds of tanks have poured into Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania in February and March this year as part of an operation dubbed **“Atlantic Resolve.”** The military grouping equipped by heavy weaponry has travelled nearly 2,000 km via six countries of the Baltic region. “As you connect countries, there is almost a line of US troops,” Defense News quoted Colonel Michael Foster of the 173rd Airborne Brigade on March 2 as saying. US forces have previously held joint war games with Baltic nations, with code-names such as “**Saber Strike,” “Spring Storm” and “Flaming Sword.”** The Baltic States have been among the most vocal advocates of NATO strengthening in the region, but the organization is bound by a 1997 agreement with Russia, which bars it from placing permanent bases in Lithuania, Latvia or Estonia. This can be circumvented by staging constant rotations of military exercises that can in practice amount to the same thing. The first waves of US soldiers have already arrived in Poland and Latvia, after the announcement that the Pentagon is sending about 600 soldiers to Poland and the three Baltic states for infantry exercises.  If at the beginning of 2014 in Poland there have been 10 American GIs, in August 2014 – 350, by the end of 2015 there could be 10,000.

NATO began [military exercises](http://rt.com/news/154096-us-warship-troops-europe/) in Poland in March. So far, 150 US paratroopers have arrived in Poland from their stationary base in Italy, with 450 more set to join them. The forces will stay there for six months. Poland’s foreign minister, Radoslaw Sikorski during stay in office has also asked NATO to deploy 10,000 troops in his country. NATO has dispatched a separate rapid reaction force to the Baltic. “There have been discussions on how to increase both the duration of that event and the scope, the other things the US can assist with from a military perspective" – said the US 173rd Airborne Brigade Commander Colonel Michael Foster at the Center for Strategic and International Studies in Washington in March.

The most closest military exercise to the Russian border was conducted last February when 140 NATO vehicles and 1400 troops swept through the Estonian town of Narva, a mere 300 meters from the Russian border. About 140 pieces of armor and 10 times as many troops, including US soldiers, took part in that event.

In March **“Joint Viking”** the biggest and unprecedented military drill since Cold War was conducted in Norway’s northernmost province Finnmark County, above the Arctic Circle bordering Russia. It involved 5,000 Norwegian troops and 400 vehicles. Apart from the ground troops involved, the exercise has put Norway’s Navy submarines and surface vessels off the coast of Finnmark and Air Force fighter jets on alert. All types of weapons have been used, reported the Barentz Observer. The last time a similar military exercise was conducted in Finnmark was in 1967.

In March-April the US, Finnish and Swedish Air Forces have conducted military exercises near the Finnish city of Pori. For the first time their aircraft (US F-16s, Finnish Hornets and Swedish JAS-39 Gripens) will hit ground-based targets.

”This is an operative exercise with all weapons and branches involved,” Norwegian Army spokesperson Lt. Col. Aleksander Jankov said.“To illustrate the magnitude of this, I can mention that if we put the vehicles one after another on the road it will stretch 6km.”Norway is planning a large joint Air Force exercise for May, in which more than 100 planes from eight NATO member states are going to take part in the “Arctic Challenge” exercise in the skies of the Barents Sea region. The joint task force will be performing training lights from airfields in Luleå (Sweden), Rovaniemi (Finland) and Bodø (Norway).

Just to compare: a couple of years ago Norway and Russia, which share a Barents Sea coastline and an almost-200 km border, used to hold joint military trainings. The last one, named Pomor, was held in 2013 and involved visits by Norwegian battleships to Russia’s port of Severomorsk and the Russian Navy calling to the Norway’s port of Tromsø in the north. Nowadays, there are no common military friendly exercises between NATO and Russia.

Between 4-15 May the USA and Estonia will conduct unprecedented military drill in Estonia code-named **“Siil-2015”** involving 13,000 men. Such large-scale exercises have never been arranged before there.

In March NATO naval exercises ended in the Black Sea involving five alliance’s nations: the US, Turkey, Italy, Canada and Romania.

