

Министерство науки и высшего образования Российской Федерации
Федеральное государственное бюджетное образовательное учреждение
высшего образования
«Владимирский государственный университет
имени Александра Григорьевича и Николая Григорьевича Столетовых»

**ПЕРЕВОД ОБЩЕСТВЕННО-ПОЛИТИЧЕСКИХ
МАТЕРИАЛОВ С АНГЛИЙСКОГО ЯЗЫКА
НА РУССКИЙ**

Учебно-практическое пособие



Владимир 2023

УДК 811.111
ББК 81.2 (Англ)
П27

Автор-составитель Н. К. Яшина

Рецензенты:

Кандидат педагогических наук
доцент кафедры профессиональной языковой
подготовки Владимирского юридического института
Федеральной службы исполнения наказаний
С. П. Фокина

Доктор педагогических наук, доцент
доцент кафедры педагогики
Владимирского государственного университета
имени Александра Григорьевича и Николая Григорьевича Столетовых
С. И. Дорошенко

Издается по решению редакционно-издательского совета ВлГУ

Перевод общественно-политических материалов с ан-
П27 глийского языка на русский : учеб.-практ. пособие / авт.-сост.
Н. К. Яшина ; Владим. гос. ун-т им. А. Г. и Н. Г. Столетовых. –
Владимир : Изд-во ВлГУ, 2023. – 140 с. – ISBN 978-5-9984-
1540-1.

Посвящено выработке и развитию навыков письменного перевода обще-
ственно-политических материалов по актуальным проблемам внешнеполитиче-
ской деятельности Российской Федерации.

Предназначено для студентов 3 – 4-го курсов очной формы обучения
направления подготовки 45.03.02 – Лингвистика.

Рекомендовано для формирования профессиональных компетенций в со-
ответствии с ФГОС ВО.

Библиогр.: 8 назв.

УДК 811.111
ББК 81.2 (Англ)

ISBN 978-5-9984-1540-1

© ВлГУ, 2023

PREFACE

Умение правильно переводить общественно-политические тексты и оперировать политическими понятиями на английском языке – одна из главных задач обучения студентов профессионально ориентированному переводу.

Цель пособия – формирование и развитие навыков письменного перевода с английского языка на русский текстов политической и экономической тематики.

Пособие состоит из четырех модулей, связанных с такими актуальными проблемами внешнеполитической деятельности Российской Федерации, как вопросы внешней политики России, политические аспекты разоружения, Послание Президента Российской Федерации Федеральному собранию, концепция национальной безопасности России.

Каждый модуль включает четыре текста, тематический словарь, упражнения на активизацию и закрепление лексики текста и анализ переводческих решений. Пособие также содержит дополнительные тексты для самостоятельной работы.

Unit 1

PRESSING PROBLEMS OF FOREIGN POLICY OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION

1.1. Forcing to Peace

Word List:

to accumulate serious foreign policy capital – накопить серьезный внешнеполитический капитал

to become firmly embedded – обрести прочную основу

a responsible state – ответственное государство

to stand up for one's citizens – стоять за чьих-либо граждан

to be mistaken on the score – заблуждаться на этот счет

to dispel any doubts – рассеять сомнения

to set a certain standard of responding – установить стандарт реагирования

the right to self-defense – право на самооборону

to follow Christian tradition – следовать христианской традиции

to dye for friends – умереть за друзей

to provide effective guarantees – необходимость обеспечить действенные гарантии

nonresumption of Georgian aggression – невозобновление грузинской агрессии

multilateral diplomacy – многосторонняя дипломатия

Russian-US interaction – российско-американское взаимодействие

to be directed at keeping Tbilisi from a perilous adventure – быть направленным на удержание Тбилиси от губительной авантюры

to restrain the Georgian government – сдерживать грузинское правительство

to encourage the unpredictable regime – поощрять непредсказуемый режим

the road of gambles – путь авантюр

Text

Russia has accumulated serious foreign policy capital – it works for the country's development and the protection of the interests of citizens and national business. Russian diplomacy has become firmly embedded in the successes of its internal development and in the real-life national interests and understandable to people.

Russia has returned to the world arena as a responsible state which can stand up for its citizens. If somebody was mistaken on that score, then Russian resolute actions to force Georgia to peace and its recognition, due to the circumstances, of the independence of South Ossetia and Abkhazia should have dispelled any such doubts.

With its reaction to the Georgian aggression Russia has set a certain standard of responding that fully complies with international law, including the right to self-defense under Article 51 of the UN Charter and Russia specific commitments in terms of the settlement of this conflict. Moreover, Russia and its peacekeepers have followed deeply Christian tradition of dying for friends.

The actions of Russia to force Georgia to peace have become a model of moderation, since they have pursued no aims other than those dictated by the necessity of providing effective guarantees of the non consumption of Georgian aggression against South Ossetia and Abkhazia.

Unfortunately, neither multilateral diplomacy nor Russian-US interaction, directed at keeping Georgia from a perilous adventure, had worked. Military aid had failed to give the US sufficient leverage to restrain Georgia's government. It had rather encouraged the irresponsible and unpredictable regime as it proceeded along the road of gambles.

Answer the following questions about the text.

1. Why has Russian diplomacy become embedded in the success of its internal development?
2. What kind of a state has Russia returned to the world arena?
3. What has Russia set with its reaction to Georgia?
4. What have the actions of Russia to force Georgia to peace become?

5. What had worked at keeping Georgia from a perilous adventure?
6. What had encouraged the Georgian irresponsible and unpredictable regime?

Vocabulary Exercises

I. Fill in the gaps with the words or word combinations from the box.

1. Russia has returned to the world arena as a _____ which can stand for its citizens.
2. Russia and peacekeepers _____ of dying for friends.
3. The actions of Russia to force Georgia to place have become _____.
4. No multilateral diplomacy _____.
5. Russia has set a certain standard of responding that _____.
6. _____ had encouraged the irresponsible regime in Georgia.

perilous adventure, to follow Christian tradition, to comply with international law, military aid, responsible state, a model of moderation

II. What is the Russian for:

to proceed along the road of gambles, a responsible state, to force Georgia to peace, the right of self-defense, the settlement of the conflict, protection of the interests of citizens, to dispel doubts, to work for the country's development, to return to the world arena, to set a standard of responding.

III. Make a pre-translation analysis of the text.

1. Определите тип источника и реципиента текста. На основании каких данных в тексте это можно сделать?
2. Охарактеризуйте лексику и термины данного текста. Приведите примеры из текста.

IV. Translate the text in a written form and single out the difficulties in translation.

V. What translation decisions have you made in the following sentences?

1. Russian diplomacy has become firmly embedded in the real-life national interests of people.

2. With its reaction to the Georgian aggression Russia has set a certain standard of responding that fully complies with international law.

3. Russia and its peacekeepers have followed deeply Christian tradition of dying for friends.

4. Russia has returned to the world arena as a responsible state which can stand up for its citizens.

5. Military aid had failed to give the US sufficient leverage to restrain Georgia's government.

VI. Choose the best variant of translation and correct the mistakes of each other.

1.2. Recognizing the Independence of South Ossetia and Abkhazia by Russia

Word List:

to seek independence – стремиться к независимости

ethnic minorities – этнические меньшинства

peacekeeping – миротворчество

to enjoy the fruits of peace – пользоваться преимуществами достижений мира

failure – провал

inability to derive benefit – неспособность извлечь выгоду

to be dictated in equal measure – быть продиктованным в равной мере

in terms of assuring effective security – в плане обеспечения эффективной безопасности

can no longer afford – уже не можем позволить

to repel aggression – отражать агрессию

fundamental requirements – фундаментальные требования

by no means – отнюдь
to run counter – противостоятъ
Helsinki Final act – Хельсинские соглашения
relapse of violence – рецидив насилия
to take measures – принимать меры
to punish those guilty – наказывать виновных
to impose an embargo – ввести эмбарго
supply of arms – поставка оружия
to presuppose responsibility – предполагать ответственность

Text

South Ossetia and Abkhazia did not seek a dependence in general, but precisely independence from the Georgia whose leadership for some reason has always tended to be chauvinistic towards ethnic minorities.

One should not forget that thanks to Russian peacekeeping in South Ossetia and Abkhazia Georgia enjoyed the fruits of peace for the last twenty years and the greatest failure of all the Georgian governments has been the interest of their own country, of their own people.

For Russia, recognizing the independence of South Ossetia and Abkhazia was dictated in equal measure by legal, moral and also pragmatic considerations – primarily in terms of assuring effective security for the peoples. Russia can no longer afford, as it did in recent years, to merely wait when Tbilisi blitzkrieg begins against South Ossetia and Abkhazia again. For Russia, the question in South Ossetia was one of the repelling aggression and protecting the Russian people directly on the borders of Russia.

Realized in Russia's actions to protect the rights of the population in South Ossetia and Abkhazia, of whom Russian citizens from a large part, are not only the fundamental requirements of its constitution, but also the growing support in the international community of the idea of the security of the individual, which by no means runs counter to the traditional concept of the security of the state. To kill people whom, you consider your own citizens is not an internal matter.

Russia, cannot regard people as “belonging” to anyone territory, without its people’s consent, pass under the sovereignty of this or that state in violation of the UN Charter and the principles of the Helsinki Final Act. Sovereignty, of which the people are the only source, presupposes responsibility in the first place – responsibility to one’s own citizens including ensuring their rights and freedoms. Herein is the purpose of the existence of the state itself – not the individual for the state, but the state for the individual.

To ensure the region against relapses of violence Russia will continue to take measures to punish those guilty and ensure that this region cannot perpetrate evil any more. For a start it is necessary to impose an embargo on supplies of arms to this region - until another government turns Georgia into a normal state.

Answer the following questions about the text.

1. Did South Ossetia and Abkhazia seek independence in general?
2. What did South Ossetia and Abkhazia enjoy during the last twenty years?
3. What was recognizing the independence of South Ossetia and Abkhazia dictated by?
4. How does Russia regard its people?
5. What will Russia do to ensure the region against relapses of violence?
6. Is it necessary to impose an embargo on supplies of arms to this region?

Vocabulary Exercises

I. Fill in the gaps with the word or word combinations from the box.

1. For Russia, the question in South Ossetia was one of _____.
2. To kill people whom you consider your own citizens is not _____.
3. The idea of the security of the individual does not counter to _____.
4. Russia will continue to take measures _____ and ensure that this region cannot perpetrate evil any more.

5. People cannot _____ of this or that state in violation of the UN Charter.

6. Responsibility of ensuring the rights and freedoms of people is the purpose of _____.

internal matter, to pass under sovereignty, existence of the state, to punish those guilty, concept of the security of the state, to repel aggression

II. What is the Russian for:

the idea of the security of individual, to recognize the independence of the state fundamental requirements, presuppose responsibility, replace of violence, to perpetrate evil, people's consent, international community, violation of the NN Charter, to impose an embargo.

III. Make a pre-translation analysis of the text.

1. Определите тип источника и реципиента текста. На основании каких данных в тексте это можно сделать?

2. Охарактеризуйте лексику и термины данного текста. Приведите примеры из текста.

IV. Translate the text in a written form and single out the difficulties in translation.

V. What translation decisions have you made in the following sentences?

1. Russia cannot regard people as “belonging” to anyone's territory, without its people's consent, pass under the sovereignty of this or that state in violation of the UN Charter and the principles of the Helsinki Final Act.

2. Russia will continue to take measures to punish those guilty and ensure that this region cannot perpetrate evil any more.

3. For Russia, recognizing the independence of South Ossetia and Abkhazia was dictated in equal measure by legal, moral and also pragmatic considerations-primarily in terms of assuring effective security for the peoples.

4. The greatest failure of all the Georgian governments has been the inability to derive benefit from this in the interests of their own country, of their own people.

5. To kill people whom you consider your own citizens is not an internal matter.

VI. Choose the best variant of translation and correct the mistakes of each other.

1.3. The Turning Point in World Development

Word List:

turning point – переломный этап

to require a profound, philosophical approach – требовать глубокого философского подхода

to dispense with turning to history – обойтись без обращения к истории

collective security system – система коллективной безопасности

to guarantee the inviolability of postwar orders – гарантировать нерушимость послевоенных границ

to take into consideration the realities of the 21st century – учитывать реалии 21 века

to conclude a european security treaty – заключить договор о европейской безопасности

to drop tack into its rut – возвращаться на круги своя

pan-European summit – общеевропейский саммит

to set out in Russian's foreign policy concept – излагать в концепции внешней политики России

sensible voices – здравый смысл

to maintain real control over strategic offensive arms – сохранять реальный контроль над стратегическим наступательным вооружением

to build a positive agenda – выстроить позитивную повестку дня

to reflect the true state of affairs – отражать действительное положение дел

Text

The turning point in world development requires a profound, philosophical approach. In this regard, there is no way to dispense with turning to history – otherwise we will be doomed to repeating it. This is important, since Europe, unfortunately, still does not have a collective security system created which would be open to all and provide all with equal security.

But something needs to be done otherwise everything in Euro – Atlantic affairs will drop back into the rut. The present crisis points to this as well. Europe needs a positive, not a negative agenda. For a start it would not be a bad idea to look at whether the previous structures and mechanisms are adequate today or thought must be given to something new for construction of new European architecture, firmly quarantining the inviolability of postwar borders while taking into consideration the realities of the 21st century. Let us call it an “audit”.

President Putin suggested concluding a European Security Treaty and starting this process at a pan – European summit. At issue is the establishment of a truly universal system of collective security in Euro-Atlantic area with the integration of Russia in it. But we would, of course, prefer collective work on European security issues-naturally on an equal, not a bloc basis. It's not we that are subjecting the entire present European security architecture to test. Its systematic defects are obvious, including above all NATO-centrism, which by definition negates the creation of a truly universal mechanism of collective security in the Euro-Atlantic area.

As to Russian - American relations their positive program is set out in Russian's Foreign Policy Concept. We have noted that, in the course of the coming presidential campaign in the US, sensible voices have begun to be heard, particularly about the need to maintain real control over strategic offensive arms. The Russian president is sure that a positive agenda can be built on such a pragmatic basis reflecting the true state of affairs and national interests and not ideological fantasies.

Answer the following questions about the text.

1. What does the turning point in the world development require?
2. What is important to have in Europe regarding security?

3. What is called an audit?
4. What did President Putin suggest to do?
5. How would Russia prefer to work on European Security issues?
6. Where are Russian-American relations set out?

Vocabulary Exercises

I. Fill in the gaps with the word or word combinations from the box.

1. President Putin suggested _____ and starting this process at a pan – European summit.
2. As to Russian-American relations their positive program is set out in _____.
3. Europe _____ not a negative agenda.
4. Russia's relative initiatives _____.
5. We have noted that, in the course of the coming presidential campaign in the US, sensible voices have begun to be heard, particularly about the need _____.
6. The construction of a new European architecture _____.

to need a positive agenda, to guarantee a postwar borders, to conclude a European Security Treaty, to remain valid, Russian's Foreign Policy Concept, to maintain control over strategic offensive arms

II. What is the Russian for:

to require a profound, philosophical approach, to take into consideration the realities of postwar orders, to conclude a European Security Treaty, Russian's Foreign Policy Concept, to build a positive agenda, to reflect the true state of affairs, the turning point in World Development, to dispense with turning to history, establishment of truly universal system of collective security.

III. Make a pre-translation analysis of the text.

1. Определите тип источника и реципиента текста. На основании каких данных в тексте это можно сделать?
2. Охарактеризуйте лексику и термины данного текста. Приведите примеры из текста.

IV. Translate the text in a written form and single out the difficulties in translation.

V. What translation decisions have you made in the following sentences?

1. Europe still does not have a collective security system created which would be open to all and provide all with equal security.
2. But something needs to be done otherwise everything in Euro-Atlantic affairs will drop back into the rut.
3. For a start it would not be a bad idea to look whether the previous structures or thoughts must be given to something new for construction of new European architecture.
4. The Russian president is sure that a positive agenda can be built on such a pragmatic basis, reflecting the true state of affairs and national interests and not ideological fantasies.
5. It is not we that are subjecting the entire present European security architecture to test.

VI. Choose the best variant of translation and correct the mistakes of each other.

1.4. Multivariant Behavior of States on the International Scene

Word List:

voluntary chosen socially oriented economy – добровольно выбранная социально ориентированная экономика
to enter the global market of ideas, values and development models – выходить на глобальный рынок идей, ценностей и моделей развития

to tackle global problems – решать глобальные проблемы
to call for a fresh look – требовать свежего взгляда
to arise prerequisites – создавать предпосылки
affirmation of the principle – утверждать принципы
grounds – основы
block policy – блоковая политика
multivariant behavior of states – многовариантное поведение государств
multipolar world – многополярный мир
to cleanse – очищать
self-regulatory international system – саморегулирующая международная система
to be drawn into any confrontation – вовлекаться в какую-либо конфронтацию
to develop privileged relations – развивать привилегированные отношения
to have a coherent view – иметь целостное видение
to succumb to provocations – поддаваться провокациям
to traverse – проходить
to unfold accumulated potential – раскрыть накопленный потенциал
active contribution to shaping and implementing an international agenda – активный вклад в формирование и реализацию международной повестки дня

Text

Russia has voluntarily chosen socially oriented economy as its aim. It is with this civilizational product that whole Euro-Atlantic area should enter into the global market of ideas, values and development models. The time has come when tackling global problems must become a part of national development strategies. This will call for a fresh look at things as ability to consider and integrate the interests of all groups of states. With the end of the Cold War the prerequisites arose for the affirmation of the principles of genuine freedom in the international community. The

grounds for bloc policies have disappeared. The multivariant behavior of states has increased on the international scene. The notorious principle of “you’re either with us, or against us” no longer operates. Conditions are being created for a multipolar world in which states are driven by their national interests cleansed of ideology of by a common understanding of collective interests. Herein is the basis of emerging new, self-regulatory system.

Russia is not going to let itself be drawn into any confrontation. If the partners of Russia are not ready for joint actions, it will be forced to go it in alone, defending its national interests, but always on the basis of international law.

On the firm basis of international law, the constitution and Russian laws, the country is going to protect the life and dignity of its people wherever they are, and to support the interests of Russian business and develop privileged relations with Russia’s friends in different regions. Russia has a coherent view of the contemporary world and its own role in it. It tackles successfully the important tasks for its people and occupies lawful place in the world. Out Russia has enough patience not to succumb to provocations. The stage of “concentration” has been traversed by Russia on the whole. The task today is to unfold the accumulated potential in the interests of Russia, the achievements of a new quality in its domestic development and its active contribution to shaping and implementing an international agenda.

Answer the following questions about the text.

1. What economy has Russia chosen as its aim?
2. What has become a part of national development strategies?
3. What prerequisites arose with the end of the Cold War?
4. What is the basis of emerging new self-regulatory system?
5. What will Russia do if its partners are not ready for joint action?
6. How is Russia going to protect the life and dignity of its people?

Vocabulary Exercises

I. Fill in the gaps with the word or word combinations from the box.

1. _____ has increased on the international scene.
2. This will _____ at things as ability to consider and integrate the interests of all groups of states.
3. Russia is going to protect the life and dignity of its people and _____ with its friends in different regions.
4. Russia will _____ with civilizational economy.
5. The basis of emerging _____ is being created in the multipolar world.
6. The task today is _____ in the interests of Russia.

to call for a fresh look, the multivariant behavior of states, to develop privileged relations with Russia's friends, to enter into the global market, new self-regulatory system, to unfold accumulated potential.

II. What is the Russian for:

active contribution to shaping and implementing an international agenda, to have enough patience, the basis of international law, to arise prerequisites, common understanding of collective interests, genuine freedom in the international community, to emerge new self-regulatory system, to be ready for joint actions, multivariant behavior of states, to unfold the accumulated potential.

III. Make a pre-translation analysis of the text.

1. Определите тип источника и реципиента текста. На основании каких данных в тексте это можно сделать?
2. Охарактеризуйте лексику и термины данного текста. Приведите примеры из текста.

IV. Translate the text in a written form and single out the difficulties in translation.

V. What translation decisions have you made in the following sentences?

1. On the firm basis of international law, the constitution and Russian laws, the country is going to protect the life and dignity of its people, wherever they are, and to support the interests of Russian business and develop privileged relations with Russia's friends in different regions.

2. With the end of the Cold War the prerequisites arose for the affirmation of principles of genuine freedom in the international community.

3. The notorious principles of "you're either with us, or against us" no longer operates.

4. Conditions are being created for a multipolar world in which states are driven by their national interests cleansed of ideology or by common understanding of collective interests.

5. The task today is to unfold the accumulated potential in the interests of Russia, the achievements of a new quality in its domestic development and its active contribution to shaping and implementing an international agenda.

VI. Choose the best variant of translation and correct the mistakes of each other.

TEXTS FOR SELF-DIRECTED ACTIVITY

Text 1. The Way Russia Serves Its Interests

Although realists claim that good relations between Washington and Moscow are impossible if one side annoys the other too much, not long ago Putin himself presided over just such good but somewhat fractious relations. As he awaited a visit from his friend U.S. President George W. Bush in the middle of 2002, Putin could look back over a three-year stretch during which the United States had bombed Serbia and occupied Kosovo, accused Russia of war crimes in Chechnya, abrogated the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, established a military presence in Central Asia, begun to train and equip Georgia's armed forces, and completed the largest-ever expansion of NATO, which included three former Soviet states, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

Bush administration officials naturally gushed that U.S.-Russian relations had never been better. What is more, Putin agreed. Some of the U.S. actions that might have seemed to be problems for Russia were nothing of the sort, he said; after all, strengthening the ability of Russia's neighbors to deal with terrorism strengthened Russia's security, too.

Yes, the two sides did not see eye to eye on some issues, but these would not threaten their deepening strategic partnership. After an earlier meeting with Putin, Bush himself had captured this outlook in his customary homey language: "You probably don't agree with your mother on every issue. You still love her, though, don't you?"

Now that U.S.-Russian relations have sunk to a new low, it is essential to recall – and understand – their previous high. Why did Putin say things in 2002 that he would never dream of saying in 2008? Was it, as realists might say weakness? Maybe. But if the Russian economy was less robust six years ago than it is now, it was already on the upswing. And in any event, in the 1990s the Russian President Boris Yeltsin objected far more vocally than Putin did to U.S. policies he disliked, even though during his tenure Russia was far weaker than it was in 2002.

Was Putin expecting a greater payoff from Washington than he actually received, and did he then change course when he did not get it?

There is not as much to this explanation as Russian officials and sympathetic Western analysts like to allege. Within a year of the attacks of September 11, 2001, Bush had offered Putin a new strategic arms treaty (which Putin had said he needed for political reasons), shifted U.S. policy on Chechnya from condemnation of Russia to understanding, recognized Russia as a market economy (an important step in easing bilateral trade disputes), supported Russia's accession to the World Trade Organization, agreed to have Russia chair the G-8 (the group of highly industrialized states) for the first time, initiated a multibillion-dollar international version of the Nunn-Lugar program (a U.S. effort launched in 1992 to help dismantle weapons of mass destruction in the former Soviet Union), and upgraded Russia's ties to NATO so that Russia's representatives could participate on a more equal footing in deliberations on European security.

As payoffs go, this was not bad, and at the time both sides emphasized that it represented more than U.S. President Bill Clinton had ever offered Yeltsin. But what really undergirded the U.S.-Russian relationship in its post-9/11 heyday was not any transactional reward. It was the two sides' shared conviction that the two countries saw major goals and major problems in broadly compatible terms — and that, more than ever before, they could deal with each other as equals.

Washington and Moscow resolved their disagreements not by exchanging payoffs but by choosing not to see differences as expressions of a deeper conflict. Russian arms sales to China did not block cooperation, nor did the U.S. State Department's human rights report. Henry Kissinger has called this kind of understanding between great powers a "moral consensus." Although the term may seem a little grand, it is a useful reminder that enduring strategic cooperation involves more than trading my quids for your quos.

Yet what changed the relationship far more than any disagreements themselves was a shift in the way Russian leaders understood them. Many events played a part in this transformation — the Iraq war, the Orange Revolution in Ukraine, and soaring energy prices, among others. From them, Putin and his colleagues seem to have drawn very different conclusions from those of 2002 — namely, that Russia's relations with the

United States (and the West in general) were inherently unequal and conflictual and that Russia would better serve its interests if it followed its own course.

As officials in the next U.S. administration examine the individual pieces of a U.S.-Russian relationship gone bad, they will have many reasons to consider specific changes in policy. On issues ranging from the military balance to democracy promotion to Russia's relations with its neighbors, new U.S. policymakers will review what is working and what is not and try to fashion a new and more productive relationship. The most significant obstacle they will face, however, is not the complexity of the individual issues in dispute – many of those are, actually, exceedingly simple. It is the fact that Russia's leaders have gone a long way toward reconceiving the relationship. In their view, common interests and strategic compatibility are no longer at its core.

Text 2. The Age of Nonpolarity. What Will Follow U.S. Dominance

The principal characteristic of twenty-first-century international relations is turning out to be nonpolarity: a world dominated not by one or two or even several states but rather by dozens of actors possessing and exercising various kinds of power.

This represents a tectonic shift from the past. The twentieth century started out distinctly multipolar. But after almost 50 years, two world wars, and many smaller conflicts, a bipolar system emerged. Then, with the end of the Cold War and the demise of the Soviet Union, bipolarity gave way to unipolarity – an international system dominated by one power, in this case the United States. But today power is diffuse, and the onset of nonpolarity raises a number of important questions. How does nonpolarity differ from other forms of international order? How and why did it materialize? What are its likely consequences? And how should the United States respond?

In contrast to multipolarity – which involves several distinct poles or concentrations of power – a nonpolar international system is characterized by numerous centers with meaningful power.

In a multipolar system, no power dominates, or the system will become unipolar. Nor do concentrations of power revolve around two positions, or the system will become bipolar. Multipolar systems can be cooperative, even assuming the form of a concert of powers, in which a few major powers work together of setting the rules of the game and disciplining those who violate them. They can also be more competitive, revolving around a balance of power, or conflictual, when the balance breaks down.

At first glance, the world today may appear to be multipolar. The major powers – China, the European Union (EU), India, Japan, Russia, and the United States – contain just over half the world's people and account for 75 percent of global GDP and 80 percent of global defense spending. Appearances, however, can even, be deceiving.

Today's world differs in a fundamental way from one of classic multipolarity: there are many more power centers, and quite a few of these poles are not nation-states. Indeed, one of the cardinal features of the contemporary international system is that nation-states have lost their monopoly on power and in some domains their preeminence as well. States are being challenged from above, by regional and global organizations; from below, by militias; and from the side, by a variety of nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) and corporations. Power is now found in many hands and in many places.

In addition to the six major world powers, there are numerous regional powers: Brazil and, arguably, Argentina, Chile, Mexico, and Venezuela in Latin America; Nigeria and South Africa in Africa; Egypt, Iran, Israel, and Saudi Arabia in the Middle East; Pakistan in South Asia; Australia, Indonesia, and South Korea in East Asia and Oceania.

A good many organizations would be on the list of power centers, including those that are global (the International Monetary Fund, the United Nations, the World Bank), those that are regional (the African Union, the Arab League, the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, the EU, the Organization of American States, the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation), and those that are functional (the International

Energy Agency, OPEC, the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, the World Health Organization).

So, too, would states within nation-states, such as California and India's Uttar Pradesh, and cities, such as New York, San Paulo, and Shanghai.

Then there are the large global companies, including those that dominate worlds of energy, finance, and manufacturing. Other entities deserving inclusion would be global media outlets (al Jazeera, the BBC, CNN), militias (Ham Hezbollah, the Mahdi Army, the Taliban), political parties, religious institutions and movements, terrorist organizations (al Qaeda), drug cartels, and NGOs of more benign sort (the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, Doctors Without Borders, Greenpeace).

Today's world is increasingly one of distributed, rather than concentrated power.

In this world, the United States is and will long remain the largest single aggregation of power. It spends more than \$500 billion annually on its military - and more than \$700 billion if the operations in Afghanistan and Iraq are included - and boasts land, air, and naval forces that are the world's most capable. Its economy, with a GDP of some \$14 trillion, is the world's largest.

The United States is also a major source of culture (through films and television), information, and innovation. But the reality of American strength should not mask the relative decline of the United States' position in the world - and with this relative decline in power an absolute decline in influence and independence.

The U.S. share of global imports is already down to 15 percent. Although U.S. GDP accounts for over 25 percent of the world's total, this percentage is sure to decline over time given the actual and projected differential between the United States' growth rate and those of the Asian giants and many other countries, a large number of which are growing at more than two or three times the rate of the United States.

Unit 2

POLITICAL ASPECTS OF DISARMAMENT

2.1. Interdependence of Globalizing World

Word List:

to offer unheard-of opportunities – открывать невиданные возможности

to address the primary task – решать главную задачу

to ensure sustainable development – обеспечить устойчивое развитие

the growing interdependence of the globalizing world – возрастающая взаимозависимость глобализирующегося мира

emerging multipolar system – возникающая многополярность

for the benefit of – на благо

favorable environment – благоприятные условия

to come up with a joint response – требовать ответа

imperative all the time – веление времени

acceptable alternative – разумная альтернатива

tough task – задача не по силам (сложная задача)

to prove futility – доказывать несостоятельность

bloc-based schemes – блоковая система

champions – приверженец

to guarantee security – гарантировать безопасность

to undermine stability – подрывать стабильность

to arrive to acceptable solutions – принять приемлемые решения

remain exclusive domain – оставаться эксклюзивной областью

residual polarity – остаточная биполярность

to cooperate with a view to strengthen common security – взаимодействовать в интересах укрепления общей безопасности

Text

Scientific achievements and the use of advanced technologies offer unheard-of opportunities for addressing the primary task for any state, i.e to ensure sustainable development and prosperity. The growing interdependence of the globalizing world and the emerging multipolar system create a favorable environment for expanding international cooperation with a view of taking maximum advantage of such opportunities for the benefit of all the countries and people. On the other hand, the new global threats in the aggravation of many existing ones, ranging from terrorism and proliferation of mass destruction to climate change require from the international community to come up with a joint response. This is an imperative to our time.

Mankind has no other acceptable alternative but to ensure security collectively, through working together. This task is too tough, both in financial and military terms, for a single state or any narrow coalition to tackle. The very logic behind the evolution of present-day international relations proves futility of unilateral and bloc-based schemes, particularly force-oriented ones. Their champions are incapable guaranteeing security even for themselves and only show the limits of what such a response can achieve.

But the main thing in such actions undermine stability by forcing other countries to take care of their security on their own and this, as a rule, does damage to non-proliferation.

Russian-American relations in the area of limitation and reduction of strategic offensive arms are of key importance to real disarmament. Unfortunately, there is no certainty about the future of this process. It has so far been impossible to arrive at acceptable solutions.

The US and Russia think that strategic stability can no longer remain an exclusive domain of their relations. This residual bipolarity needs to be overcome through opening up this sphere to all interested states prepared to actively cooperate with a view to strengthening common security.

Answer the following questions about the text.

1. What is the primary task for the development of any state?
2. What creates a favorable environment for expanding international cooperation?

3. What is acceptable alternative for ensuring collective security?
4. Why is this task tough?
5. What is the damage to non-proliferation?
6. What do new global threats require from the international community?

Vocabulary Exercises

I. Fill in the gaps with the word or word combinations from the box.

1. New global threats require from the international community _____.
2. Scientific development _____ and prosperity.
3. Multipolar system creates a favorable environment for _____.
4. The strategic stability can no longer _____ in the US and Russia relations.
5. Many countries _____ on their own.
6. This situation _____.

to remain exclusive domain, to ensure sustainable development, to be incapable guaranteeing security, to do damage to non-proliferation, to expand international cooperation, to come up with a joint response

II. What is the Russian for:

the use of advanced technologies, interdependence of the globalizing world, acceptable alternative, to prove futility, to take care of security on one's own, to arrive at acceptable solutions, residual bipolarity, to strengthen common security, to undermine stability, strategic offensive arms.

III. Make a pre-translation analysis of the text.

1. Определите тип источника и реципиента текста. На основании каких данных в тексте это можно сделать?
2. Охарактеризуйте лексику и термины данного текста. Приведите примеры из текста.

IV. Translate the text in a written form and single out the difficulties in translation.

V. What translation decisions have you made in the following sentences?

1. The growing interdependence of the globalizing world and the emerging multipolar system create a favorable environment for expanding international corporation with a view to taking maximum advantage of such opportunities for the benefit of the countries and people.

2. Mankind has no other acceptable alternative but to ensure security collectively, through working together.

3. The very logic behind the evolution of present-day international relations proves futility of unilateral and bloc-based schemes, particularly force-oriented ones.

4. Russian-American relations in the area of limitation and reduction of strategic offensive arms are of key importance to real disarmament.

5. This residual bipolarity needs to be overcome through opening up this sphere to all interested states prepared to actively cooperate with a view to strengthening common security.

VI. Choose the best variant of translation and correct mistakes of each other.

2.2. Not Allow “the Cold War”

Word List:

world competitive struggle – мировая конкурентная борьба

battlefields – поля сражений

to preserve the historic prospect – сохранить историческую перспективу

identity – самобытность

key guarantee – ключевая гарантия

to ensure – обеспечивать

to shake off “the Cold War” – избавиться от холодной войны

to attain a new equilibrium – обрести новое равновесие

to favor collective actions – выступать за коллективный образ действий
on the basis of the UN Charter – на основе устава ООН
recognition of security indivisibility – признание неделимости безопасности
to favour setting up open collective security system – выступать за создание открытой системы коллективной безопасности
formation of a single security space – формирование единого безопасного пространства
to draw some country into a costly confrontation – втянуть какую-либо страну в затратную конфронтацию
detrimental arms race – пагубная гонка вооружений
to maintain continuity – сохранять преемственность
in terms of treaties – на основе договорно-правового развития
in the spirit of strategic openness – в духе стратегической открытости
to throw challenges – бросать вызовы
to make one's choice – сделать выбор
to be prepared to work jointly – быть готовым к совместной работе

Text

In the new age, the goal of any state is to play and win in the world competitive struggle rather, than on the battlefields. Russia's entire foreign policy is oriented towards preserving the historical prospects for the independent development, truly based on its identity, in the family of other nations, that has been offered to it for the first time. This will be impossible without continuing accelerated social and economic growth in the country, which will be one of the key guarantees of our security. Russia's security should be ensured by a more just and genuinely democratic architecture of international relations.

Unfortunately, the world that shook off “the Cold War” has so far failed to attain a new equilibrium. The conflict potential, including in the areas close to the Russian frontiers is very high.

That is why Russia has been consistently favoring collective actions being reaffirmed and the legal principles strengthened in regional and

global affairs on the basis of the UN Charter and recognition of indivisibility of security and development in the modern world.

That is why Russia favors setting up collective security systems, first of all formation of a single security space in the Euro-Atlantic area. There is no need for security against each other or against anyone, we need security against transnational threats.

That is why Russia will not allow to draw it into a costly confrontation, including in new race raise detrimental to the internal development of the country.

That is why the Russian state favors maintaining continuity in the process of disarmament and arms control, its further development in terms of treaties and law and in the spirit of strategic openness.

It is not Russia that throws challenges to its international partners, it is life itself that throws challenges to all states without exception, first of all, to major states, which largely determine the future of the world. We have made our choices and are prepared to work jointly.

Answer the following questions about the text.

1. What is the goal of any state in the world competitive struggle?
2. What is Russia's foreign policy oriented to?
3. What will one of the key guarantees of security in Russia be?
4. Has the world attained a new equilibrium in respect to international security?
5. What does Russia favor in the field of security?
6. What throws challenges to the international partners?

Vocabulary Exercises

I. Fill in the gaps with the word or word combinations from the box.

1. Russia favors setting up collective security systems in _____ in the Euro Atlantic area.
2. This will be impossible without continuing _____ in the country which will be one of the key guarantees of security.
3. That is why Russia will not allow _____ including a new arms race.
4. Russia's security should _____.

5. It is not Russia that _____.
6. The Russian state _____ in the process of disarmament and arms control.

accelerated social and economic growth, to be ensured by democratic architecture of international relations, the formation of a single security space, to favor maintaining continuity, to throw challenge, to draw some country into a costly confrontation

II. What is the Russian for:

to shake off “the Cold War”, to attain new equilibrium, to favor collective actions, transnational threats, to make one's choice, process of disarmament and arms control, development in terms of treaties, to throw challenge, key guarantee, to determine the future of the world.

III. Make a pre-translation analysis of the text.

1. Определите тип источника и реципиента текста. На основании каких данных в тексте это можно сделать?
2. Охарактеризуйте лексику и термины данного текста. Приведите примеры из текста.

IV. Translate the text in a written form and single out the difficulties in translation.

V. What translation decisions have you made in the following sentences?

1. Unfortunately, the world that shook off “the Cold War” has so far failed to attain a new equilibrium.
2. That is why Russia has been consistently favouring collective actions being reaffirmed and the legal principles strengthened in regional and global affairs on the basis of the UN Charter and recognition of indivisibility of security and development in the modern world.
3. In the new age, the goal of any state is to play and win in the world competitive struggle, rather than on the battlefield.
4. Russia's security should be ensured by a more just and genuinely democratic architecture of international relations.

5. That is why the Russian state favors maintaining continuity in the process of disarmament and arms control, it's further development in terms of treaties and law and in the spirit of strategic openness.

VI. Choose the best variant of translation and correct the mistakes of each other.

2.3. New Challenges and Threats

Word List:

to uphold the principles of equality, mutual respect and constructive dialogue, joint analysis – отстаивать принципы равенства, взаимного уважения, конструктивного диалога, совместного анализа
highly grave challenges and threats – серьезные вызовы и угрозы
to advance disarmament process on the basis of reciprocity – продвигать разоружение на основе взаимности
to ensure predictability of military activities in space – обеспечить предсказуемость в военной космической деятельности
to endanger world's military and political equilibrium – наносить угрозу военному и политическому равновесию в мире
to require measures – требовать принятия мер
to turn space into arena of confrontation – превратить космическое пространство в арену противостояния
to prohibit deployment – запретить размещение
WMD (weapons of mass destruction) – оружие массового уничтожения
to have a global reach – иметь глобальную зону действия
the capability for hidden engagement of space objects – возможность скрытого воздействия на космические объекты
to generate suspicion and tensions – генерировать подозрительность и напряженность
to frustrate the climate of mutual trust and cooperation – нарушать климат взаимного доверия и сотрудничества
to result in a chain reaction – вызвать цепную реакцию
to be fraught with a new spiral – приводить к новому витку

Text

Russia will continue to uphold the principles of equality, mutual respect, a constructive dialogue, joint analysis in its foreign policy.

In the past Russia cannot solve the current problems of the foreign policy alone: new and highly grave challenges and threats can call for an urgent joint response.

Like a great majority of other states, Russia is, of course, dissatisfied with the situation of stagnation in the sphere of disarmament, arms control and non-proliferation for more than 10 years now. But the Russian state is convinced that by given political will, the situation can be reversed.

And the key prerequisite for these lies in the favorable international conditions for disarmament process that can only advance on the basis of reciprocity, the principle of equal security and compliance with an international law.

Without preventing an arms race in space international security will be wanting. Strategic stability which is central to the world's military and political equilibrium will be endangered.

The activities in the exploration and use of outer space have substantially expanded lately in their scale and importance. The interests of further dynamic development of international space cooperation require insistently measures aimed to prevent turning space into an arena of confrontation and to keep space free from any weapons. Countries must act according to modern international space law in the sphere of disarmament.

This law doesn't prohibit deployment in space of weapons which do not belong to WMD (weapons of mass destruction). However, such weapons, if deployed in space, would have a global reach, high employment readiness and capability for hidden engagement of space objects in contrast to WMD, such weapons would be fit for real use, generate suspicion and tension among states and frustrate the climate of mutual trust and cooperation in space.

Apart from this, weapons deployment in space by one state will inevitably result in chain reaction. And this, in turn, is fraught with a new spiral in the arms race both in space and on the Earth.

Answer the following questions about the text.

1. What will Russia continue to uphold in its foreign policy?
2. In what way can the situation of stagnation in the sphere of disarmament be reversed?
3. What is one of issues in field of military activities in space?
4. What case will space international security be wanting?
5. How must countries act in the sphere of disarmament?
6. What will the consequences of weapons deployment in space be?

Vocabulary Exercises

I. Fill in the gaps with the word or word combinations from the box.

1. _____ for disarmament process are necessary.
2. New and highly grave challenges and threats _____.
3. This law does not _____.
4. This is the weapons deployment in space by one state will _____.
5. Disarmament process can only advance on the basis of reciprocity, the principle of equal security and _____.
6. Weapons which do not belong to WMD _____ among states and frustrating climate of mutual trust in cooperation in space.

to prohibit deployment of weapons in space, to generate suspicion and tension, to result in chain reaction, favourable international conditions, compliance with international law, to call for an urgent joint response

II. What is the Russian for:

climate of mutual trust and cooperation in space, weapons deployment, to keep space free from any weapons, issue of paramount importance, principle of compliance with international law, sphere of

disarmament, arms control and non-proliferation, to prevent an arms race in space, world's military and political equilibrium, to have a global reach.