**Slide 14/ NATO is using the situation in Ukraine to push closer to Russia's border.** The Alliance's activities have expanded considerably over the past years. According to the minister, what NATO is doing is completely out of proportion with what NATO commanders call the build-up of Russian forces on its side of the border in Ukraine. NATO's activities are many times greater than Russia's. Instead of uniting forces to fight evil, the worst of which is terrorism, Western nations are drawing new divisive lines, trying to realize containment schemes against unwelcome states. Today, Russia has been chosen as the target.

**In 2014 there have been 13 such exercises with more than 33,000 troops involved from all 28 NATO-member states.**

**In 2015 NATO plans to organize 200 military exercises.**

On March 23, 2015 the US House of Representatives passed a Resolution urging the US President to start **“lethal weapons” supplies to Ukraine.** President Poroshenko recently admitted publicly on the Ukrainian TV that 11 European nations have already signed contracts with Kiev to send various types of arms to Ukrainian Armed Forces, including offensive. At least only 7 European nations have voiced their negative stance to deliver lethal arms to Ukraine. Russia believes that weapon supplies may cause not only the failure of the ceasefire and a new escalation of violence in the south east (of Ukraine), but also pose a threat to Russia’s security. But during the entire internal Ukrainian conflict Moscow has never sent its weapons to the freedom fighters in Donbass: all weapons the freedom fighters either bought from Ukrainian troops against payment or by capturing them at the battlefields. However, a number of Russian MPs called the President to supply Russian arms to the freedom fighters in Donbass, if the West continues to sell weapons to Ukrainian Armed Forces (Romania sells ammunition, Lithuania and Poland sell tanks and armored combat vehicles to Kiev).

Moscow is also concerned with the **next wave of NATO enlargement**. Georgia? Moldova and Ukraine have been included on the shortlist of countries looking for 'enhanced co-operation' with NATO, alongside Finland and Sweden. Their admission will create additional tension, provoke confrontation and undermine the entire security system in the Euro-Atlantic area. And it will create something more dangerous than military bases and military presence – that is hatred and suspicion between common people and the whole nations for many years to come. As the independent nations all of them have their own word to say whether to join NATO or not. But do they really need to lose their neutral status? To permit fielding new US military bases on their territory and to send their national troops to take part in the dubious regional conflicts?

**Russia’s concerns.** NATO military capabilities’ build up in the vicinity of the Russian land and Russian shores can be qualified as the demonstration of hostile intentions and as the scheme for provocative power projection. It is NATO that really moved on Russia’s doorstep. Not vice versa.

Moscow claim that NATO is actively engaged in military exercise dynamics in Eastern Europe, where the Ukraine crisis has reverberated. In that context, the Alliance’s exercises serve as threats to Russia security, demonstrating excessive military capabilities and suggesting hostile intent.

Moscow is concerned with a large-scale military drills near its shores. Russia’s General Staff believes that the deployment of US and NATO aviation, ships and troops raises concerns. “Our concern is caused by an increase of US air force and the American military personnel in the Baltic, Poland, and also the Alliance's ships in the Black Sea,” the Defense Ministry said in a statement, quoting General Valery Gerasimov, the head of the Russian General Staff. Moscow says the buildup of military activities next to Russian border does not promote restoration of confidence in Euro-Atlantic.

The updated in February 2015 “National Security Strategy of the USA” enacted by the US President clearly states that the US Armed Forces will be used at any place around the globe. It means in Europe as well.

Western military exercises have taken on a threatening posture. These exercises themselves seem to simulate a full-scale confrontation with Russia through the forward deployment of combat vessels, attack submarines, theater ballistic missiles and strategic bomber aircraft. The US and NATO strategic and tactical weapon systems have also been deployed to locations near Russian borders. The forward deployment of the US and NATO theater ballistic missiles and bomber aircraft are provocative indicators of possible pre-emptive action against the Russian territory.

**Arctic will become as one of the priority area in the new Maritime Strategy of Russia that will be active till 2030.** It will set upfirst and foremostnon-military tasks in the area:to consolidate economic potential, to expand oil and gas extraction, to improve navigationalsystem, to protect environment and biology resources, and finally, maintaining strategic stability in the region.