III. Make a pre-translation analysis of the text.

1. Определите тип источника и реципиента текста. На основании каких данных в тексте это можно сделать?

2. Охарактеризуйте лексику и термины данного текста. Приведите примеры из текста.

IV. Translate the text in a written form and single out the difficulties in translation.

V. What translation decisions have you made in the following sentences?

1. Like a great majority of other states, Russia is of course dissatisfied with the situation of stagnation in the sphere of disarmament, arms control and non-proliferation for more than 10 years now.

2. Without preventing an arms race in space international security will be wanting.

3. The activities in the exploration and use of outer space have substantially expanded lately in their scale and importance.

4. The interests of further dynamic development of international space cooperation require insistently measures aimed to prevent turning space into an arena of confrontation and to keep space free from any weapons.

5. Strategic stability which is central to the world's military and political equilibrium will be endangered.

VI. Choose the best variant of translation and correct the mistakes of each other.

2.4. Internal and External Threats

Word List:

the imperfect nature of the system and structure of the authorities – несовершенство системы организации государственной власти
criminalization of social relations – криминализация общественных отношений
increased scope of terrorism – увеличенный масштаб терроризма
a broad range of internal and external threats – широкий спектр внутренних и внешних угроз
to be of comprehensive nature – иметь комплексный характер
contraction – сокращение
gross domestic product – валовый внутренний продукт
stagnation in agriculture – стагнация в аграрном секторе
distorted banking system – разбалансированная банковская система
brain drain of specialists – отток специалистов за рубеж
decay of one's high-technology industries – деградация наукоемких производств
to undermine defense capabilities – подрывать обороноспособность
social stratification – социальная дифференциация
devaluation of spiritual values – девальвация духовных ценностей
to cause tension – способствовать усилению напряженности
to pose a threat – представлять угрозу
socioeconomic fabric – социально-экономический уклад
score of terrorism – масштаб терроризма
to accompany changes of ownership – сопровождать изменения форм собственности
the consequences – последствия
sharp drop in the birth rate – резкое сокращение рождаемости
average life expectancy – средняя продолжительность жизни
to undermine workforce – подрывать трудовые ресурсы
weakening of the fundamental nucleus of society – ослаблять фундаментальную ячейку общества
loss of democratic gains – утрата демократических завоеваний

Text

The state of the national economy and the imperfect nature and structure of the authorities of the state, social and political polarization of the Russia's society and criminalization of social relations increased score of terrorism, complications in international relations are all creating a broad range of internal and external threats to the country's national security.

In the economy, these threats are of a comprehensive nature and are caused above all by a substantial contraction in the gross domestic product; reduced investment and innovation; diminished scientific and technological potential; stagnation in agriculture; a distorted banking system; growth in the states internal and external debt.

A weakened national scientific and technological potential, reduced research in strategically vital areas of science and technology and the brain drain of specialists and intellectual property mean that Russia is faced with the threat of loss of its leading world positions, decay of its high-technology industries increased dependence on foreign technology and undermining of its defense capabilities.

Economic disintegration, social stratification and the devaluation of spiritual values cause tension between regions and the center and pose a threat to the federal structure and the socioeconomic fabric of the Russian Federation.

The scope of terrorism and organized crime is growing because of the conflicts that frequently accompany changes of ownership and also an increased struggle for power along clan and ethnic or nationalist interests.

A threat to the nation's physical health can be seen in the crisis in the systems of public health care and social protection of the population, in increasing consumption of alcohol and narcotics.

The consequences of this profound social crisis are a sharp drop in the birth rate and average life expectancy, distortion of the demographic and social composition of the society an undermining of the workforce as a foundation for industrial development, weakening of the fundamental nucleus of society – the family – and a decline in society's spiritual, moral and creative potential.

The deepening crisis in the domestic political, social and spiritual spheres could lead to the loss of democratic gains.

Answer the following questions about the text.

1. What aspects can be regarded as internal and external threats?
2. What are these threats in economy?
3. What shows that Russia is faced of loss its leading world position?
4. What causes tension and poses a threat to the federal structure?
5. What is the reason of growing conflicts?
6. What are the consequences of the profound social crisis?

Vocabulary Exercises

I. Fill in the gaps with the word or word combinations from the box.

1. One of the consequences is weakening of _____ – the family and a decline in society’s spiritual, moral and creative potential.
2. _____ is one of its internal threats.
3. In the economy these threats _____.
4. Russia _____ of loss of its leading world positions.
5. A threat to the nation’s physical health can be seen in the crisis in the systems _____ and social protection of the population.
6. The score of terrorism _____ is growing because of the conflicts that frequently accompany changes of ownership.

the fundamental nucleus of society, public health care, organized crime, to be faced with the threat, to be of comprehensive nature, political polarization of the Russia’s society

II. What is the Russian for:

criminalization of social relations, a weakened national scientific and technological potential, intellectual property, decay of high-technology industries, devaluation of spiritual values, socioeconomic fabric, defense capabilities, vital areas of science and technology, brain drain, increased struggle for power.

III. Make a pre-translation analysis of the text.

1. Определите тип источника и реципиента текста. На основании каких данных в тексте это можно сделать?

2. Охарактеризуйте термины и лексику данного текста. Приведите примеры из текста.

IV. Translate the text in a written form and single out the difficulties in translation.

V. What translation decisions have you made in the following sentences?

1. The state of the national economy and the imperfect nature and structure of the authorities of the state social and political polarization of the Russia's society and criminalization in international relations are all creating a broad range of internal and external threats to the country's national security.

2. Economic disintegration, social stratification and the devaluation of spiritual values cause tension to the federal structure and the socioeconomic fabric of the Russian Federation.

3. The scope of terrorism and organized crime is growing because of the conflicts that frequently accompany changes of ownership and also an increased struggle for power along clan and ethnic or nationalist interests.

4. A threat to the nation's physical health can be seen in the crisis in the systems of public health care and social protection of the population, in increasing consumption of alcohol and narcotics.

5. A weakened national scientific and technological potential, reduced research in strategically vital areas of science and technology, the brain drain of specialists and intellectual property mean that Russia is faced with the threat of loss of its leading world positions, decay of its high-technology industries, increased dependence on foreign technology and undermining of its defense capabilities.

VI. Choose the best variant of translation and correct the mistakes of each other.

TEXTS FOR SELF-DIRECTED ACTIVITY

Text 1. How to Stop Nuclear Terror

President George W. Bush has singled out terrorist nuclear attacks on the United States as the defining threat the nation will face in the foreseeable future. In addressing this specter, he has asserted that Americans' "highest priority is to keep terrorists from acquiring weapons of mass destruction." So far, however, his words have not been matched by deeds. The Bush administration has yet to develop a coherent strategy for combating the threat of nuclear terror. Although it has made progress on some fronts, Washington has failed to take scores of specific actions that would measurably reduce the risk to the country. Unless it changes course – and fast – a nuclear terrorist attack on the United States will be more likely than not in the decade ahead.

The administration's inaction is hard to understand. Its behavior demonstrates a failure to grasp a fundamental insight: nuclear terrorism is, in fact, preventable. It is a basic matter of physics: without fissile material, you can't have a nuclear bomb. No nuclear bomb, no nuclear terrorism. Moreover, fissile material can be kept out of the wrong hands. The technology for doing so already exists: Russia does not lose items from the Kremlin Armory, nor does the United States from Fort Knox. Nascent nukes should be kept just as secure. If they are, terrorists could still attempt to create new supplies, but doing so would require large facilities, which would be visible and vulnerable to attack.

Denying terrorists access to nuclear weapons and weapons-grade material is thus a challenge to nations' willpower and determination, not to their technical capabilities. Keeping these items safe will be a mammoth undertaking. But the strategy for doing so is clear. The solution would be to apply a new doctrine of "Three No's": no loose nukes, no new nascent nukes, and no new nuclear states.

A few numbers starkly illustrate the scale of the problem the United States now faces in trying to control the spread of nuclear weapons materials. Just eight countries – China, France, India, Israel, Pakistan, Russia, the United Kingdom, and the United States – are known to have

nuclear weapons. In addition, the CIA estimates that North Korea has enough plutonium for one or two nuclear weapons. And two dozen additional states possess research reactors with enough highly enriched uranium (heU) to build at least one nuclear bomb on their own. According to best estimates, the global nuclear inventory includes more than 30,000 nuclear weapons, and enough heU and plutonium for 240,000 more.

Hundreds of these weapons are currently stored in conditions that leave them vulnerable to theft by determined criminals, who could then sell them to terrorists. Even more "nascent nukes" (the heU and plutonium that are the only critical ingredients for making nuclear bombs) are at risk. Almost every month, someone somewhere is apprehended trying to smuggle or steal nuclear materials or weapons. Last August, for example, Alexander Tyulyakov – the deputy director of Atomflot (the organization that carries out repair work for Russian nuclear icebreakers and nuclear submarines) – was arrested in Murmansk for trying to do just that. The situation is so bad that three years ago, Howard Baker, the current U.S. ambassador to Japan and the former Republican leader of the Senate, testified, "It really boggles my mind that there could be 40,000 nuclear weapons, or maybe 80,000 in the former Soviet Union, poorly controlled and poorly stored, and that the world is not in a near-state of hysteria about the danger."

Text 2. The return of arms control

The impact of Russia's new strategic outlook will be particularly evident when the next U.S. administration reviews U.S. arms control policy. The East- West treaties on nuclear and conventional weapons negotiated at the end of the Cold War have caused a more massive and more dramatic reshaping of military forces than is generally recognized.

Since 1990, with little fanfare and virtually no opposition on either side, the number of Russian nuclear warheads on intercontinental ballistic missiles – which make up the largest part of Russia's nuclear force – has been cut by almost 70 percent. Also with no controversy, the largest part of the United States' strategic nuclear force – weapons deployed on submarines – has been cut by almost 50 percent.

Cuts in conventional forces have been even more dramatic: the number of U.S. tanks in Europe has dropped from over 5,000 to 130; Germany has eliminated more than 5,000 tanks of its own; Russia, over 4,000; and the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, and Ukraine, together almost 8,000 tanks. With all this dismantling going on, the U.S.-Russian military balance gradually became the quietest corner of the relationship.

Now, however, arms control is back at center stage. One reason is the calendar: the two treaties on U.S.-Russian strategic arms reductions will expire during the next U.S. president's term. But far more important is Moscow's altered view of what is at stake. The former chief of the Russian general staff, Yuri Baluyevsky, declared earlier this year that U.S. nuclear policies reflect a "drive for strategic domination." Ignoring the ongoing decline in military forces across Europe, Putin has charged that other states are taking advantage of Russia's peaceful nature to wage an "arms race" (and on this basis, in December 2007 he suspended Russia's compliance with the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe). Russian officials also insist that the U.S. missile defense system planned for deployment in eastern Europe after 2012 is, despite Washington's denials, designed to neutralize Russia's strategic deterrent. To thwart this, they say, Russia must deploy nuclear forces that restore it to a position of rough equality with the United States. "National security," Putin and his successor as president, Dmitry Medvedev, have taken to saying, "is not based on promises."

Many U.S. foreign policy specialists look at the return of arms control with a mixture of boredom and regret. Most stopped viewing Russia as an interesting security problem years ago. When civilian experts bother with the issue of strategic arms reductions, it is usually not because they think that the U.S.-Russian strategic balance matters but because they want to revive attention to some related issue, such as "loose" nuclear weapons and materials or the need for the United States and Russia to strengthen non-proliferation efforts by making large cuts in their own arsenals. It is telling that the most significant arms control idea of recent years, advanced by the Cold War veterans Kissinger, Sam Nunn, William

Perry, and George Shultz, has been nuclear abolition. Mere nuclear parity apparently bores them, too.

Hostility to old-style arms control and inattention to the growing mismatch between U.S. and Russian thinking on national security clearly led the Bush administration to mishandle these issues with Moscow. Merely dismissing Moscow's charges that the U.S. missile defense plans threaten Russia's security has not stopped the Russians from objecting – or from winning the sympathy of some U.S. allies. Washington proposed allowing Russian military monitors at the U.S. missile defense sites in the Czech Republic and Poland, but the Czechs and the Poles opposed this plan, giving Moscow one more reason to complain.

To keep military issues from becoming a continuing source of U.S.-Russian discord, the next U.S. president will want to adopt a different approach. He will surely drop his predecessor's resistance to formal and legally binding arms control agreements.

Yet both Washington and Moscow will further benefit by preserving some elements of the Bush administration's outlook – above all, the recognition that the treaties that work best are those that allow each side maximum flexibility in implementation. If both sides can also agree that their military forces do not really threaten each other, they will not have to sweat every detail over limiting them.

Unit 3

ADDRESS OF THE RUSSIAN PRESIDENT TO THE FEDERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION

3.1. About Society's Ideals and Moral Principles

Word List:

to bring civilization – сделать цивилизованным

to build up powerful economic and military potential – создавать мирный политический и военный потенциал

to act on solid basis – действовать на прочной основе

the test of time – проверка временем

society's ideals and moral principles – общественные идеалы и моральные принципы

to say frankly – говорить откровенно

it is far from easy – очень непросто

to have it firmly in the head – нужно твердо знать

to give up things – поступиться вещами

to fight until victory – бороться и побеждать

things dear to you – то, что дорого вам

political equality – политическое равноправие

responsible leaders – ответственные руководители

to give each individual a decent place in our society – добиваться достойного места для каждого человека в обществе

freedom of speech and religion – свобода слова и вероисповедания

welfare and dignity – благосостояние и достоинство

faithfulness – верность

sober and critical look – трезвый и критический взгляд

deep-rooted love – глубокая привязанность

moral beacon – нравственные ориентиры

to put things more simply – говорить просто

to make a single people – делать народ единым

Text

I think it could hardly be otherwise when we are talking about people with more than a thousand years history, a people that have developed and brought civilization to a vast territory, created a unique culture and build up a powerful economic and military potential, a people who act on solid basis of values and ideals that have taken shape over the centuries and stood the test of time.

I would like to say a few words separately about our values, our society's ideals and moral principles. But I say, quite frankly, based on my own experience, that it's far from easy to make decisions that will affect the lives welfare and health of thousands of citizens, a reputation and destiny of great people. When I make these decisions, I need to have it firmly in my head that there are things that cannot be given up, things for which we have to fight until victory, things dear to you, dear to me, dear to us all, things without which it is impossible to imagine our country.

Our people have a rich spiritual and moral heritage. The values in our country are well known. There is justice, which we understand as political equality, honest courts and political leaders.

Justice is embodied in practice as social guarantees and the fight against poverty and corruption, the efforts to give each a decent place in our society and give the Russian nation as a whole a worthy place in the system of international relations.

There is freedom-personal, individual freedom. It means economic freedom, freedom of speech and religion, freedom to choose one's place of residence and one's job. And there is general national freedom, the independence and freedom of the Russian state.

There is a welfare and dignity of human life. There is interethnic peace and unity of diverse cultures. There are family traditions, love and faithfulness, care for the young and for the old. There is patriotism, along with the most sober and critical look at our country's history and our far from ideal present, belief in Russia that shines through no matter what the circumstances, deep-rooted love for our native land and our great culture.

These are our values, the foundations of our society and our moral beacons. To put things more simply, it is these self-evident things that we all understand that are what make us a single people, what make us Russia.

Answer the following questions about the text.

1. Is it easy to make decisions: affecting the lives, welfare and health of a great people?
2. Are there any things that cannot be given up?
3. What is justice as a value in our society?
4. How is justice embodied in practice?
5. In what way is freedom interpreted?
6. What values make us Russia?

Vocabulary Exercises

I. Fill in the gaps with the word or word combinations from the box.

1. It is far from easy to make decisions that will _____ of thousands of citizens.
2. Our people have _____.
3. We are talking about the people which more than a thousand years history, a people that _____.
4. Justice is embodied in a practice as and _____ to fight against poverty and corruption.
5. There is _____.
6. There is freedom-personal and individual among _____.

to develop and bring civilization to vast territory, to affect the lives, welfare and health of citizens, a great spiritual and moral heritage, as social guarantees, welfare and dignity of human life, to choose place and residence

II. What is the Russian for:

the unity of diverse cultures, moral beacons, national freedom and independence of Russian state, to make decisions, to act on solid basis of values and ideals, to be based on someone's experience, to fight until

victory, to affect lives, welfare and health of people, society's ideals and principles.

III. Make a pre-translation analysis of the text.

1. Определите тип источника и реципиента текста. На основании каких данных в тексте это можно сделать?

2. Охарактеризуйте лексику и термины данного текста. Приведите примеры из текста.

IV. Translate the text in a written form and single out the difficulties in translation.

V. What translation decisions have you made in the following sentences?

1. But I say, quite frankly, based on my own experience, that it's far from easy to make decisions that will affect the lives welfare and health of thousands of citizens, a reputation and destiny of great people.

2. There is justice, which we understand as political equality, honest courts and political leaders.

3. There are family traditions, love and faithfulness, care for the young and for the old.

4. There is patriotism, along with the most sober and critical look at our country's history and our far from ideal present, belief in Russia that shines through no matter what the circumstances, deep-rooted love for our native land and our great culture.

5. To put things more simply, it is these self-evident things that we all understand that are what make us a single people, what make us Russia.

VI. Choose the best variant of translation and correct the mistakes of each other.

3.2. At the Cutting Edge of Innovation

Word List:

to refer to – иметь в виду

enterprises in crucial sectors – предприятия в важных отраслях

machinebuilding industry – машиностроение

defence industry – оборонно-промышленный комплекс

small businesses – малое предприятие (предприятие малого бизнеса)

to pay close attention to – обращать максимальное внимание на

to delay the implementation of a programs – откладывать решение программы

to keep one step ahead – действовать на опережение

to compete – конкурировать

to gain benefits in future – получить выгоду и преимущества в будущем

to occupy niches in the world economy – занять ниши в мировой экономике

to produce knowledge – производить знания

cutting – edge achievements – достижение лидирующих позиций

to be at the cutting-edge of innovations – быть на переднем крае инноваций

to guarantee equal opportunities – гарантировать равные возможности

ability to innovate and create – способность к новаторству и творчеству

to consolidate around national priorities – консолидироваться вокруг национальных приоритетов

to set on populist chatter – настроиться на популистскую болтовню

to satisfy personal ambitions – удовлетворять личные амбиции

to seek to provoke tension – провоцировать обострение

to inflame social and interethnic strife – разжигать социальную и межнациональную рознь

to draw to illegal actions – вовлекать в противоправные действия

to maintain constitutional order – обеспечить конституционный порядок

Text

I am referring here to the enterprises in crucial sector such as agriculture, construction, machine building and defense industry. I am also talking about small businesses. Here we must pay close attention to the effectiveness of our work and the justification of our plans and programs. This applies to the state, business, and to each individual.

What we need more than anything today is trust and cooperation. We must not delay the implementation of our strategic programs not even for a day. In this situation we need to keep one step ahead. It is now that to lay the foundations that will enable our country to compete in areas where future benefits are to be gained. We need to work fast to occupy niches in the world economy that are still free.

We need to build new and effective enterprises and spread the use of the most advanced technology. Our priority is to produce new technology and advanced culture, cutting-edge achievements in science, education and the arts in other words.

We must be at the cutting edge of innovation in the main economic sectors and in public life.

Our policies are based on an ideology which has people at its center, people as individuals and citizens, people who are guaranteed equal opportunities from birth. Their success in life depends on their personal initiative and independence, and on their abilities to innovate and create. This is more important now than ever before for our country. We simply must consolidate around our national priorities.

Those who want to make some “easy” political capital out of economic difficulties, those who have their hearts set on populist chatter and want to destabilize society in order to satisfy their personal ambitions, I advise them to read the Constitution. I consider in my duty to warn those who seek to provoke tension in political situation.

We will not allow anyone to inflame social and interethnic strife, deceive people and draw them into illegal actions. We will continue to maintain Constitutional order through all the legal means.

Answer the following questions about the text.

1. What is the president talking about?
2. What does Russia need more today?
3. What do we need to realise our strategic programmes?
4. What is our priority?
5. What are our policies based on?
6. In what way is it possible to maintain Constitutional order?

Vocabulary Exercises

I. Fill in the gaps with the word or word combinations from the box.

1. I consider it my duty to warn those who seek _____.
2. Their success in life depends on their personal initiative and their _____.
3. Here we must _____ to the effectiveness of our work and the justification of our plans and programmes.
4. We need _____ and spread the use of the most advanced technology.
5. We must _____ in the main economic sectors and public life.
6. What we need more than anything today is _____.

to pay close attention to, trust and cooperation, to build new and effective enterprises, to be at the cutting edge of innovations, abilities to innovate and create, to provoke tension in the political situation

II. What is the Russian for:

crucial sectors, defence industry, cutting-edge achievements in science, education and art, to produce new technology, to occupy the niches in the world economy, small businesses, delay the implementation of strategic programmes, to keep one step ahead, to lay the foundations, justification of plans and programmes

III. Make a pre-translation analysis of the text.

1. Определите тип источника и реципиента текста. На основании каких данных в тексте это можно сделать?
2. Охарактеризуйте лексику и термины данного текста. Приведите примеры из текста.