At the end of last December President Vladimir Putin identified the Arctic wherenational interests of the country are to be protected (item 32). It was stated in a newly updated **Military Doctrine in December 2014**. The same month of the same year Russia’s Northern Fleet announced as the [backbone](http://rt.com/news/218659-russia-arctic-command-army/) of the new Arctic Command, responsible for a zone covering the high-latitude areas of the Arctic Ocean and the North Pole. In February 2015, Sergei Shoigu, Russian Defense Minister, confirmed that Russia might consider protecting its [national interests](http://rt.com/news/235615-arctic-defense-arms-resources/) in the Arctic with military assets if necessary, pointing to the increasing interest in the region’s resources by countries with no direct access to the Arctic.

**Slide 15/** The US President Directive № NSPD-66/HSPD-25 signed January 9, 2009 displays another approach. **In the Section B** it is said:

“1. The United States has broad and fundamental national security interests in the Arctic region and is prepared to operate either independently or in conjunction with other states to safeguard these interests. These interests include such matters as missile defense and early warning; deployment of sea and air systems for strategic sealift, strategic deterrence, maritime presence and maritime security operations; and ensuring freedom of navigation and overflight”.

Because of too many NATO offensive military drills in the Arctic area in March 2015 Russia announced a massive surprise military inspection, putting forces all over the country on high alert and commencing exercises in the Baltic Sea, Black Sea, the Arctic and the Far East. The snap check of the military involves about 80,000 troops, up to 12,000 vehicles, 65 warships, 15 submarines, and about 220 warplanes and helicopters.

On March 21st, 2015 102 foreign Defense Attaches accredited in Moscow visited the ‘ultra secret’ National Defense Command and Control Center of the Russian Federation where they had been assured that under the new Military Doctrine updated last December Russia would not attack any nation. At the same time, Russian Defense Ministry notes a considerable buildup of military activity of NATO member-states, large-scale military exercises bringing too much of heavy weaponry to Europe, especially near Russian borders, despite the Alliance’s assurances of its own military restraint.

**Slide 16/ What are the major differences between Russian and NATO military exercises?**

Russia has never been the first nation that started a large-scale of military drills. Russia has resorted to the responsive actions.

Russian ground troops engaged in military exercises are located on Russian territory. American troops are sent thousands kilometers away from their country.

Russia agreed to invite foreign observers to its exercises, including observers to “unexpected” or to previously unannounced drills. NATO countries ceased to invite Russian observers to its military drills.

Russian western military district where military exercises are being conducted has the smallest number of combat units stationed there. NATO forces massively outnumber Russian troops there and they are heavily reinforcing their presence there.

As to Russian snap exercises, they have been arranged with the utmost transparency and exclusively on the Russian territory. Despite the strength of recent drills have not exceeded the limits of the obligatory pre-notification of the OSCE, Russia openly declares their composition, manpower and missions. Russian Ministry of Defense also pledges to continue with the openness policy in this context. Recently Moscow has offered to NATO to return to the previous level of trust and transparency on the basis of reciprocity.

**Second outstanding feature of the New Phase of the Cold War: new challenges and threats in the arms control**

**Slide 17/** This phenomena can be compared with a coin that has both an obverse and a reverse sides. On one hand there is a military buildup, on the other there are no arms control talks.

Just compare: during the first Cold War Moscow and Washington have been able to arrive at five SOA agreements and one INF, nuclear missiles de-targeting agreement, and a cornerstone of the global strategic stability – the ABM Treaty, 13 INCSEA accords have been reached and two international conventions on banning chemical and biological weapons entered into force, the CFE Treaty though with setbacks but has been formalized.

**Slide 18**/ So, after the Prague Treaty on SOA Reductions between two giant nuclear powers signed in 2010 there is no single bilateral arms control arrangement between Russia and the USA.

The entire process in this domain has been stalled, and nobody is aware – for how long it will last. Today between the USA and Russia **there are 15 such unresolved issues:** there are no official talks on nuclear arms control, no negotiations on limiting anti-satellite weapons or BMDS, etc. The whole list of these issues is displayed at the slide.

**Slide 19/** What are those 15 unresolved issues between Moscow and Washington?

They cover some areas of a paramount importance. They constitute both threats and challenges for the regional and the global stability.

Amongst them: there is uninterrupted US global missile defense deployment; there is conversion of the US SSBN (strategic submarines equipped with nuclear-tipped ballistic missiles) into SSGN (strategic submarines equipped with cruise missiles); there is no desire of the USA to count SOA (strategic offensive arms) warheads stored in active reserve; the USA has dismissed proposals to control long-range nuclear-tipped SLCM (sea-launched cruise missiles); the USA still has tactical nuclear weapons in Europe – outside its territory; the USA has no intention to proliferate INCSEA accord (incidents-at-sea-prevention agreements) on strategic nuclear-powered submarines (12 collisions have been recorded so far between American and Soviet/Russian nuclear-powered submarines); the USA still has an offensive nuclear doctrine based upon general nuclear deterrence and extended nuclear deterrence - with the first nuclear strike provisions in the form of preventive and preemptive strikes; there is no US intention to draft a qualitatively new CFE (CFE-2); there is no US wish to reach accord on PAROS (prevention of arms emplacement in the outer space); the USA has no plans to sign ASAT accord (anti-satellite agreement); the USA is violating of the INF Treaty by testing missile defense interceptors by using medium-range (1,000-5,500 km) and “intermediate-range” ballistic missiles (3,000-5,500 km); the USA and NATO are conducting Air Force Operation “Baltic Air Policing” during 24 hours a day, 365 days a year with DCA (dual-capable aircraft) that can carry nuclear free-fall bombs; Washington still deviates from the ratification of the CTBT (Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty) - 18 years have elapsed since it was signed; the USA has no wish to limit armed UAVs (unmanned aerial vehicles) and still uses them against civilians, especially in Pakistan, Afghanistan and other nations, and finally, the USA has no desire to enforce ceilings on hypersonic conventional weapons with pin-point accuracy to be launched under the “Prompt Global Strike” strategy.

**Slide 20**/ Recently, Russia has indentified **17 external threats** to its national security in its recently updated Military Doctrine (December 26 last year). 13 such threats have been named in the previous Military Doctrine signed 4 years ago. For the sake of comparison: the recently updated National Security Strategy of the **USA identifies 8 external threats** for the nation.

As a new poll has revealed, Russians are increasingly worried about a military threat from outside. At the end of last February, as the independent Levada Center pollster said 68% of Russians believe a foreign power threatens Russia’s national security, a 24 percentage points increase over the last decade.

A new stage of the Cold War will undoubtedly lead to an enemy-image period of the past we managed to overcome in the 90s. Again public opinion polls show that currently 81% of Russians feel negatively about the United States and 71% about the European Union. Today 42% of Russians dubbed the relations between Russia and the USA as that of “enemies”. In January 2014 before the Ukrainian crisis the same answer was only 4%. Is it a normal situation? No. Once again we are witnessing the mistrust. It can lead to an arms race. Once President Ronald Reagan has put it as “People mistrust each other because they arm, and people arm because they mistrust each other. Is there any remedy to overcome this vicious circle? Our generation failed to find the way out from this impasse. Could you?

**Slide 21/** In its updated Military Doctrine enacted December 26, 2014 Russia has retained the same formula of **using its nuclear weapons** that was used in the last Military Doctrine of 2010: only in response of using nuclear and other means of the WMD, as well as in case an aggression vs the Russian Federation is made when the very existence of the state is endangered. On the other hand, the USA is still committed to the first nuclear strikes advocating unconditionally use of nuclear weapons in a first preventive and pre-emptive nuclear strikes.

Moscow will be happy if Washington adjusts its nuclear doctrine to that of Russian doctrine.

**Slide 22/ What to do?**

***First.***The USA and its NATO allies should stop any military build-up near Russia’s borders. The US tactical nuclear weapons with relevant infrastructure and the BMD assets must be removed from Europe and brought to the continental USA. A new multilateral ABM Treaty limiting the number of the strategic interceptors should be developed.

And *de facto* and *de jure* nuclear-weapon states have to assume commitments not to use nuclear weapons in the first strike. The next New US-Russian START (START-4) may be debated provided all previous arrangements are implemented. The USA and NATO have to regard Russia as their permanent ally, rather than permanent foe.