IV. Translate the text in a written form and single out the difficulties in translation.

V. What translation decisions have you made in the following sentences?

1. In this situation we need to keep one step ahead.
2. We must be at the cutting edge of innovations in the main economic sectors and in public life.
3. Our policies are based on an ideology which has people at its center, people as individuals and citizens, people who are guaranteed equal opportunities from birth.
4. We will not allow anyone to inflame social and interethnic strife, deceive people and draw them into illegal actions.
5. I am referring here to the enterprises in crucial sector such as agriculture, construction, machine building and defense industry.

VI. Choose the best variant of translation and correct the mistakes of each other.

3.3. The Role of Constitution in the Development of Russia's Statehood

Word List:

to uphold freedom and justice – утверждать свободу и независимость
human dignity and welfare – человеческое достоинство
и благополучие

the unity of our multiethnic people – единство нашего
многонационального народа

common values – общепризнанные ценности

legal concepts – юридические понятия

to give force in practice – придавать юридическую силу
to form social institutions – формировать социальные институты
address to the federal assembly – Послание Федеральному
собранию
to set out vision – обозначить своё видение
to cement in the constitution – закреплять в конституции
to ensure the development of Russia's statehood – обеспечить
развитие российской государственности
developing democracy in Russia – становление демократии
в России
to combat corruption – избавиться от коррупции
expansion of free enterprise and economic freedom – расширение
экономической и предпринимательской свободы
implementation of the social guarantees – реализация социальных
гарантий
to prohibit propaganda of social superiority – запрещать
пропаганду социального превосходства
legal force – норма закона
observance of commitments under international agreements
and treaties – соблюдение следования международным
соглашениям и договорам
provisions of international law – международные правовые нормы
to bolster international law – укреплять международное право

Text

The Russian Constitution upholds freedom and justice, human dignity and welfare, protection of family and Fatherland, and the Unity of our multiethnic people – not just as common values but as legal concepts.

In other words, the Constitution gives them force in practice and supports them with all resources of the state and with all of its own authority. The Constitution forms our social institutions and the way of life of millions of people.

It is for this reason that in my Address to the Federal Assembly I feel it necessary to set out my vision of the fundamental laws governing our life, the goals and values of our society, cemented in the Constitution and thus having a direct influence on every aspect of our domestic and foreign policy. I would like to give a brief analysis of how these goals and values have ensured the development of Russia's statehood.

First is the decisive role the Constitution has played in developing democracy in Russia. Now, as we come to a new stage in our development, we are setting new goals that call for greater participation by our citizens, political parties and other public institutions.

Second is the Constitution's importance in developing a new legal system and independent courts, and in combating corruption and legal nihilism.

Third is the role the Constitution plays in continued expansion of free enterprise and economic freedom. That is the key to successful development of a middle class, growth of small and medium businesses and the establishment of an innovation economy.

Fourth is the implementation of the social guarantees set out in the Constitution: wages, benefits, pensions and savings. I repeat the state authorities will continue to fulfil their commitment to the public even in today's difficult situation. I want to remind you that the Constitution prohibits propaganda of social superiority. This is a moral law that also has legal force in our country.

Finally, fifth, the Constitution also plays its part in bolstering international law. International law, as we know, is made up of state's observance of their international constitutions and their commitments under international agreement and treaties.

Therefore, the better states coordinate their actions on the international stage with the provision of international law, the greater the level of security in our world.

Answer the following questions about the text.

1. What does the Russian Constitution uphold?
2. What does it form?
3. What is the decisive role of Constitution?

4. What is the importance of Constitution in a new legal system?
5. What is its role in economy?
6. What social guarantees are provided by the Constitution?

Vocabulary Exercises

I. Fill in the gaps with the word or word combinations from the box.

1. I would like to give a brief analysis of how these goals and values _____.
2. Now, as we come to a new stage in our development, we _____ that call for greater participation by our citizens, political parties and other public institutions.
3. Second is the Constitution's importance in developing a new legal system and _____ and in combating corruption and legal nihilism.
4. That is the key to successful development of a middle class, growth of _____ and the establishment of an innovation economy.
5. I repeat the state authorities will continue _____ to the public even in today's difficult situation.
6. Finally, fifth, the Constitution also plays its part in _____.

to ensure the development of Russia's statehood, to set new goals, independent courts, small and medium businesses, to fulfil one's commitments, to bolster international law

II. What is the Russian for:

to support with all recourses, to form social institutions, to cement goals and values in the Constitution, to play the decisive role, to develop a new legal system, establishment of an innovation economy, implementation of the social guarantees, state authorities, to set new goals, observance of national constitutions.

III. Make a pre-translation analysis of the text.

1. Определите тип источника и реципиента текста. На основании каких данных в тексте это можно сделать?
2. Охарактеризуйте лексику и термины данного текста. Приведите примеры из текста.

IV. Translate the text in a written form and single out the difficulties in translation.

V. What translation decisions have you made in the following sentences?

1. The Russian Constitution upholds freedom and justice, human dignity and welfare, protection of family and Fatherland, and the Unity of our multiethnic people – not just as common values but as legal concepts.

2. The Constitution gives people force in practice and supports them with all resources of the state and with all of its own authority.

3. Now, as we come to a new stage in our development, we are setting new goals that call for greater participation by our citizens, political parties and other public institutions.

4. Fourth is the implementation of the social guarantees set out in the Constitution: wages, benefits, pensions and savings.

5. International law, as we know, is made up of state`s observance of their international constitutions and their commitments under international agreement and treaties.

VI. Choose the best variant of translation and correct the mistakes of each other.

3.4. Improvement of the Level and Quality of Representation in Government

Word List:

to develop roots – укорениться

the level and quality of public representation – уровень и качество народного представительства

civic activeness – гражданская активность

to lower the barrier for entry to the State Duma – снизить барьер прохождения в Государственную думу

to keep in place the system of incentives – сохранить систему поощрения

to form the main frame – создавать основу
nominations of heads – предложение по кандидатурам
representative assemblies – представительные органы
local self-government bodies – местные органы самоуправления
to raise the quality of public representation – повысить качество
народного представительства
to take into account public interests – учитывать интересы людей
to give trust in government – укреплять доверие граждан к власти
to increase solidarity within society – повысить солидарность
общества

Text

The existing democratic institutions need to develop roots in all groups in society. First of all, we need to entrust a growing number of social and political responsibilities directly to our citizens, their organizations and local self-government.

Above all therefore, I propose taking measures to improve the level and quality of public representation in government, measures that will encourage the public to become more involved in political life.

More than 90 percent of voters usually vote for the parties that enter the State Duma during elections. But there are almost five million people who vote for parties that do not make it in the State Duma. These people have no representation at federal level, though they show their civic activeness and go to vote in the election.

This is unfair situation and something must be done about it. I do not think, however, that it is necessary at this point to lower the barrier set by law for entry to the State Duma.

My first proposal is therefore to give guarantees for voters who vote for the so-called small parties. I think that parties that have received from 5-7 percent of the vote could be given a guaranteed one or two seats in the State Duma. This would make it possible to keep in place the system of incentives for consolidation of the big parties, something we have been

working on these last years the parties that form the frame of our national political system.

Second, I think it possible that nominations of the heads of the executive authorities in the regions could be made only by the parties that have won the biggest number of votes in the regional elections, and by no one else. This would mean that only public, open political organizations representing the bulk of the country's population would have the right to put forward candidates for these posts.

Third, the practice of having to provide a sum of money as collateral should be abolished for elections at every level. It is not money that should decide participation in elections but people's opinions, the party's reputation and voters' confidence in its program. Fourth, the Federation Council should be made up of people elected to the representative assemblies and deputies from local self-government bodies of the region in question.

In this way, people who have gone-through a procedure of public election have experience of working with voters and represent not only the regional authorities but most importantly represent the region's people who will vote in the Federation Council.

I am sure that these measures will help to raise the quality of public representation and make it possible to take public interests into account better. I will give people greater trust in government and increase solidarity within society.

Answer the following questions about the text.

1. What do the existing democratic institutions need?
2. What does the president propose?
3. How many percent of people vote for entry to the State Duma?
4. What do remaining 10 % of voters do?
5. What is the first proposal of president?
6. What is the second (third) measure?

Vocabulary Exercises

I. Fill in the gaps with the word or word combinations from the box.

1. I am sure that these measures will help _____ and make it possible to take public interests into account better.

2. Second, I think it possible that _____ in the regions could be made only by the parties that have won the biggest number of votes in the regional elections, and by no one else.

3. Above all therefore, I propose _____ to improve the level and quality of public representation in government, measures that will encourage the public to become more involved in political life.

4. These people have no _____, though they show their civic activeness and go to vote in the election.

5. This would make it possible _____ for consolidation of the big parties.

6. I do not think, however, that it is necessary at this point to _____.

taking measures, to have representation at a federal level, to lower the barrier for entry to the State Duma, to keep in place the system of incentives, nomination of heads of the executive authorities, to raise the quality of public representation

II. What is the Russian for:

heads of executive authorities, to decide participation in elections, self-government bodies, quality of public representation, voters' confidence, a growing number of social and political responsibilities, to have representation at a federal level, to encourage the public, to enter the State Duma, to show civic activeness.

III. Make a pre-translation analysis of the text.

1. Определите тип источника и реципиента текста. На основании каких данных в тексте это можно сделать?

2. Охарактеризуйте лексику и термины данного текста. Приведите примеры из текста.

IV. Translate the text in a written form and single out the difficulties in translation.

V. What translation decisions have you made in the following sentences?

1. Third, the practice of having to provide a sum of money as collateral should be abolished for elections at every level.

2. Fourth, the Federation Council should be made up of people from local self-government bodies of the region in question.

3. I am sure that these measures will help to raise the quality of public representation and make it possible to take public interests into account better.

4. This would mean that only public, open political organizations representing the bulk of the country's population would have the right to put forward candidates for these posts.

5. Above all therefore, I propose taking measures to improve the level and quality of public representation in government, measures that will encourage the public to become more involved in political life.

VI. Choose the best variant of translation and correct the mistakes of each other.

TEXTS FOR SELF-DIRECTED ACTIVITY

Text 1. A Constitution for Europe

When the 263-page Treaty Establishing a Constitution for Europe was unveiled in June 2003, Washington said little, maintaining its decades-old stance of official neutrality regarding the progress of European integration. The significance of the proposed constitution, however, was not lost on Europeans. "This is crossing the Rubicon," Czech President Vaclav Klaus noted.

The proposed European federation is unprecedented: no democracy has ever merged with another to form such an entity. The constitution, which purports to integrate the 25 nations of the European Union, would create a new international actor with its own foreign minister and its own foreign policy. This development would have profound and troubling implications for the transatlantic alliance and for future U.S. influence in Europe.

By structure and inclination, the new Europe would focus on aggrandizing EU power at the expense of NATO, the foundation of the transatlantic security relationship for more than half a century. In other words, it would seek to balance rather than complement U.S. power—an outcome for which the United States is wholly unprepared.

Washington's "hands off" policy on European integration was traditionally based on two assumptions: that, in the face of the Soviet threat, an integrated Europe would be a boon to NATO and Western democracy (it was) and that, as free nations, prospective EU member states are entitled to organize themselves any way they choose (they are). But the text and context of the proposed constitution should prompt U.S. policymakers to reconsider.

The constitution's national security provisions signify that, for the first time, the NATO alliance faces a threat from within Europe itself. The political integration of the EU presents the greatest challenge to continuing U.S. influence in Europe since World War II, and U.S. policy must begin to adapt accordingly.

Not since the EU's founding in 1957 has the velocity of European integration been as high as it is today. European institutions are steadily and unambiguously expanding their power over the three pillars of EU policy: the common market, foreign and security policy, and justice and home affairs. With the addition of ten new members in May 2004, expansion has put significant stress on existing political institutions and accelerated efforts to create new ones.

The envisioned federal union would restrict the sovereignty of its member states to a considerable degree. The constitution provides that "the Union shall have legal personality," creating a new actor on the world stage, and that its actions "shall have primacy over the law of the Member States."

The constitution also expands from 34 to 70 the spheres in which the EU may legislate by "qualified majority" (55 percent of member states representing at least 65 percent of total EU population) rather than unanimity. A legislative rule of unanimity, and the de facto veto each country enjoys as a result, would obtain only in matters of taxation, social security, most foreign policy, and the creation of a common defence force.

Text 2. The Democratic Rollback

Since 1974, more than 90 countries have made transitions to democracy, and by the turn of the century approximately 60 percent of the world's independent states were democratic. The democratization of Mexico and Indonesia in the late 1990s and the more recent "color revolutions" in Georgia and Ukraine formed the crest of a tidal wave of democratic transitions. Even in the Arab world, the trend is visible: in 2005, democratic forces in Lebanon rose up to peacefully drive out Syrian troops and Iraqis voted in multiparty parliamentary elections for the first time in nearly half a century.

But celebrations of democracy's triumph are premature. In a few short years, the democratic wave has been slowed by a powerful authoritarian undertow, and the world has slipped into a democratic recession. Democracy has recently been overthrown or gradually stifled in a number of key states, including Nigeria, Russia, Thailand, Venezuela,

and, most recently, Bangladesh and the Philippines. In December 2007, electoral fraud in Kenya delivered another abrupt and violent setback. At the same time, most newcomers to the democratic club (and some long-standing members) have performed poorly. Even in many of the countries seen as success stories, such as Chile, Ghana, Poland, and South Africa, there are serious problems of governance and deep pockets of disaffection.

In South Asia, where democracy once predominated, India is now surrounded by politically unstable, undemocratic states. And aspirations for democratic progress have been thwarted everywhere in the Arab world (except Morocco), whether by terrorism and political and religious violence (as in Iraq), externally manipulated societal divisions (as in Lebanon), or authoritarian regimes themselves (as in Egypt, Jordan, and some of the Persian Gulf monarchies, such as Bahrain).

Before democracy can spread further, it must take deeper root where it has already sprouted. It is a basic principle of any military or geopolitical campaign that at some point an advancing force must consolidate its gains before it conquers more territory. Emerging democracies must demonstrate that they can solve their governance problems and meet their citizens' expectations for freedom, justice, a better life, and a fairer society.

If democracies do not more effectively contain crime and corruption, generate economic growth, relieve economic inequality, and secure freedom and the rule of law, people will eventually lose faith and turn to authoritarian alternatives. Struggling democracies must be consolidated so that all levels of society become enduringly committed to democracy as the best form of government and to their country's constitutional norms and constraints. Western policymakers can assist in this process by demanding more than superficial electoral democracy. By holding governments accountable and making foreign aid contingent on good governance, donors can help reverse the democratic recession.

Western policymakers and analysts have failed to acknowledge the scope of the democratic recession for several reasons. First, global assessments by the Bush administration and by respected independent organizations such as Freedom House tend to cite the overall number of democracies and aggregate trends while neglecting the size and strategic

importance of the countries involved. With some prominent exceptions (such as Indonesia, Mexico, and Ukraine), the democratic gains of the past decade have come primarily in smaller and weaker states.

In large, strategically important countries, such as Nigeria and Russia, the expansion of executive power, the intimidation of the opposition, and the rigging of the electoral process have extinguished even the most basic form of electoral democracy. In Venezuela, President Hugo Chavez narrowly lost a December 2 referendum that would have given him virtually unlimited power, but he still does not allow the sort of free and fair political process that could turn him out of office.

Despite two decades of political scientists warning of "the fallacy of electoralism," the United States and many of its democratic allies have remained far too comfortable with this superficial form of democracy. Assessments often fail to apply exacting standards when it comes to defining what constitutes a democracy and what is necessary to sustain it. Western leaders (particularly European ones) have too frequently blessed fraudulent or unfair elections and have been too reluctant to criticize more subtle degradations of democracy. They tend to speak out only when democratic norms are violated by unfriendly governments (as in Russia and Venezuela or in Bolivia) and soft-pedal abuses when allies (such as Ethiopia, Iraq, or Pakistan) are involved.

Unit 4

RUSSIA IN THE WORLD COMMUNITY

4.1. The National Security Concept of the Russian Federation

Word List:

a system of views – система взглядов

to ensure security of an individual – обеспечить безопасность личности

the most important guidelines – важнейшие направления

to take shape antagonistic trends – сформировать взаимоисключающие тенденции

integrative associations – интеграционные объединения

multilateral management – многостороннее управление

to facilitate the birth of ideology – способствовать формированию идеологии

domination – доминирование

circumvention – обход

the shaping of international relations – формирование международных отношений

to step up efforts – направлять усилия

to undermine international security – подорвать международную безопасность

to slow down positive changes – тормозить положительные изменения

Text

The national security concept of the Russian Federation is a system of views on how to ensure within the Russian Federation security of the individual, this is society and the state against external and internal threats in any aspect of life activities. The concept formulates the most important guidelines of the state policy of the Russian Federation.

The national security of the Russian Federation means the security of its multinational people in whom reside sovereignty and sole source of authority within the Russian Federation. The situation in the world is

characterized by a dynamic transformation of the system of international relations. Following the end of the bipolar confrontation era two antagonistic trends took shape.

The first of these trends is manifested in the strengthened economic and political positions over a significant number of states and their integrative associations and in improved mechanisms for the multilateral management of international processes. Economic, political, scientific and technological, environmental and information factors are playing an ever-increasing role. Russia shall facilitate the birth of an ideology of establishing a multipolar world on this basis.

The second trend is manifested in efforts to create an international relations structure based on the developed Western countries domination in the international community under US guidance and designed for unilateral solutions to key issues in the world affairs in circumvention of the fundamental norms of international law with the preference to the use of military force.

The shaping of international relations is accompanied by competition and also by aspiration of a number of states to enhance their influence on world affairs including through manufacturing weapons of mass destruction. Military force and violence remain substantial aspects of international relations.

Despite the complex international situation and its domestic difficulties, Russia continues to play an important role in global processes by virtue of its substantial economic, scientific, technological potential and its unique strategic positioning in the Eurasian continent.

At the same time a number of states are stepping up efforts to weaken Russia politically economically, militarily and in other ways. Attempts to ignore Russia's interests when solving major issues of international relations including conflict situations, are capable of undermining international security, stability, and slowing down the positive changes in international relations.

Answer the following questions about the text.

1. What is the national security concept of the Russian Federation?
2. What does the concept formulate?

3. What does the national security of the Russian Federation mean?
4. How is the situation in the world characterized?
5. What is the first antagonistic trend in international relations?
6. What is the shaping of international relations accompanied by?

Vocabulary Exercises

I. Fill in the gaps with the word or word combinations from the box.

1. The situation in the world is characterized by _____ of the system of international relations.
2. The national concept of the Russian Federation is a system of views on how to ensure within the Russian Federation _____.
3. The concept formulates _____ of the state policy of the Russian Federation.
4. The first antagonistic trend is manifested in the strengthened economic and political positions of a significant number of states and their _____ and in improved mechanisms for the multilateral management of international processes.
5. The shaping of international relations is accompanied by competition and also by aspiration of a number of states to enhance their influence on the world affairs including through _____.
6. As ever-increasing role Russia shall _____ of establishing a multipolar world on these bases.

to ensure security of the individual, the most important guidelines, dynamic transformation, integrative associations, to facilitate the birth of an ideology, manufacturing weapons of mass destruction

II. What is the Russian for:

the national security concept, sole source of authority, dynamic transformation of the system of international relations, to play an ever-increasing role, to facilitate the birth of an ideology, preference to the use of military force, to undermine international security, to slow down the

positive changes in international relations, military force and violence, international community under US guidance.

III. Make a pre-translation analysis of the text.

1. Определите тип источника и реципиента текста. На основании каких данных в тексте это можно сделать?

2. Охарактеризуйте лексику и термины данного текста. Приведите примеры из текста.

IV. Translate the text in a written form and single out the difficulties in translation.

V. What translation decisions have you made in the following sentences?

1. Despite the complex international situation and its domestic difficulties, Russia continues to play an important role in global processes by virtue of its substantial economic, scientific, technological potential and its unique strategic positioning in the Eurasian continent.

2. The national security of the Russian Federation means the security of its multinational people in whom reside sovereignty and sole source of authority within the Russian Federation.

3. The second trend is manifested in efforts to create an international relations structure based on the developed Western countries domination in the international community under US guidance.

4. Economic, political, scientific and technological, environmental and information factors are playing an ever-increasing role. Russia shall facilitate the birth of an ideology of establishing a multipolar world on this basis.