The USA has to pull back all its TNW from Europe and the relevant infrastructure, as well as cease all training exercises of their aircraft capable to deliver TNW.

A qualitatively new CFE has to be elaborated and signed between all NATO member-states, including new entrants, and Russia. An international treaty banning arms deployment in outer space should be accepted by all states. NATO should discontinue its 24/7 Baltic Air Patrol over the skies of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, which has been flown for ten years and is clearly intended to provoke Russia.

Naturally, the question arises: what to do next? The answer is simple – **a new treaty is needed**. And it should be designed starting from an entirely new footing. It must be free of all the inherent disadvantages of the previous agreement in this regard, drawn up on the basis of the principle of equality and of equal and indivisible security for all parts of Europe, eliminating the significant advantages held by NATO members in their conventional armed forces, and extended to cover all naval forces and their activities in the waters bordering Europe.

The new treaty must also stipulate the complete withdrawal of American tactical nuclear weapons and all related infrastructure from Europe and the Asian part of Turkey, as well as the removal of both the US ground-based missile-defense system from the European continent, plus the naval component of her missile shield from the adjoining seas.

The new treaty must stop “forward deployment forces” that are gradually moving to the Eastern direction.

At the same time the new covenant must not be tied to any type of local conflict. And it must prohibit all signatory states from employing their national armed forces against their own citizens.

In other words, the new CFE or CFE-2 Treaty must be an intrinsically innovative covenant that will genuinely contribute to the strengthening of European security, instead of serving to weaken and undermine it.

***Second***.Economic and financial sanctions versus Russia should be lifted for good and in full as unfair and illegitimate arrangement undermining the WTO principles and norms of a fair trade. At the same time Russia will not tackle any conditions aimed at lifting off these sanctions as a trade-off for changing its stance on the Ukrainian crisis created not by it.

***Third.*** Ukraine will have to declare its pledge to retain its non-nuclear and non-aligned status for ever.

The people of Donbass will have the right to determine their own future - without any aggression and punitive actions within its own administrative borders within the rest of Ukraine. A peaceful solution to the Ukrainian crisis requires not merely a ceasefire, but a complete withdrawal of all Ukrainian regular troops and irregular formations from the territory of the Donetsk and Lugansk Republics. Kiev authorities should sign a non-aggression pact with them and also compensate fully all human and material losses for Donbass population.

***Fourth****.* In general terms, the time has come to prohibit from the international life the use of threats under dubious pretexts and vague explanations. The world community at large must firmly oppose the attempts to reconsider the results of the WW2 and consistently combat any forms and manifestations of racism, xenophobia, aggressive nationalism and chauvinism.

**Conclusion**

**Slide 23/** There is the urgent need to carry out a rational reconstruction of the present-day situation in Europe and adapt it to the new realities in the system of international relations.

As a veteran of the US diplomacy **Henry Kissinger** recently observed, the new Cold War really exists and it represents a danger that can be transformed into “a tragedy” if ignored. Such tragedy can be gradually modified into “a Hot War”.

**Slide 24/** The current Colder War is not based upon ideology, but rather upon geopolitical ambitions fostered by the USA and its “indispensability”. Such Colder War is currently limited by few actors: on one hand, the USA and key NATO countries, and on the other – Russia and its allies.

**Russia does not want any type of Cold War with any country. We still have enormous tasks to reshape our state, to radically improve the living standards for our citizens that is still not sufficient.**

Instead of imposing the Colder War that has already been initiated Russia needs once again a really global detente that was developing quite successfully during last century.

The European arms control is in deep deadlock. It is a bad heritage for succeeding generations.

The present-day Ukrainian crisis must not overshadow or torpedo the paramount mission to enhance radically the European security edifice.

It is the urgent task for all European nations – big or small, nuclear or non-nuclear, aligned or non-aligned to make Europe as non-confrontational space.

**Slide 25/A special US-Russia’s summit is needed to tackle all these issues with a new US President after his inauguration.**

**An All-European Security Summit should be also convened to tackle all security-related issues that have direct bearing on Europe.**

These measures can be implemented only after the next US President is elected and sworn in January 20th, 2017.
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