5. The shaping of international relations is accompanied by competition and also by aspiration of a number of states to enhance their influence on world affairs including through manufacturing weapons of mass destruction.

VI. Choose the best variant of translation and correct the mistakes of each other.

4.2. Russia's National Interests (part 1)

Word List:

combination of balanced interests – совокупность сбалансированных интересов

domestic policy – внутренняя политика

to be of long-term nature – носить долгосрочный характер

to define the primary goals – определять основные цели

current tasks – текущие задачи

to be secured by institutions of state authority – обеспечиваться институтами государственной власти

implementation of constitutional rights and freedoms – реализация конституционных прав и свобод

strengthening democracy – укрепление демократии

a rule-of-law state – правовое государство

to achieve and maintain public accord – достигать и поддерживать общественное согласие

spiritual renewal – духовное обновление

inviolability of constitutional system – незыблемость конституционного строя

unconditional adherence to law – безусловное обеспечение законности

international cooperation on equal terms – равноправное международное сотрудничество

mutual beneficial cooperation – взаимовыгодное сотрудничество

unity in legal domain – единство правового пространства

to ensure a high standard of living – обеспечить высокий уровень жизни

spiritual sphere – духовная сфера

to strengthen society's moral values – укреплять нравственные ценности общества

Text (part 1)

Russia's national interests are a combination of balanced interests of the individual, the society and the state in the spheres of economy; domestic policy, social and international affairs, information, border protection, ecology and others. They are long-term in nature and define the primary goals and strategic and current tasks of the state's domestic and foreign policy.

The national interests are secured by institutions of state authority, which perform their functions among other things in coordination with public organizations functioning on the basis of the Constitution and laws of the Russian Federation.

The interests of the individual lie in the implementation of constitutional rights and freedoms and in personal security in a higher quality and standard of living; in physical, spiritual and intellectual development of every person and citizen.

The interests of society lie in strengthening democracy; in creating a rule-of-law and social state; in achieving and maintaining public accord and in the spiritual renewal of Russia.

The interests of the state lie in the inviolability of Russia's constitutional system, its sovereignty and territorial integrity; in political, economic and social stability; in unconditional adherence to law and order and in the development of international cooperation on equal terms and to mutual benefit.

Russia's national interests may be implemented only on the basis of sustainable economic development. Russia's national interests in the domestic political sphere lie in the stability of the constitutional system and state authority and its institutions; in ensuring civil peace and national accord, territorial integrity, unity of legal domain, law and order.

Russia's national interests in the social sphere lie in ensuring a high standard of living of its people. The national interests in the spiritual sphere lie in maintaining and strengthening society's moral values, traditions of patriotism and humanism and the country's cultural and scientific potential.

Answer the following questions about the text.

1. What are Russia's national interests?
2. How are national interests secured?
3. Where do the interests of individual lie?
4. What are interests of society composed of?
5. What do interests of state consist of?
6. How can Russia's national interests be implemented?

Vocabulary Exercises

I. Fill in the gaps with the word or word combinations from the box.

1. The interests of the individual lie in the _____ and in personal security in a higher quality and standard of living.
2. The interests of society lie in strengthening democracy and _____.
3. The national interests _____ which perform their functions.
4. The interests of state lie in the inviolability of Russia's constitutional system, its _____.
5. Russia's national interests _____ and define the primary goals of the country's domestic and foreign policy.
6. Russia's national interests in _____ lie in the stability of the constitutional system.

to be long-term in nature, to be secured by institutions of state authority, implementation of constitutional rights and freedoms, creating a rule-of-law state, sovereignty and territorial integrity, domestic political sphere

II. What is the Russian for:

intellectual development of every person and citizen, state authority, spiritual sphere, to function on the basis of Constitution and laws of the Russian Federation, to define the primary goals, standard of living, a combination of balanced interests, unity of legal domain, spiritual renewal of Russia

III. Make a pre-translation analysis of the text.

1. Определите тип источника и реципиента текста. На основании каких данных в тексте это можно сделать?
2. Охарактеризуйте лексику и термины данного текста. Приведите примеры из текста.

IV. Translate the text in a written form and single out the difficulties in translation.

V. What translation decisions have you made in the following sentences?

1. The interests of society lie in strengthening democracy; in creating a rule-of-law and social state; in achieving and maintaining public accord and in the spiritual renewal of Russia.
2. The national interests are secured by institutions of state authority, which perform their functions among other things in coordination with public organizations functioning on the basis of the Constitution and laws of the Russian Federation.
3. Russia's national interests are a combination of balanced interests of the individual, the society and the state in the spheres of economy; domestic policy, social and international affairs, information, border protection, ecology and others.
4. Russia's national interests in the social sphere lie in ensuring a high standard of living of its people.
5. Russia's national interests may be implemented only on the basis of sustainable economic development.

VI. Choose the best variant of translation and correct the mistakes of each other.

4.3. Russia's National Interests (part 2)

Word List:

to receive and make use of information – получать и пользоваться информацией

to defend independence – защищать независимость

to prevent a military aggression – предотвратить военную агрессию

border policy – политика в пограничной сфере

to promote political, legal, organizational conditions – создавать политические, правовые, организационные условия

execution of economic activity within the border-adjacent area – осуществление экономической деятельности в пограничной зоне

to preserve and improve the environment – сохранять и оздоравливать окружающую среду

to uphold sovereignty – обеспечивать суверенитет

to strengthen positions – укреплять позиции

influential centre of multipolar world – влиятельный центр многополярного мира

integrative associations – интеграционные объединения

Commonwealth of Independent States – Содружество Независимых Государств

vital components – важнейшие составляющие

natural and man-made disasters – ситуации природного и техногенного характера

to arise from the conduct and consequences of military operations – возникать в результате ведения военных действий

Text (part 2)

Russia's national interests in the information sphere lie in the observance of its citizens' constitutional rights and freedoms to receive and make use of information, in the development of advanced telecommunications and in protecting the state's information resources from the unsanctioned access.

Russia's national interests in the military sphere lie in defending its independence, sovereignty, state and territorial integrity, in the prevention of a military aggression against Russia and its allies and in ensuring the conditions for peaceful and democratic development of the state.

Russia's national interests in border policy lie in promoting political, legal, organizational and other conditions for ensuring reliable protection of the state border of the Russian Federation, and in observing the procedure and rules laid down by the Russian Federation legislation for the execution of economic and all other kinds of activity within the border-adjacent area of the Russian Federation.

Russia's national interests in the ecological sphere lie in preserving and improving its environment.

Russia's national interests in the international sphere lie in upholding its sovereignty and strengthening its positions as a great power and as one of the influential centers of multipolar world in developing equal and mutually advantageous relations with all countries and integrative associations and in particular, with the members of the Commonwealth of Independent States and Russia's traditional partners.

Vital components of Russia's national interests are the protection of the individual, the society and the state from terrorism, including international terrorism, as well as from natural and man-made disasters and their effects, and in times of war from the dangers arising from the conduct and consequences of military operations.

Answer the following questions about the text.

1. Where do Russia's national interests in information sphere lie?
2. What are Russia's national interests in military sphere composed of?
3. What are Russia's national interests in ecology directed to?

4. Where do Russia's national interests in border policy lie?
5. What activities are included into Russia's national interests in ecology?
6. What are vital components of Russia's national interests?

Vocabulary Exercises

I. Fill in the gaps with the word or word combinations from the box.

1. Vital components of Russia's national interests are _____ the society and the state from terrorism.
2. Russia's national interests in the information sphere lie in _____.
3. _____ of Russia includes promotion of political, legal, organizational conditions for ensuring reliable protection of state border of the Russian Federation.
4. Russia is one of _____ developing equal and mutually advantageous relations with countries.
5. Russia's national interests in the international sphere lie in _____ and strengthening its position as a great power.
6. Russia's national interests in the ecological sphere lie in _____.

observance of citizens' constitutional rights and freedoms, defending independence, sovereignty, state and territorial integrity, border policy, preserving and improving environment, influential center of multipolar world, protection of individual, upholding the sovereignty

II. What is the Russian for:

military sphere, development of advanced telecommunication resources, to prevent a military aggression, to ensure conditions for peaceful and democratic development of the state, the Russian Federation legislation, to uphold the sovereignty of the state border-adjacent area, reliable protection of state borders, integrative associations, natural and man-made disasters.

III. Make a pre-translation analysis of the text.

1. Определите тип источника и реципиента текста. На основании каких данных в тексте это можно сделать?

2. Охарактеризуйте лексику и термины данного текста. Приведите примеры из текста.

IV. Translate the text in a written form and single out the difficulties in translation.

V. What translation decisions have you made in the following sentences?

1. Russia's national interests in the ecological sphere lie in preserving and improving its environment.

2. Russia's national interests in the military sphere lie in defending its independence, sovereignty, state and territorial integrity, in the prevention of a military aggression against Russia and its allies and in ensuring the conditions for peaceful and democratic development of the state.

3. Russia's national interests in the information sphere lie in the observance of its citizens' constitutional rights and freedoms, to receive and make use of information, in the development of advanced telecommunications and in protecting the state's information resources from the unsanctioned access.

4. Russia's national interests in the international sphere lie in upholding its sovereignty and strengthening its positions as a great power and as one of the influential centers of multipolar world.

5. Vital components of Russia's national interests are the protection of the individual, the society and the state from terrorism, including international terrorism, as well as from natural and man-made disasters and their effects, and in times of war from the dangers arising from the conduct and consequences of military operations.

VI. Choose the best variant of translation and correct the mistakes of each other.

4.4. Ways of Developing Russia's Democracy

Word List:

to proclaim – провозглашать

unprecedented event – беспрецедентное событие

to affirm to commitment to the constitution – подтверждать приверженность к конституции

to fulfill social commitments – выполнять социальные обязательства

to demand compliance with the law – требовать соблюдения законов

to increase the level of trust – повышать уровень доверия

to trust free citizens – доверять свободному человеку

to push into dangerous conclusions – подталкивать к опасным выводам

to cast fear – терроризировать

to take control of media outlet – брать под контроль СМИ

to meddle in the electoral process – вмешиваться в избирательный процесс

to go counter to the constitution – вступать в противоречие с конституцией

calm and steady work – спокойная и размеренная работа

to delay work – откладывать работу на потом

Text

The adoption in 1993 of a Constitution proclaiming the individuals, their life, rights and property as the highest value was an unprecedented event in Russia's history.

Today, at a new stage in its development, Russian society affirms its commitment to the Constitution's democratic values. It has for the most part become familiar with the practice and procedures of democracy. Not long ago, democracy was associated in minds of the Russian people with chaos, helplessness and degradation. The new Russia has proven its ability to fulfill its social commitments and ensure economic growth, guarantee

people's rights and demand compliance with the law and successfully combat terrorism and outside aggression.

Not long ago, people were still asking themselves whether or not democracy was the road forward for Russia. Today the answer is clear democracy is the way forward, and no one disputes this now. The question today is how Russia's democracy should continue its development.

Russia's people are much readier now for free activity (professional public and political) than they were at the start of reforms. They have no need for the state to look after their every step. More and more people rely on themselves above all and believe that their personal success – and thus the country's success. It depends on themselves and their personal achievements. This means it is absolutely essential and also possible to increase the level of trust to society.

But it was the case 20 years ago, the bureaucracy still does not trust free citizens and free activity. This logic pushes it into dangerous conclusions and acts. The bureaucracy from time to time casts fear over the business world, pressing it to keep in line and not to take what they consider wrong action, takes control of this or that media outlet, trying to stop it from saying what they consider the wrong person, puts pressure on courts, etc.

This is a completely ineffective system and leads only to corruption. It goes counter to the Constitution, and hinders the development of innovative economic and democratic institutions.

A strong state and all-powerful bureaucracy are not one and the same thing. Civil society needs a strong state as a tool of developing and maintaining order, and for protecting and strengthening democratic institutions. But all-powerful bureaucracy is a moral danger for civil society. That is why our society must continue calm and steady work to build its democratic institutions and not delay this work.

Answer the following questions about the text.

1. What kind of an event was the adoption of Constitution in Russia, in 1993?
2. What has Russia become familiar with at a new stage of development?

3. What were people asking themselves about democracy not long ago?
4. What are Russian people ready to do now?
5. What does the bureaucracy still do?
6. What must civil society do towards building up democratic institutions?

Vocabulary Exercises

I. Fill in the gaps with the word or word combinations from the box.

1. A strong state and _____ are not one and the same thing.
2. The bureaucracy from time to time _____, pressing it to keep in line and not to take what they consider wrong action.
3. Not long ago, _____ was associated in minds of the Russian people with chaos, helplessness and degradation.
4. They have no need for the state _____.
5. The new Russia has proven its ability _____ and outside aggression.
6. This means it is absolutely essential and also possible _____.

democracy, successfully combat terrorism, to look after one's every step, to increase level of trust to society, to cast fear over business, all-powerful bureaucracy

II. What is the Russian for:

to put pressure on courts, innovative economic and democratic institutions, a tool for developing and maintaining order, to continue calm and steady work, not delay this work, to consider wrong action, to lead to corruption, free activity, to affirm commitment to the Constitution, to be familiar with the practice and procedures, to demand compliance with the law.

III. Make a pre-translation analysis of the text.

1. Определите тип источника и реципиента текста. На основании каких данных в тексте это можно сделать?
2. Охарактеризуйте лексику и термины данного текста. Приведите примеры из текста.

IV. Translate the text in a written form and single out the difficulties in translation.

V. What translation decisions have you made in the following sentences?

1. The new Russia has proven its ability to fulfill its social commitments and ensure economic growth, guarantee people's rights and demands, compliance with the law and successfully combat terrorism and outside aggression.

2. Russia's people are much readier now for free activity (professional public and political) than they were at the start of reforms.

3. A strong state and all-powerful bureaucracy are not one and the same thing.

4. Not long ago, people were still asking themselves whether or not democra The adoption in 1993 of a Constitution proclaiming the individuals, their life, rights and property as the highest value was an unprecedented event in Russia's history.

VI. Choose the best variant of translation and correct the mistakes of each other.

TEXTS FOR SELF-DIRECTED ACTIVITY

Text 1. Rethinking of National Interests

What is the national interest? This is a question that I took up in 2000 in these pages. That was a time that we as a nation revealingly called "the post-Cold War era." We knew better where we had been than where we were going. Yet monumental changes were unfolding – changes that were recognized at the time but whose implications were largely unclear.

And then came the attacks of September 11, 2001. As in the aftermath of the attack on Pearl Harbor in 1941, the United States was swept into a fundamentally different world. We were called to lead with a new urgency and with a new perspective on what constituted threats and what might emerge as opportunities. And as with previous strategic shocks, one can cite elements of both continuity and change in our foreign policy since the attacks of September 11.

What has not changed is that our relations with traditional and emerging great powers still matter to the successful conduct of policy. Thus, my admonition in 2000 that we should seek to get right the "relationships with the big powers" – Russia, China, and emerging powers such as India and Brazil – has consistently guided us. As before, our alliances in the America, Europe, and Asia remain the pillars of the international order, and we are now transforming them to meet the challenges of a new era.

What has changed is, most broadly, how we view the relationship between the dynamics within states and the distribution of power among them. As globalization strengthens some states, it exposes and exacerbates the failings of many others – those too weak or poorly governed to address challenges within their borders and prevent them from spilling out and destabilizing the international order. In this strategic environment, it is vital to our national security that states be willing and able to meet the full range of their sovereign responsibilities, both beyond their borders and within them. This new reality has led us to some significant changes in our policy. We recognize that democratic state building is now an urgent component of our national interest. And in the broader Middle East, we recognize that

freedom and democracy are the only ideas that can, over time, lead to just and lasting stability, especially in Afghanistan and Iraq.

As in the past, our policy has been sustained not just by our strength but also by our values. The United States has long tried to marry power and principle – realism and idealism. At times, there have been short-term tensions between them. But we have always known where our long-term interests lie. Thus, the United States has not been neutral about the importance of human rights or the superiority of democracy as a form of government, both in principle and in practice. This uniquely American realism has guided us over the past eight years, and it must guide us over the years to come.

By necessity, our relationships with Russia and China have been rooted more in common interests than common values. With Russia, we have found common ground, as evidenced by the "strategic framework" agreement that President George W. Bush and Russian President Vladimir Putin signed in Sochi in March of this year. Our relationship with Russia has been sorely tested by Moscow's rhetoric, by its tendency to treat its neighbors as lost "spheres of influence," and by its energy policies that have a distinct political tinge. And Russia's internal course has been a source of considerable disappointment, especially because in 2000 we hoped that it was moving closer to us in terms of values.

Yet it is useful to remember that Russia is not the Soviet Union. It is neither a permanent enemy nor a strategic threat. Russians now enjoy greater opportunity and, yes, personal freedom than at almost any other time in their country's history. But that alone is not the standard to which Russians themselves want to be held. Russia is not just a great power; it is also the land and culture of a great people.

And in the twenty-first century, greatness is increasingly defined by the technological and economic development that flows naturally in open and free societies. That is why the full development both of Russia and of our relationship with it still hangs in the balance as the country's internal transformation unfolds.

Text 2. Winning the Early Battles of the Long War

The first step toward a realistic peace is to be realistic about our enemies. They follow a violent ideology: radical Islamic fascism, which uses the mask of religion to further totalitarian goals and aims to destroy the existing international system. These enemies wear no uniform. They have no traditional military assets. They rule no states but can hide and operate in virtually any of them and are supported by some.

Above all, we must understand that our enemies are emboldened by signs of weakness. Radical Islamic terrorists attacked the World Trade Center in 1993, the Khobar Towers facility in Saudi Arabia in 1996, our embassies in Kenya and Tanzania in 1998, and the U.S.S. Cole in 2000. In some instances, we responded inadequately. In others, we failed to respond at all. Our retreat from Lebanon in 1983 and from Somalia in 1993 convinced them that our will was weak.

We must learn from these experiences for the long war that lies ahead. It is almost certain that U.S. troops will still be fighting in Iraq and Afghanistan when the next president takes office. The purpose of this fight must be to defeat the terrorists and the insurgents in Iraq and Afghanistan and to allow these countries to become members of the international system in good standing. We must be under no illusions that either Iraq or Afghanistan will quickly attain the levels of peace and security enjoyed in the developed world today.

Our aim should be to help them build accountable, functioning governments that can serve the needs of their populations, reduce violence within their borders, and eliminate the export of terror. As violence decreases and security improves, more responsibility can and should be turned over to local security forces. But some U.S. forces will need to remain for some time in order to deter external threats.

We cannot predict when our efforts will be successful. But we can predict the consequences of failure: Afghanistan would revert to being a safe haven for the terrorists, and Iraq would become another one – larger, richer, and strategically located. Parts of Iraq would undoubtedly fall under the sway of the enemies, particularly Iran. The balance of power in the Middle East would tip further toward terror, extremism, and repression. America's influence and prestige – not just in the Middle East but around the world – would be dealt a shattering blow.

Our allies would conclude that we cannot back up our commitments with sustained action. Our enemies – both terrorists and rogue states – would be emboldened. They would see further opportunities to weaken the international state system that is the primary defense of civilization. Much as our enemies in the 1990s concluded from our inconsistent response to terrorism then, our enemies today would conclude that America's will is weak and the civilization we pledged to defend is tired. Failure would be an invitation for more war, in even more difficult and dangerous circumstances.

America must remember one of the lessons of the Vietnam War. Then, as now, we fought a war with the wrong strategy for several years. And then, as now, we corrected course and began to show real progress. Many historians today believe that by about 1972 we and our South Vietnamese partners had succeeded in defeating the Vietcong insurgency and in setting South Vietnam on a path to political self-sufficiency.

But America then withdrew its support, allowing the communist North to conquer the South. The consequences were dire, and not only in Vietnam: numerous deaths in places such as the killing fields of Cambodia, a newly energized and expansionist Soviet Union, and a weaker America. The consequences of abandoning Iraq would be worse.

Our goal is to see in Iraq and Afghanistan the emergence of stable governments and societies that can act as our allies against the terrorists and not as breeding grounds for expanded terrorist activities. Succeeding in Iraq and Afghanistan is necessary but not sufficient. Ultimately, these are only two battlegrounds in a wider war. The United States must not rest until the al Qaeda network is destroyed and its leaders, from Osama bin Laden on down, are killed or captured. And the United States must not rest until the global terrorist movement and its ideology are defeated.

Much of that fight will take place in the shadows. It will be the work of intelligence operatives, paramilitary groups, and Special Operations forces. It will also require close relationships with other governments and local forces. The next U.S. president should direct our armed forces to emphasize such work, in part because local forces are best able to operate in their home countries and in part in order to reduce the strain on our own troops.

SUPPLEMENTARY TEXTS

The Five-Day War

On August 8, Georgian forces had responded to attacks by secessionists in South Ossetia, an ethnic enclave in northern Georgia, by pummeling civilian areas in the region's capital, Tskhinvali, and seeking to retake the territory by force. Moscow, which had supported the province's secessionist government for more than a decade, retaliated with a full-scale invasion, sending aircraft and armored columns into South Ossetia and targeting key military and transport centers inside Georgia proper.

Russia also beefed up its military presence in Abkhazia, another secessionist province, in the northwestern corner of the country. Russian troops had been present in both enclaves as peacekeepers, deployed with Georgia's consent 15 years earlier. When the Georgian attack on South Ossetia killed Russian soldiers and threatened the fragile status quo, Moscow intervened with lightning speed. At first glance, the Russian-Georgian war of August 2008 seemed little more than the stuff of adventure-book fantasy: a reawakened empire going to battle against an old viceroyalty over a mountainous principality of negligible strategic value to either side. But it has had momentous consequences.

The five-day war killed hundreds, left thousands of refugees in temporary shelters, and brought relations between Russia and the United States to their lowest point since the dark days of the Cold War. For some of Russia's neighbors, such as Poland and the Baltic states, the war symbolized the return of the old NATO – a traditional alliance providing security guarantees in order to deter external aggression rather than a postmodern club promoting democracy and good governance. For Georgia, the Russian tanks that scarred the lush countryside were an affront to all that had been achieved since the Rose Revolution of 2003, including the creation of passably democratic institutions and the implementation of an unwaveringly pro-U.S. foreign policy. For Russia, the war was a firm rejoinder to a reckless Georgian leadership and a chance to stand up to U.S. influence in Moscow's backyard.

Western journalists were quick to compare the conflict to Leonid Brezhnev's crushing of the Prague Spring or Hitler's invasion of the Sudetenland. But if there is a historical analogy, it is not 1968, much less 1938. An older and more typically Russian pattern is at work. Russia spent the early part of the nineteenth century collaborating with Austria, the United Kingdom, and other allies against Napoleon. In time, however, the Russian tsars came to see the great powers as self-interested and manipulative, and busy either dismantling solid countries or propping up decrepit ones at their whim, Russia eventually traded its partnership with Europe for a wary cynicism, an introverted nationalism, and a belief in raw power as the hallmark of international politics.

A Serious Burden on U.S. Policy

Because the stakes are high, simple prudence will oblige the next U.S. administration to move cautiously. Whatever Washington embarks on now, it must be able to carry through, and that rules out overreaching. To have broader options down the road, U.S. policymakers must offer Georgia, in the short term, effective humanitarian relief; then, support for economic stabilization and reconstruction; and, after that, help in restoring the country's armed forces. As such steps begin to succeed, the question of Georgia's membership in NATO will arise again. Georgia deserves a place in the Western alliance, but nothing will do more harm to Georgia's security than to raise the issue before NATO is ready with an answer.

Rebuilding Georgia – and rebuilding a policy that gives post-Soviet states a place in the Western world – must be the first order of business for the next U.S. administration. There is no other way to deal seriously with the wreckage created by Russian aggression. But in making this effort, the United States and its European allies will have to wrestle with a seeming paradox: in the past, the United States was able to do more for Russia's neighbors when its own relations with Moscow were good (and the neighbors' relations with Moscow were at least civil).

For the foreseeable future, U.S.-Russian relations will not be good, and that all impose a serious burden on U.S. policy. There is no way to

break cleanly out of this box, but to do so at all, the United States needs to regain the diplomatic initiative. It needs ideas and proposals that can blunt Russia's recent strategy while offering Moscow a different path to international influence.

As it happens, the Russians themselves may have put forward the most readily usable idea of this kind. Before the war against Georgia, in his most substantive foray into foreign policy to date, President Medvedev called for a new conference on European security, explicitly harking back to the diplomacy of the mid-1970s, out of which the Helsinki Final Act emerged. To be sure, his goals seemed a little too much like those of the Soviet leader Leonid Brezhnev, who hoped that a conference on "security and cooperation" would bring Western recognition of the division of Europe.

For his part, Medvedev wants recognition of the Commonwealth of Independent States, the Collective Security Treaty Organization, and other arrangements that link Moscow to a number of post-Soviet states. And like Brezhnev, who lived to see Helsinki become a banner for opponents of the Soviet regime, Medvedev might discover that such a forum, whatever its short-term propaganda value, would give other governments a chance to put Russia's conduct in the spotlight and promote principles that would make the realization of its would-be imperium harder to achieve.

With Georgia still bleeding from defeat, the idea of exploring proposals whose clear aim is to consolidate Russia's gains, devalue and constrain NATO, and close off avenues to the outside world for Russia's neighbors may seem untimely, even defeatist. And yet the United States and its allies should not forget that they have permanent advantages in diplomatic enterprises of this kind. It is not easy to imagine a European security conference, now or in the future, in which Russia would not be isolated by its own behavior.

Would anyone but Russia oppose the principle that all states are free to join alliances of their own choosing? Which states could Russia count on to object to a reaffirmation of Georgia's sovereignty and territorial integrity? Who would support Russia's idea that having waged war against Georgia, its own forces should now assume the mantle of peacekeepers?

Policymakers in Moscow claim that Russia simply wants to sit at the high table of global diplomacy, to be a rule maker and norm setter for the international order. They seem to believe that a European security conference, even a European security treaty, would strengthen Russia's sphere of influence. They want to show that when they speak, they get a hearing.

Such aims and expectations may produce only stalemate. Yet the process would not be a waste of time if it did nothing more than demonstrate that Russia's ideas and conduct are at odds with the opinions of all the other participants.

The next U.S. administration should therefore look carefully at Russia's proposals, consult with its friends and allies, hold exploratory conversations, seek clarifications, bracket ideas it does not like, and so forth.

Then it should accept Medvedev's idea with pleasure.

Whose Sphere of Influence?

From the moment the Soviet Union collapsed, it was the policy of the United States and its Western allies to give Russia's neighbors, like other postcommunist states, a chance to integrate themselves into the Western world.

In the 1990s, states of the former Soviet Union – unlike Hungary and Poland, or even Bulgaria and Romania – were not considered good candidates for the ultimate prize: full membership in the European Union and NATO. But they enjoyed many other forms of support from the West: sponsorship of oil and gas pipelines that provided access to international markets, the encouragement of foreign direct investment, mediation efforts to resolve separatist disputes, technical advice to speed accession to the World Trade Organization, training and equipment to combat drug trafficking and nuclear smuggling, cooperation on intelligence and counterterrorism, and funding for non-governmental election-monitoring groups.

All these were the same tools that the United States employed in its relations with Russia, and their goal was also the same: to encourage the emergence of somewhat modern-looking, somewhat European-looking political and economic systems from the post-Soviet rubble.

At first, this U.S. policy did not threaten U.S.-Russian relations. But then, something unexpected happened: Russia's neighbors began to succeed. In the past five years, the economic growth of many former Soviet states has outstripped Russia's own. While Russia became less democratic, several of its neighbors made important political breakthroughs. All of them began to seek ties with the West. That would bring them out of Moscow's shadow, and two – Georgia and Ukraine – have sought to lay claim to membership in the European Union and NATO.

In part because U. S. policy had not really changed over time, Washington probably underestimated the significance of encouraging such aspirations. It surely underrated the single-mindedness of Russia's opposition. With its own economy reviving, Moscow sought to block Western pipeline projects and to close off the West's military access to air bases in Central Asia. It accused Western nongovernmental organizations of trying to destabilize Russia's neighbors. And in April, Putin labeled the further enlargement of NATO «a direct threat to the security of our country».

In all this, the United States and Europe misjudged their ability to help Russia's neighbors slip into the Western orbit without a full-blown international crisis. Now that there has been a test of strength, and Russian strength has prevailed, many of the tools of Western policy are severely damaged. Those NATO members that had endorsed eventual membership for Georgia or Ukraine are now divided on the issue.

Those former Soviet states that had viewed closer cooperation with NATO (even without membership in the alliance) as a critical lifeline to the outside world now wonder whether this is still a good idea. Energy producers in Central Asia that were considering new pipelines outside the Russian network may see such projects as too risky. Western mediation

efforts are on hold along Russia's entire periphery; in Georgia, they are dead.

Yet whatever else Russia has accomplished in his pummeling of Georgia, it has failed at the most important. Even as Russian leaders have begun to speak openly about their desire for a sphere of influence, their actions have made Russia's acquisition of such a sphere less, not more, acceptable to the United States and Europe. It is now necessary to consider whether Russia's invasion marks the beginning of a concerted drive by Moscow to restore its influence over other post-Soviet states.

In the past, such a revival might have seemed undesirable in the West for sentimental reasons. Today, the reasons are more serious. There can be no doubt that a Russia that dominated an industrial powerhouse such as Ukraine, an energy storehouse such as Kazakhstan, and the other pieces of the old Soviet Union as well would change the national security calculations of virtually all the world's leading states.

A Blueprint for Cooperation

Working constructively with Russia does not mean nominating Putin for the Nobel Peace Prize or inviting him to address a joint session of Congress. Nor is anyone encouraging Russia to join NATO or welcoming it as a great democratic friend.

What Washington must do is work with Russia to advance essential U.S. interests in the same way that the United States works with other important nondemocratic states, such as China, Kazakhstan, and Saudi Arabia. This means avoiding both misplaced affection and the unrealistic sense that the United States can take other countries for granted without consequences.

Few deny that such cooperation should be pursued, but Washington's naïve and self-serving conventional wisdom holds that the United States can secure Russia's cooperation in areas important to the United States while maintaining complete freedom to ignore Russian priorities. U.S. officials believe that Moscow should uncritically support Washington

against Iran and Islamist terrorists on the theory that Russia also considers them threats.

However, this argument ignores the fact that Russia has a very different view of the Iranian threat. While Russia doesn't want a nuclear-armed Iran, it doesn't see the issue as urgent and can be content with intrusive checks to prevent commercial-scale uranium enrichment. Expecting Russia to go along with the United States on Iran, regardless of U.S. policy on other issues, is the functional equivalent of expecting Iraqis to welcome U.S. and coalition troops as liberators, as it fundamentally ignores the other side's perspective on U.S. actions.

With this in mind, the United States should be firm in its relations with Russia and should make clear that Iran, nonproliferation, and terrorism are defining issues in the bilateral relationship. Similarly, Washington should communicate to Moscow that aggression against a NATO member or the unprovoked use of force against any other state would do profound damage to the relationship.

The United States should also demonstrate with words and deeds that it will oppose any effort to re-create the Soviet Union. In economic affairs, Washington should signal very clearly that manipulation of the law to seize assets that were legally acquired by foreign energy companies will have serious consequences, including restrictions on Russian access to U.S. and Western downstream markets and damage to Russia's reputation that would limit not only investment and transfers of technology but also Western companies' support for engagement with Russia.

Finally, the United States should not be deterred by Russian objections to placing missile defense systems in the Czech Republic and Poland. Rather, in Henry Kissinger's formulation, Washington should keep the deployments limited to their "stated objective of overcoming rogue state threats" and combine them with an agreement on specific steps designed to reassure Moscow that the program has nothing to do with a hypothetical war against Russia.

The good news is that although Russia is disillusioned with the United States and Europe, it is so far not eager to enter into an alliance against the West. The Russian people do not want to risk their new

prosperity – and Russia's elites are loath to give up their Swiss bank accounts, London mansions, and Mediterranean vacations.

Although Russia is seeking greater military cooperation with China, Beijing does not seem eager to start a fight with Washington either. At the moment, the Shanghai Cooperation Organization – which promotes cooperation among China, Russia, and the Central Asian states – is a debating club rather than a genuine security alliance.

But if the current U.S.-Russian relationship deteriorates further, it will not bode well for the United States and would be even worse for Russia. The Russian general staff is lobbying to add a military dimension to the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, and some top officials are beginning to champion the idea of a foreign policy realignment directed against the West.

Russia Leaves the West

It is hardly a secret that relations between Russia and the West have begun to fray. After more than a decade of talk about Russia's "integration" into the West and a "strategic partnership" between Moscow and Washington, U.S. and European officials are now publicly voicing their concern over Russia's domestic political situation and its relations with the former Soviet republics. In a May 4 speech in Lithuania, for example, Dick Cheney accused the Kremlin of "unfairly restricting citizens' rights" and using its energy resources as "tools of intimidation and blackmail."

Even as these critics express their dismay, they continue to assume that if they speak loudly and insistently, Russia will heed them and change its ways. Unfortunately, they are looking for change in the wrong place. It is true, as they charge, that Putin has recently clamped down on dissent throughout Russia and cracked down on separatists in Chechnya, but more important changes have come in Russia's foreign policy. Until recently, Russia saw itself as Pluto in the Western solar system, very far from the center but still fundamentally a part of it. Now it has left that orbit entirely: Russia's leaders have given up on becoming part of the West and have started creating their own Moscow-centered system.

The Kremlin's new approach to foreign policy assumes that as a big country, Russia is essentially friendless; no great power wants a strong Russia, which would be a formidable competitor, and many want a weak Russia that they could exploit and manipulate. Accordingly, Russia has a choice between accepting subservience and reasserting its status as a great power, thereby claiming its rightful place in the world alongside the United States and China rather than settling for the company of Brazil and India.

The United States and Europe can protest this change in Russia's foreign policy all they want, but it will not make any difference. They must recognize that the terms of Western-Russian interaction, conceptualized at the time of the Soviet Union's collapse 15 years ago and more or less unchanged since, have shifted fundamentally. The old paradigm is lost, and it is time to start looking for a new one.

The West deserves some blame for the shift in Russian foreign policy. The sudden collapse of Soviet power and the speed of German reunification took the US and Europe by surprise. In response, European governments, led by France, have reshaped the European Community into a more cohesive European Union (EU), while putting aside the question of what to do with Eastern Europe and Russia. Meanwhile, Washington focused on managing the ever-weakening Soviet Union and rejoicing in its victory in the Cold War, while neglecting to define a strategy for post-Soviet Russia. President George W. Bush's "New World Order", formulated while the Soviet Union was still in existence, demanded only that the Soviets cease their meddling in the affairs of the world. It was only later that politicians began to think about organizing a real order after the Cold War, and when they did, their approach to managing post-Soviet Russia almost guaranteed failure.

After the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989, Western governments formed many partnerships with their former communist adversaries in an attempt to project their values and influence beyond the wall's ruins. They hoped that some countries would quickly join Europe, now "whole and free", while others would be drawn to it more slowly. The conflict in the Balkans dampened this early enthusiasm and demonstrated the alienation of the United States' aloofness and Europe's weakness in the face of the forces released by the end of the superpower confrontation.

From the beginning of the post-Cold War era, the West saw Russia as a special case. Armed with nuclear weapons, its great-power mentality shaken but unbroken, and just too big, Russia would be granted privileged treatment but no real prospect of membership in either NATO or the EU. The door to the West would officially remain open, but the idea of Russia's actually entering through it remained unthinkable. The hope was that Russia would gradually transform itself, with Western assistance, into a democratic polity and a market economy. In the meanwhile, it was important that Russia pursue a generally pro-Western foreign policy.

Moscow considered such a proposal unacceptable. She was willing to consider joining the West only if she was given something like co-chairmanship of a Western club, or at least membership in its Politburo. Russian leaders were unwilling to follow directions from Washington and Brussels or accept the same rules followed by its former Soviet satellites. Thus, despite all the talk about integrating Russia into Western institutions, the project was initially stillborn. It was only a matter of time before this reality became apparent to both sides.

Is America Losing Its Edge?

Washington should understand the limits of the data used to describe S&T trends. Although the number of Ph.D. students coming to the United States has dropped, for example, the proportion of those choosing to remain after their studies has increased substantially. Moreover, a bachelor's degree may now be more relevant to innovation than before, and the number of American students getting such degrees in science and engineering has increased over the last decade.

Policymakers should therefore be careful not to focus too much on any particular statistic. Dollars spent on R&D or research papers published are easy to measure, but innovation involves many other factors. The speed at which new technologies such as broadband are adopted and diffused, the flexibility of labor markets, and the ease with which new companies can enter and exit technology markets all affect the ability of innovators to flourish in a particular economy-yet such factors usually fall outside the parameters of traditional S&T policy.

The double-edged phenomenon of globalization, which can both strengthen U.S. technology companies and threaten the innovation system, makes the task of supporting innovation through policy much more difficult. Proximity to consumers gives firms a better sense of potential new markets and allows them to rapidly respond to changing customer demands. Yet a move overseas, although it might seem good for shareholders, could also destabilize the complex interactions between firms and universities that drive technological discovery in the United States.

Removing any one element from a technology cluster can diminish its ability to generate new ideas. Send manufacturing jobs to Asia and you risk exporting important components of your innovation infrastructure.

The United States cannot and should not prevent the emergence of new technology clusters in Asia. Instead, it should prepare to develop and absorb new technologies as they emerge elsewhere. The ability to make good use of diverse ideas and systems remains one of the United States' most important comparative advantages, and U.S. companies must make sure that good ideas, no matter where they are developed, are brought to market in the United States first.

U.S. private industry may want to follow the example of the nation's armed forces. Washington's military dominance no longer depends on it denying others access to critical technologies. Many of the sensors that the U.S. military now uses to detect ships or aircraft beyond visual range or to provide targeting information are off-the-shelf items produced by companies around the world. Unable to prevent the spread of these technologies to potential enemies, the United States has maintained its military superiority by making sure it is better than any other country at using such tools, integrating sensor input, and creating sensor networks. In the commercial sphere, U.S. firms should similarly strive to maintain their advantage by adopting and integrating new technologies more rapidly than their competitors.

Maintaining such speed will require that U.S. companies have a presence in Asian markets to track, develop, and invest in the most promising new ideas. Washington must continue to pressure its trading partners-especially Beijing-to meet the terms of current trade agreements

and allow such access. The United States must also promote voluntary and open technology standards. In March 2004, the Bush administration protested regulations requiring all wireless imports to China to contain data-encryption technology produced only by Chinese companies. Beijing has since withdrawn the regulations, but given China's interest in developing new technology standards, the United States should watch for future attempts of a similar nature.

At home, Washington should not strive to identify the next big thing. Rather, policymakers should ensure that the United States remains the most dynamic innovation system. Funding for science and education must be maintained. Although it might be tempting to shrink the budget deficit by reducing discretionary funding for the sciences, this would weaken one of the pillars of the country's future economic and technological health. Money for basic research, especially in the physical sciences and engineering, and support for the National Science Foundation should therefore be maintained at current levels or increased.

Of equal importance, policymakers must also reinforce the United States' entrepreneurial climate, its greatest asset. The building blocks of American innovation-flexible capital and labor markets, transparent government regulation, and a business environment that rewards risk-need to be strengthened. Making the R&D tax credit permanent and expanding it to include more types of collaborative research, for example, would help provide incentives for innovation in as many technological sectors as possible.

With innovative capacity rapidly spreading across the Pacific, the United States cannot simply assume that it will remain the epicenter of scientific research and technological innovation. Instead, it should meet the challenge from Asia head-on. The United States must actively engage with new centers of innovation and prepare itself to integrate rapidly and build on new ideas emerging in China, India, and South Korea. Above all, it must not assume that future innovation will occur automatically. Only through renewed attention to science funding, educational reform, the health of labor and capital markets, and the vitality of the business environment can the United States maintain its edge-and the most innovative economy in the world.

Aiding The Democratic Revival

The current situation may seem discouraging, but there is hope. Even in very poor nations drowning in corruption and clientelism, citizens have repeatedly used the democratic process to try to replace predatory governments. Connected by grass-roots movements, community radio stations, cell phones, civic organizations, and the Internet, citizens are rising up as never before to challenge corruption, defend the electoral process, and demand better governance. The most important challenge now for the United States and other international actors is to stand with them.

The leverage needed to bring about radical change will never exist unless the politicians and officials who sit atop the structures of predation come to realize that they have no choice but to reform. In the early 1990s, many African regimes moved toward free elections when a combination of internal and external pressure left them no choice: they were running out of money and could not pay their soldiers and civil servants. Now, with the momentum going against democracy, a resurgent and oil-rich Russia flexing its muscles, and China emerging as a major aid donor in the rest of Asia and Africa, it will be more difficult to encourage reforms. Forcing change that leads to better governance will require serious resolve and close coordination among the established bilateral and multilateral donors.

The key is the principle of conditionality (or selectivity), which lies at the core of the Millennium Challenge Account – one of the Bush administration's least heralded but most important foreign policy innovations. Under the program, states qualify for generous new aid payments by competing on the basis of three broad criteria: whether they rule justly, whether they invest in basic health care and education, and whether they promote economic freedom. The instrument of aid selectivity is showing promise as a tool that civil-society actors in predatory states can use to campaign for governance reforms and as an incentive for corrupt governments in need of more aid to reform their ways.

The international donor community's habit of keeping afloat predatory and other troubled states (in some cases covering up to half of their recurrent government expenditures) must end. The overriding purpose of foreign assistance must be genuine development, not the assuaging of

Western guilt or the care and feeding of the massive network of career professionals, nonprofit organizations, and private-sector companies that constitute the global aid industry. It is time to start listening to the growing chorus of activists and organizations in developing countries that are imploring the West to please stop "helping" them with indiscriminate aid that only serves to entrench corrupt elites and practices.

To be sure, it will be an uphill struggle to get international donors, and especially institutions such as the World Bank, to refocus their aid strategies on good-governance goals. Still, the reality of the link between development and decent governance – in particular the control of corruption – is gradually taking hold in foreign-aid circles, and the civil societies of developing countries are emerging as some of the most compelling and legitimate advocates of this concept.

Now, as democratic setbacks multiply, is the moment for a new strategy. Without a clear understanding of the fundamental problem – bad governance – and the necessary institutional responses, more democratic breakdowns are likely. Without a resolute and relentless international campaign to rein in corruption and improve the quality of governance in at-risk democracies, the current democratic recession could lead to a global democratic depression.

Such a development would be enormously costly to human freedom and dangerous for U.S. national security. Public opinion surveys continue to show that majorities in every region of the world believe democracy is the best form of government. The urgent imperative is to demonstrate, through the effective functioning of democracies worldwide, that it really is.

New Century, New Challenges

Confronting the challenges of the new century will require strength, creativity, and moral leadership. The century ahead will bring new efforts by nonstate actors, ranging from terrorist groups to ethnically based local and regional movements, to redefine the boundaries of states, the jurisdiction of multilateral organizations, and the authority of international law. We will also face instability generated by weak and failing states. And

we will face continuing challenges to our efforts to promote democracy. Elections alone are not enough; new democracies need to cultivate constitutionalism, strong institutions, pluralism, and a respect for a free press and the rule of law.

Finally, a host of twenty-first-century developments from climate change to pandemics will likely impose additional stresses. A report issued in April by a group of 11 retired military officers, including General Gordon Sullivan, the former army chief of staff, and General Zinni, the former CENTCOM commander, described the potential of climate change to ignite a chain reaction leading to global instability. It could trigger conflicts over shrinking natural resources, weaken states through the creation of climate refugees, and hasten the spread of diseases and famine. We must act aggressively against this threat.

We should begin our reengagement with the world by bringing an end to the Iraq war. Iraq's problems are deep and dangerous, but they cannot be solved by the U.S. military. For over a year, I have argued for an immediate withdrawal of 40,000 to 50,000 U.S. combat troops from Iraq, followed by an orderly and complete withdrawal of all combat troops. Once we are out of Iraq, the United States must retain sufficient forces in the region to prevent a genocide, a regional spillover of the civil war, or the establishment of an al Qaeda safe haven.

We will most likely need to retain quick-reaction forces in Kuwait and a significant naval presence in the Persian Gulf. We will also need some security capabilities in Baghdad, inside the Green Zone, to protect the U.S. embassy and U.S. personnel. Finally, we will need a diplomatic offensive to engage the rest of the world – including Middle Eastern nations and our allies in Europe – in working to secure Iraq's future. All of these measures will finally allow us to close this terrible chapter and move on to the broader challenges of the new century.

We must confront these challenges not only through our military but also through diplomacy. Few areas deserve the United States' moral leadership more urgently than Sudan. The African Union peacekeeping troops stationed in Darfur have acted bravely in a difficult situation. But these 7,000 troops have been unable to protect civilians or enforce a 2004

cease-fire, and security has deteriorated dramatically. I believe President Bush should convene an emergency meeting of NATO's leadership to provide assistance to a UN deployment of 3,000 troops, backed by logistical, operational, and financial support. NATO must establish a no-fly zone over the region to cut off supplies to the brutal Janjaweed militias and end the Sudanese government's bombing of civilians in Darfur.

NATO member states should also impose a new round of multilateral sanctions on the Sudanese government and freeze the foreign assets of individuals complicit in the genocide. The United States must make a decisive new commitment to employ the extraordinary assets of the U.S. military – our airlift capabilities, logistical support, and intelligence systems – to assist UN and African Union peacekeeping efforts in Darfur. And we must continue to pressure other countries with influence in the region, such as China, to meet their own responsibilities to help end this conflict.

We also need to renew our commitment to engagement and diplomacy in order to solve problems before they occur, rather than scrambling to deal with crises after they have erupted. With engagement comes far greater knowledge and the potential for progress and even trust. Presidents Kennedy and Reagan talked with Soviet leaders at the height of the Cold War, in both cases turning back major threats to our national security. We need to do the same with Iranian and North Korean leaders.

Iran presents a complicated challenge for the United States. President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad is a dangerous radical and a strong supporter of Hezbollah and Hamas. He has said repeatedly that Israel should be "wiped off the map" and last December sponsored a conference for Holocaust deniers in Tehran. Iran cannot be allowed to possess nuclear weapons.

Overhauling Intelligence

Before World War II, the United States' defense, intelligence, and foreign policy apparatus were fragmented, as befitted a country with a limited role on the world stage. With U.S. entry into the war, interagency collaboration developed out of crisis-driven necessity. Wartime

arrangements, although successful, were ad hoc. And after the war, President Harry Truman and Congress realized that the United States could not meet its new responsibilities without a national security structure that rationalized decision-making and integrated the intelligence and military establishments. It was against this background that on July 26, 1947 – 60 years ago this summer – Truman signed the National Security Act, a seminal piece of legislation for the U.S. intelligence community that laid the foundation for a robust peacetime intelligence infrastructure.

With the proper tools and public support and the help of allies, the United States built the world's premier intelligence establishment. It put spy planes in the sky, satellites into space, and listening posts in strategic locations around the world. It also invested in its people, developing a professional cadre of analysts, case officers, linguists, technicians, and program managers and trained them in foreign languages, the sciences, and area studies.

But by the time the Cold War ended, the intelligence establishment that had served Washington so well in the second half of the twentieth century was sorely in need of change. The post-Cold War "peace dividend" led to a reduction of intelligence starting by 22 percent between fiscal years 1989 and 2001. Only now is starting getting back to pre-Cold War levels. The National Security Act mandated that information be shared up the chain of command but not horizontally with other agencies. At the time of the act's passing, little thought was given to the need for a national-level intelligence apparatus in Washington that could synthesize information from across the government to inform policymakers and help support real-time tactical decisions. That reality, coupled with practices that led to a "stovepiping" of intelligence, arrested the growth of information sharing, collaboration, and integration - patterns that still linger.

All these shortcomings have made the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (IRTPA) and the creation of the post of director of national intelligence (DNI) timely and appropriate but, by themselves, insufficient. Indeed, these measures must be only the beginning of a larger reform. The state-sponsored terrorist groups that

threaten the United States are accompanied by an ever larger number of nonstate actors moving at increasing speeds across geographic and organizational boundaries. These new actors blur the traditional distinctions between foreign and domestic, intelligence-related and operational, strategic and tactical. To respond, Washington must forge a collaborative approach to intelligence that increases the agility of individual agencies and facilitates the effective coordination and integration of their work.

The post of DNI was created in 2005 to transform and modernize intelligence institutions, rules, and relationships to meet today's intelligence needs. Since 1947, new threats to U.S. national security have appeared, new missions have been developed, and new intelligence agencies have come into existence. A national intelligence authority was needed to focus, guide, and coordinate all the United States' 16 intelligence agencies to better provide timely, tailored intelligence support to a wide range of users with different, and often competing, requirements. The National Security Act sought to unify U.S. military and foreign intelligence efforts, but it did not envision or provide for today's requirement to integrate intelligence and law enforcement. Our main challenge in doing this is to strike the right balance between centralized direction and decentralized execution so that the O/ce of the DNI does not just end up being another layer of bureaucracy on top of the existing structures.

Ensuring the integration of foreign and domestic intelligence collection and analysis, as the 9/11 Commission recommended, is one of the most important responsibilities given to the O/ce of the DNI — and a vital component of striking that balance. How to do this while respecting and protecting the rights Americans hold dear has been among the most difficult challenges facing the intelligence community. The difficulties have been compounded by the need to operate under the rigid barriers put in place by the National Security Act.

Under the act, U.S. intelligence capabilities involve four distinct areas of responsibility: supporting the president, engaging in clandestine activities abroad in support of national policy goals, protecting the United States against Soviet penetration, and supporting strategic military

operations. The director of central intelligence and the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) are given responsibility over the first two, the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) over the third, and military intelligence units over the fourth.

Diplomacy

Diplomacy is a method of influencing foreign governments through dialogue, negotiation, and other measures short of war or violence. The word "diplomacy" is derived from the ancient Greek diploma, meaning an object folded in two - a reference to the documents through which princes granted permission to travel and other privileges.

Historically, diplomacy was concerned chiefly with the conduct of official relations between two countries. In the 20th century, however, diplomacy included summit meetings and international conferences, parliamentary diplomacy (diplomacy conducted within international organizations such as the United Nations), and the activities of nongovernmental organizations such as Amnesty International.

The Nature of Diplomacy

Diplomacy is often confused with foreign policy, but the terms are not synonymous. The foreign policy of a country comprises the general goals it seeks to achieve in its relations with other countries, together with strategies for achieving them. Diplomacy is the chief, but not the only, means of carrying out a country's foreign policy; other means include the use of secret agents, subversion, and war. Foreign policy is set by political leaders, while most diplomacy is conducted by career professionals called diplomats. A general term for a diplomatic representative is envoy (derived from the French *envoyé*, meaning one who is sent).

Diplomacy seeks to preserve peace. Diplomats try to develop goodwill towards their home country, and expand international cooperation. However, even in times of peace diplomats may threaten economic penalties or military action to force acceptance of their country's policies by other countries.

Diplomats are specialists in carrying messages and negotiating the resolution of quarrels between countries. Their tools are words, backed by

the power of the country or organization they represent. Diplomats help political leaders to understand the attitudes and actions of foreigners and to develop strategies and tactics to influence the behaviour of foreign governments. The wise use of diplomats is an essential element of a successful foreign policy.

Diplomatic Missions

In essence, a diplomatic mission is a group of individuals sent to a foreign country to carry out the tasks of diplomacy. A mission may include both military and civilian personnel. The term is frequently used to denote an embassy, which is a permanent resident diplomatic mission located in the capital of the host country. Within the embassy are the ambassador's offices and staff; it may also include the ambassador's residence.

Another type of mission is a legation. Similar to an embassy but of lower rank, the legation is headed by a minister rather than an ambassador. A third type of mission is a consulate. But while embassies and legations are concerned with matters of state, the consulate is involved with the commercial and legal interests of its citizens living, visiting, and / or doing business in the host country. Consulates provide public services for their citizens, such as electoral registration, issuing passports, and ensuring fair treatment for those charged with crimes. Unlike embassies, which are always located in the host country's capital, consulates may be located anywhere in the host country.

Diplomatic Tasks

A diplomatic mission serves many functions. These include representing the sending country in the host country, and protecting the interests of the sending country and its citizens. The mission is also charged with negotiating agreements with the host country when authorized, and the lawful gathering of information on conditions and developments in the host country. One of the most important tasks of the mission is promoting friendly relations between the two countries and furthering their economic, commercial, and cultural contacts.

Role of the Ambassador

The ambassador is charged with carrying out all the tasks of the diplomatic mission through assistants and aides, or through personal

intervention with local authorities when necessary. A diplomat's primary daily activities are collecting and analysing information, and negotiating. However, the ambassador spends much time entertaining visiting politicians and attending receptions, at which some business is conducted. Reports to the sending country are filed by telegram, telephone, facsimile, and e-mail, usually in an encrypted form to maintain secrecy. A key task is to predict a developing crisis. This is accomplished by gathering information from a variety of sources and the use of experience and expert knowledge. The ambassador must inform his government in detail and without distortion about the content of his conversations with the host foreign minister, prime minister, and other key officials and politicians.

Political System and Types of Government

As long as people have lived together in communities there have been governments to rule those communities. As the forms of communities grew and changed, governments developed many institutions to help them function. Political systems consist of all the ways in which the different parts of government interact through these institutions.

Although many countries have similar institutions, the definition of those bodies and the way they work together can vary greatly. The main bodies are an executive, or head of state; a legislature; and a judiciary, or court system. Often these are defined by a constitution. In democracies the roles of these institutions are clearly defined and separated to some extent. In some countries these are all controlled by one person or a small group of people. Such countries can be monarchies or dictatorships.

There are two leading types of constitutional democracy in the world today. These are the presidential system, such as that of the United States, and the parliamentary system, such as that of the United Kingdom.

Presidential system

In a presidential system the executive, legislative, and judicial branches are clearly separated. The president is elected by the people and is not a member of the legislature. In such systems the president is both the political head of the government and also the head of state, who presides

over ceremonies and official functions. The president chooses people to serve as his or her cabinet. These are the heads of the various departments. They are not elected.

The legislature usually consists of two bodies. In the US Congress, members of both the Senate and the House of Representatives are elected officials. Like the president, they are elected for set terms.

Established court systems are found in all advanced political systems. There are often several levels of courts. In the United States judges of local courts are elected by the people of a particular district. The highest court is the Supreme Court. Supreme Court justices are appointed by the president and approved by the Senate.

Parliamentary system

In a parliamentary system the prime minister is the national political leader, and another figure serves as the head of state. In the United Kingdom the head of state is the queen. In Japan it is the emperor. In some countries the head of state may be an elected president, but the prime minister usually has the true power. The prime minister is generally a member of the legislature who is either elected by the legislature or chosen automatically as the leader of the party with the most members in the legislature. The prime minister's cabinet, and the leaders of the government departments, are also members of the legislature.

The legislature is known generally as a parliament, though each country may have its own name for it. In Israel the name is the Knesset, for instance, while in Japan it is the Diet. The legislature may consist of one or two houses. The members are chosen in a variety of ways. Sometimes one house is elected by the people while the members of the other house are appointed by the ruler or by regional assemblies. In other cases all members of both houses are elected.

The judiciary is also controlled by the legislature to varying degrees. In the United Kingdom the Lord Chancellor is responsible for the efficient functioning of the courts. Formerly he was also the presiding officer of the House of Lords and the head of the judiciary in England and Wales.

Other systems

Some constitutional countries, notably France, have systems that combine elements of the presidential and parliamentary approaches.

Although France's constitution established a parliamentary form of government, it also increased the role of the president of the republic. The constitution gives the president the power to appoint the prime minister and the executive ministers, preside over the cabinet, sign important decrees, appoint high civil servants and judges, and dissolve one house of the parliament. Because of this arrangement the prime minister and president must share power to a certain extent.

Dictatorships

Dictatorships can take various forms. In some cases elected presidents and prime ministers capture power by establishing one-party rule and ending all opposition. They may continue to call the country a republic and maintain some institutions, such as a legislature, but in fact they control all the power in the country. In other cases, the military may take control.

Nazi Germany under Adolf Hitler was an example of a third type of dictatorship. In this case the government was led by a strong leader with a specific programme and goals based on a theory about the world. It also tried to spread its power and make others follow its ideas. Many countries did establish Communist governments based on the model of the Soviet Union. By the end of the 20th century, however, most of the Communist governments, including that of the Soviet Union, had collapsed.

The European Union

The organization for the economic and political integration of Europe known as the European Union (EU) was officially created on November 1, 1993. In practice, however, the union traces its origins back to 1950, and it has continued to grow in the 21st century. EU members are sovereign countries that have control over their own basic economic and political affairs, yet they have agreed to follow several EU laws and standards, including treaties regulating regional and world trade, the free movement of citizens within the EU, environmental regulations, and security and law enforcement agreements.

EU Government

There are five main governmental institutions of the EU. Both the European Parliament and the Council of the European Union make EU

laws, among other responsibilities. Members of Parliament are elected directly, with proportionately larger numbers elected by the citizens of more populous countries. Members of the Council are appointed by the EU members' national governments, with the presidency shared on a rotating basis. Each president holds office for a six-month term. The European Commission is the executive branch of EU government and the "driving force" behind many of its actions. The Court of Justice resolves disputes between national laws and EU laws, while the Court of Auditors ensures that the budget is managed correctly.

When the European Parliament meets, its representatives sit with other members of their political group (consisting of several national political parties) rather than sitting in national groups. Among the larger political groups are the European Socialists, the European People's party (or Christian Democrats), the Liberal Democratic and Reform Group, the European Democrats, the European United Left, and the Greens (an environmental group).

Predecessors of the EU

After the terrible destruction and loss of life caused by World War II, many hoped that international cooperation would help Europe avoid future wars. Some felt that stronger economies would aid western European democracies, which they believed were threatened by the Communist states of eastern Europe. However, a union did not always seem possible. Few politicians wished to give up power, and they only gradually cooperated when international agreements also served their own interests, which might have included helping their own national corporations and special interest groups.

The creation of the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) was the first step on the road towards western European integration. It was formed through the efforts of Paul-Henri Spaak of Belgium and Robert Schuman and Jean Monnet of France, among other leaders. Schuman called for integration in a speech on May 9, 1950 (a date now celebrated as "Europe Day"). As a result, in April 1951 the Treaty of Paris set up an international agency to supervise the coal and steel industries of Belgium, France, West Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands. The

treaty took effect on July 25, 1952. Brussels, Belgium, was named as headquarters for the ECSC, as it later was for the EU. By 1954 nearly all barriers to intra-community trade in coal and steel had been removed, and this success prompted further cooperation.

The same six countries agreed to establish the European Economic Community (EEC), or Common Market, in the Treaty of Rome in March 1957, and the EEC officially came into existence on January 1, 1958. Among its goals were to remove European trade barriers, to establish a single trade policy towards non-member countries, to coordinate transportation systems and agricultural policies, to help workers move freely across borders, and to encourage free-market competition. Meanwhile, the European Atomic Energy Community (Euratom) began coordinating nuclear energy for western Europe.

On July 1, 1967, the members of the ECSC, EEC, and Euratom created the European Commission (EC), which is regarded as the immediate predecessor of the EU. Denmark, the United Kingdom, and Ireland joined the EC in 1973; Greece in 1981; and Spain and Portugal in 1986. Germany took on an even more central role in the organization after the Berlin Wall was dismantled in 1989 (an event so surprising that it changed the political climate almost overnight). On October 1, 1990, East and West Germany were officially reunified.

Creation and Expansion of the EU

Several other political events energized the process of integration, such as the momentous decline and breakup of the Soviet Union (and end of the Cold War), the Persian Gulf War of 1990-91, and the civil wars and splintering of Yugoslavia. Another factor was globalization, or the increasing development of worldwide economic and cultural connections. In the midst of these changes, a stronger European trading bloc – within a closer political union – was seen as a way to compete economically with the United States.

In April 1990 the EC committed itself to a common foreign and defence policy, and in 1991 the EC and the seven-member European Free Trade Association agreed to create a free-trade zone called the European Economic Area, which took effect on January 1, 1993. Meanwhile, in

December 1991 delegates from the 12 member states met in Maastricht, the Netherlands, to call for a closer political union, a central bank, and a common currency. After a lengthy ratification process, the historic Maastricht Treaty took effect on November 1, 1993, the date marking the official creation of the EU.

Austria, Finland, and Sweden joined the EU on January 1, 1995, but voters in Norway rejected membership in 1994. The EU currency, known as the euro, made its debut in 11 member countries in 1999. In 2003 the EU invited several of the formerly Communist countries of eastern Europe – the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Slovakia, and Slovenia – to join the organization, along with Cyprus and Malta. They became full EU members on May 1, 2004, bringing the total number of EU countries to 25. Meanwhile, the EU allowed for the possibility of future membership for Bulgaria, Romania, Croatia, and Turkey.

Some have heralded the EU as the beginning of a federally united Europe, but not everyone shares this ideal. For example, citizens of smaller nations have been concerned that larger countries such as Germany, the United Kingdom, and France may wield too much influence. International events have also brought disagreements into the union, as occurred when the British joined in the United States-led invasion of Iraq in 2003 despite objections from Germany, France, and other EU countries. There have also been debates over EU economic policies and their varying levels of support for small farmers, industrial workers, international investors, and powerful multinational corporations. The EU has achieved a large degree of political cooperation while also becoming a sort of economic "counterbalance" to the United States, but its effectiveness in the 21st century will depend on numerous events at local, national, and global levels.

The United Nations

The United Nations (UN) is an international association of independent states that was founded by the victorious nations of World War II to keep the peace their efforts had won. Its supreme goal was to end war, but by the end of the 20th century the organization had expanded its

mandate to cover a varied agenda that included such issues as human rights, world poverty, public health, and environmental concerns. Membership was eventually extended to almost every country on Earth, growing from the initial 51 member nations in 1945 to 191 by 2002.

After World War II it was expected that the great powers would work together to keep the peace. Instead, disagreements between the Soviet Union and the West beginning in the late 1940s created a state of international tension called the Cold War. The Soviet Union's goal was to spread the communist system. The Western nations, led by the United States, joined together to resist communist expansion. Both sides built up their weapons, which included nuclear arms. During this era the United Nations played a key role as peacemaker between East and West. After the Cold War ended in the early 1990s with the collapse of the Soviet Union, the United Nations continued to promote peace and cooperation throughout the many troubled areas of the world, adapting to circumstances that were not dreamed of by its founders.

Origin of the United Nations

In 1941, during World War II, United States President Franklin Delano Roosevelt and British Prime Minister Winston Churchill met secretly for five days in the North Atlantic Ocean off the coast of Newfoundland. The purpose of their meeting was to draft a statement outlining a plan for a global organization that would help oversee international affairs and maintain peace and security. At the conclusion of their talks they issued the Atlantic Charter. The charter looked forward to abandoning the use of force and to the establishment of a permanent system of general security.

In 1942 representatives of 26 countries, calling themselves the United Nations, signed a pledge in Washington, D.C., to defeat the Axis Powers – the alliance of Germany, Italy, and Japan – and to uphold the principles of the Atlantic Charter. In 1944 representatives of China, the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, and the United States drew up plans for a world organization when they met at Dumbarton Oaks, a private mansion in Washington, D.C.

In February 1945, at a conference in the Crimean city of Yalta on the Black Sea, representatives of the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, and

the United States discussed procedures for the organization and called for a conference to draw up a charter. On April 25, 1945, the United Nations Conference on International Organization opened in San Francisco, California. Delegates of 50 nations discussed and modified the original Dumbarton Oaks proposals. On June 26 the United Nations Charter was completed, signed, and sent to the member nations for ratification. In the United States, the Senate voted 89 to 2 on July 28, 1945, to ratify the charter. By October 24, 1945, the required number of nations had ratified the charter and the United Nations officially came into existence. October 24 has been celebrated as United Nations Day since 1948. Some countries set aside seven days – United Nations Week – for educational and social programmes.

The United Nations Charter

The preamble of the United Nations Charter sets forth the aims of the organization. The Charter itself states the basic principles and purposes, defines the membership, and establishes the six principal departments, which are also called organs.

The original members of the United Nations numbered 51. The Charter provides, however, that "all other peace-loving states" can become members on the recommendation of the Security Council if approved by a two-thirds vote of the General Assembly. The Assembly, on recommendation of the Security Council, can expel a member that has persistently violated the principles of the charter.

Amendments to the Charter require a vote of two thirds of all the members of the General Assembly. Following Assembly approval, the amendment must be ratified by two thirds of the member states, including all five permanent members of the Security Council.

In addition to sharing the risks of maintaining peace and security, the member states of the UN share in the financial burden of maintaining the organization. Each member nation contributes to the main budget and to the budget of each agency to which it belongs. The scale of contributions, based partly on ability to pay, is set by the General Assembly. Some states pay less than half of 1 per cent of the budget. The largest contributors in the early 21st century were the United States, Japan, Germany, France, Italy, and the United Kingdom.

Six Basic Organs of the United Nations

The duties with which the United Nations is charged are so vast that it was determined from the beginning to divide the organization into functional arms, or organs, that would address specific areas of peacekeeping and human rights.

The General Assembly

The largest of the six basic organs, the General Assembly is the great deliberative body of the United Nations. It is linked with all the other organs and it elects their membership. It may discuss any subject within the scope of the Charter, except those disputes that are being dealt with by the Security Council. After voting, it may forward its recommendations to other organs or to member governments.

All member states are represented in the Assembly. Each state may have up to five representatives but only one vote. Decisions on important questions (listed in the Charter) require a two-thirds majority of members present and voting. Other questions are decided by a simple majority of those voting.

The Assembly meets in regular annual sessions but may in some instances call a special session. A president is elected to oversee each session.

The Security Council

Maintaining world peace and security is the responsibility of the Security Council. Every member of the United Nations is pledged to accept and carry out the Council's decisions. The Council is set up to function continuously; thus a representative of each of its members must be present at all times at UN headquarters. The Council is headed by a president, chosen from among the Council members. This presidency changes monthly.

The Security Council has 15 members. Five nations, known collectively as the Big Five – China, France, Russia, the United Kingdom, and the United States – have permanent seats. (Russia's seat was held by the Soviet Union until that country's break-up in 1991.) Of the other 10 seats, five are elected each year by the General Assembly for two-year terms; five retire each year. Each member has one vote. On all routine

(procedural) matters, approval requires nine "yes" votes. On all other matters, the nine "yes" votes must include the votes of all five permanent members. Thus, each of the Big Five has a veto power. Any one of them can block even the Discussion of an action of which it disapproves. A party to a dispute, however, must abstain from voting.

Any state, even if it is not a member of the United Nations, may bring a dispute to which it is a party to the notice of the Security Council. The first response of the Council is always to search for a peaceful solution to the conflict. If the Council finds there is a real threat to peace, or an actual act of aggression, it may call upon the members of the United Nations to cut communications with the countries concerned or break off trade relations. If these methods prove inadequate, the Charter states that the Council may take military action against the offending nation by air, sea, and land forces of the United Nations.

Every member of the United Nations is pledged by Article 43 to supply the Council with armed forces when needed. These forces are directed by the Military Staff Committee, consisting of the chiefs of staff (or their representatives) of the five permanent members.

The International Court of Justice

The International Court of Justice, sometimes also called the World Court, is the supreme court of the United Nations. Its permanent seat is in the Netherlands at The Hague. The Court consists of 15 judges, no two of whom can be from one nation, elected by the General Assembly and the Security Council. The judges serve for nine years and are eligible for reelection. Nine judges make a quorum and questions are decided by a majority vote.

Any states – even non-members – may bring disputes to the Court for judgment. Both parties must first agree to allow the Court to try the case. Should one of them fail to accept the judgment of the Court, the other may appeal to the Security Council for enforcement. The Court serves also as the legal adviser to the General Assembly, Security Council, and other United Nations organs.

The Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC)

The constructive tasks of peace – achieving higher standards of living, improving health and education, and promoting respect for human

rights and freedoms throughout the world – are the responsibility of the Economic and Social Council. It works under the authority of the General Assembly and reports to the Assembly. The Council has 54 members, each of whom is elected to a three-year term. The Economic and Social Council is assisted by its own commissions and by independent specialized agencies.

The Secretariat

The UN Secretariat carries on the day-to-day business of the United Nations and assists all the other organs. At its head is the Secretary-General, the chief administrative officer and spokesperson of the United Nations. The Secretary-General embodies the ideals of the United Nations, drawing upon his or her personal integrity to prevent international disputes from escalating and helping to facilitate the work of the organization as needed. The Secretary-General is appointed by the General Assembly upon recommendation of the Security Council. For many years the Secretary-General's staff included thousands of workers from many countries. Efforts were begun in 1997 to trim the size of the department to control administrative costs. Because the Secretary – General's responsibilities had expanded with the increased number of new UN programmes, the post of deputy Secretary-General was created in 1998.

The Trusteeship Council

The original responsibility of the Trusteeship Council was to protect the interests of people who lived in trust territories and to lead them towards self-government. Under the trusteeship system, colonial territories taken from countries defeated in war were administered by a trust country under international supervision until their future status was determined. The Council received reports from the administering authorities, examined petitions from trust territories, and sent out visiting missions. It consisted of states administering trust territories, permanent members of the Security Council that did not administer trust territories, and other UN members elected by the General Assembly.

The Trusteeship Council met once each year until Palau, the last trust territory, became independent in 1994. The Council then terminated its operations. No longer required to meet annually, the Trusteeship Council

may meet on the decision of its president or on a request by a majority of its members, by the General Assembly, or by the Security Council. Since 1994 new roles for the Council have been proposed, including serving as a forum for minority and indigenous peoples.

Non-Governmental Organizations

The term non-governmental organization (NGO) normally refers to organizations that are neither a part of a government nor conventional for-profit businesses. Usually set up by ordinary citizens, NGOs may be funded by governments, foundations or businesses. Some avoid formal funding altogether and are run primarily by volunteers. NGOs are highly diverse group of organizations engaged with a wide range of activities, and take different forms in different parts of the world. Some may have charitable status, while others may be registered for tax exemption based on recognition of social purposes. Others may be fronts for political, religious or other interest groups.

NGOs have existed for centuries; indeed, in 1910 some 130 international groups organized a coordinating body called the Union of International Associations. The term non-governmental organization was coined at about the time of the founding of the United Nations (UN) in 1945 to distinguish private organizations from intergovernmental organizations (IGOs), such as the UN itself. Many large international NGOs, such as Amnesty International, the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, Oxfam International, CARE, Save the Children, and the World Wildlife Fund, are transnational federations of national groups. Other international NGOs, such as Greenpeace and the Sierra Club, are mass-membership organizations. Most NGOs are small, grassroots organizations not formally affiliated with any international body, though they may receive some international funding for local programmes.

NGOs perform a variety of functions. They provide information and technical expertise to governments and international organizations (such as specialized agencies of the UN) on various international issues, often

supplying local information unavailable to governments. NGOs may advocate on behalf of specific policies, such as debt relief or the banning of landmines (e.g., the International Campaign to Ban Landmines), and they may provide humanitarian relief and development assistance (e.g., the Red Cross, Oxfam, and CARE). NGOs may also monitor human rights or the implementation of environmental regulations (e.g., the International Union for the Conservation of Nature, Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, and Transparency International).

Since World War II – and particularly since the 1970s – NGOs have proliferated, especially at the national and local levels. At the international level large numbers of NGOs have been created to address issues such as human rights, women's rights, and environmental protection. At the same time, international NGOs have become important actors in world affairs within the UN and its specialized agencies and within other forums.

Although NGOs vary considerably in size, organization, and approach, they share the basic belief that principled individuals working together can do much to solve human and environmental problems through grassroots organizing the creative use of information, and sophisticated political strategies. NGOs have played central roles in global campaigns against slavery, the trade in ivory, whaling, violence against women, apartheid in South Africa, and the proliferation of nuclear weapons. NGOs exert influence on the policies and programmes of governments and IGOs by observing or participating in the meetings at which norms, principles, treaties, and conventions are negotiated, disputes settled, and resources allocated. Although the UN's members are states, Article 71 of the UN Charter authorizes the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) to grant consultative status to NGOs. In the early 21st century, more than 2,000 NGOs were officially accredited with consultative status. Accredited NGOs are automatically granted the right to participate in UN-sponsored conferences, though each conference has different rules for the participation of other NGOs, particularly local ones. Beyond the UN, other IGOs set their own guidelines for NGO participation.

NGOs are influential because of their expertise and their access to important sources of information. As a result, a significant share of

development aid and humanitarian relief is now channelled through such organizations. In some cases, however, the sheer number of NGOs as well as their diversity make it difficult for them to develop a coordinated approach to certain problems. Another factor that tends to limit their effectiveness is their perceived lack of representativeness. Many international NGOs, for example, claim to speak for the peoples of Africa, Asia, or Latin America, though their leadership is drawn almost exclusively from Europe or North America.

Since the late 20th century, some governments have reacted to the growing power and influence of NGOs by accusing them of being undemocratic and accountable only to those who provide them with funding. Other governments have attempted to prevent certain NGOs from participating in international decision-making forums. Despite these difficulties, NGOs continue to play an important role in developing global norms and rules on a wide range of transnational issues.

Fight Must Go On

The falsification of the election result was as crude as it was widespread, as the Central Elections Commission makes plain. Officially, Yanukovych won by 2.85 percentage points in the second round, but this was accomplished by blatant ballot stuffing. Turnout in the second round increased by 5.4 percent, but a minimal increase of 0.6 percent was recorded in the 17 regions where Yushchenko prevailed. A whopping 9.1 percent surge was recorded in the 10 regions carried by Yanukovych. In the Donetsk region, turnout was up 18.6 percent to a remarkable 96.7 percent, with 96.2 percent of the voters allegedly supporting Yanukovych.

Assuming an equal overall increase in the turnout of 0.6 percent in the second round, the Yanukovych people added 1.7 million votes – 5.5 percent of the votes cast. All of these were clearly cast for Yanukovych. Discounting them, Yushchenko emerges as the winner by 3 percent of votes cast. Both rounds were marred by other forms of cheating, disinformation and repression by the ruling side. In a free and fair election, Yushchenko would have won by a huge majority.

In his strongly worded statement last week U.S. Secretary of State Colin Powell announced that the United States did not accept the election results as legitimate. The United States and Europe - represented by OSCE, the Council of Europe and the European Union – have come together on this critical foreign policy issue. President Vladimir Putin is left with egg on his face, as Stephen Sestanovich put it on National Public Radio. Putin has managed to unite the United States and the EU against him. Kremlin-connected spin doctors Gleb Pavlovsky and Sergei Markov were arguably Yanukovich's propagandists during the campaign. They should now take responsibility for their actions rather than blaming others. The Ukrainian election has dealt Putin's authority the biggest blow since Beslan.

The obvious next step is to repeat the second-round vote as soon as possible – a decision that would presumably be made by the Supreme Court. A new Central Elections Commission, as well as regional and local commissions, must be appointed. Some of the worst election practices, such as ambulatory ballot boxes and absentee ballots, should be outlawed or restricted. Obviously, the foreign observers who played such an important role in the first two ballots will remain vital to the process.

A Legal Aberration

The first bill restricts Duma elections to registered political parties. A candidate may only run on the list of one of a handful of parties. It will not be necessary to be a card-holding member of this party: up to one-half of candidates on the list may be non-partisan. Parties will be forbidden to form election blocks, and there will be no independent, individually elected candidates.

Cabinet ministers and governors topping party lists will not be able to get away with cheating on their mandates anymore: their seats will be automatically transferred to other parties.

If only two parties clear the 7-percent barrier and garner a total of 60 percent of the vote between them, all Duma seats will be divided up between them.

If only one party gets more than 60 percent of the vote, it will have to share with the party that will have garnered the second largest number of

votes. If, however, all of the parties that have cleared the 7-percent hurdle fail to gather an aggregate of 60 percent, the most successful parties that have garnered less than 7 percent of the vote will also be allowed into parliament.

Each party list will be divided into regional sections whose number must be "no less than fourth-fifths of the number of the RF components". The number of deputy seats per region list will be based on the number of votes that a party has received in a particular region.

The draft law On the Public Chamber is a legal aberration: it envisions the creation of an oversight body that, under the current law, no one is obliged to obey. Forty-two members – one-third of the total – are nominated by the president ("from among citizens who have done meritorious service to the State"), who in turn will nominate another 42 members from nongovernmental organizations. These members will then select the final one-third of the Chamber. All members of the Public Chamber will be compensated for their work from the federal budget. They will use the staff appointed by the government, and submit an "annual report on the status of civil society".

On December 12, the president signed the law On Regional Governors electing. According to the law, governors are not directly elected, but nominated by the president for further regional parliament's approval. In case the candidate is rejected three times by the deputies, the president may dismiss the parliament.

On Gubernatorial Elections

With the State Duma prepared to approve a Kremlin bill to scrap gubernatorial elections Friday, contenders in seven regions are jumping at the last opportunity to get elected without the Kremlin's approval in Sunday elections. But many of the governorships are still likely to go to Kremlin-approved candidates.

Dimitrovgrad Mayor Sergei Morozov is tipped as the leading candidate in the Ul'yanovsk region, and five of the eight other candidates have written an open letter to President Vladimir Putin complaining that he

is getting preferential treatment on local television. Morozov enjoys the support of Putin's envoy to the Volga Federal District, Sergei Kiriyenko. Out-going Ul'yanovsk Governor Vladimir Shamanov dropped his pre-election bid several weeks ago after the Kremlin made him an aide to Prime Minister Mikhail Fradkov.

One of the more gripping races is in Bryansk, where popular incumbent Governor Yury Lodkin, a Communist, was abruptly scratched from the ballot Monday on accusations of improperly using his position in the campaign and bribing voters. Lodkin's supporters say the decision aims to clear the way for the second favorite in the race, Nikolai Denin, a United Russia State Duma deputy from Bryansk. Incumbent Pskov Governor Yevgeny Mikhailov, who is backed by United Russia, will face off against businessman Mikhail Kuznetsov in a runoff election, while incumbent Kurgan Governor Oleg Bogomolov, a United Russia member, will face off against Moscow businessman Yevgeny Sobakin.

Defiant Khodorkovsky Denies All Charges

Mikhail Khodorkovsky, the former head of the Russian oil firm Yukos, today said he was completely innocent of charges of tax evasion, fraud and misappropriation brought against him by the state.

"I do not consider myself guilty of a single charge that has been brought against me," he said as cross examination began in the nine-month-old trial.

Reading from a thick sheaf of notes, Mr. Khodorkovsky methodically responded to each of the prosecution's accusations against him. He argued that he had not been responsible for the decision-making behind some of the alleged violations and that, in any case, there had been nothing wrong with Yukos's actions under the laws that existed at the time. He said prosecutors were making "deliberately false declarations" every time he came to the end of his response to an accusation.

"The state prosecutor has not provided any evidence, but he tries to ... create it," Mr. Khodorkovsky said, adding that he felt sorry for the prosecutor, Dmitry Shokhin, because "his role is to make a stand for the illegal hypotheses of others."

Yukos has been the target of a months long back-tax investigation that culminated in the sale of its main production facility, Yuganskneftegaz, against \$28bn (14.6bn euros) in back-tax claims at a disputed auction in December.

Critics of the Kremlin say the case is part of a government vendetta against Mr Khodorkovsky after he funded opposition parties. Moscow insists the investigation is targeting a rotten business empire and its owners.

Mr. Khodorkovsky and his co-defendant, Platon Lebedev, stand accused of fraud in connection with the 1994 privatisation of a fertiliser company, Apatit. The prosecution says the pair illegally acquired a 20% stake in the company, valued at \$283m.

"I always acted within the law," Mr. Khodorkovsky said. "I have given a detailed account of the circumstances of the acquisition of 20% of Apatit, and said I consider that acquisition was fraudulent to be a deliberate lie." Yukos yesterday suffered a setback in its efforts to get a hearing in the US when a judge threw out its bankruptcy case and said the issue belonged in a forum that included the participation of the Russian government.

The ruling ended two months of legal attempts by Yukos to pull the US courts into its struggle with the Kremlin.

Describing the US court's decision as "regrettable", Yukos pointed out that the judge agreed with it on four of five issues, and said it had no doubt it had acted appropriately in bringing the matter to the US bankruptcy court.

"We must now consider all the options available to us and determine what our next steps will be," Steven Theede, the Yukos chief executive, said in a statement. The trial continues.

We Were Victims Too

As part of our debate on the reform of the criminal justice system, Reg Dudley, who was convicted in 1977 of a horrific double murder, urges caution on the Government in its drive to secure more convictions.

This week, more than 25 years after my friend Bob Maynard and I were sent to prison for two murders we didn't commit, evidence of severe

irregularities in the original investigation will finally be heard by the Court of Appeal. New expert testimony suggests that the main planks of the case against us, our supposed 'confessions', were fabricated – as we have claimed all along. The Crown's star witness has also made a statement admitting perjury. In June 1992, The Observer published an investigation into our case. More than a decade later, it looks as if the courts are finally catching up.

I am now 77. My marriage broke up long ago. I missed my children flourishing into adulthood; the childhoods of my grandchildren. I had to live with the label of being one of the notorious 'torso murderers', who had shot, decapitated and dismembered one man, and then brutally disposed of a second. Although the trial judge recommended, we serve 15 years, Bob and I were 'knocked back' time and again by the Parole Board and Home Secretary – because we would not admit our guilt. Before I finally came out in 1998, I had done the rounds of Britain's toughest jails: Dartmoor, Gartree, the Scrubs.

So, forgive me if I sound cynical. When I hear politicians and police officers claiming that our criminal justice system needs reforming to make it easier to get convictions, that guilty men are going free and that victims are unprotected, I feel a need to interrupt. Hold on. Be careful. Bob and I are victims too.

To Join the Elite, it's TV That Counts

It's not how powerful you are but how much coverage you get on television.

That was the finding of a recent opinion poll that asked Russians across the country to name the most influential personalities in politics, business, culture and science.

Unsurprisingly, respondents readily picked President Vladimir Putin as the most powerful politician and pop diva Alla Pugacheva as the leading cultural figure.

But their selections for the business elite essentially turned into a hate list topped by Unified Energy Systems chief Anatoly Chubais.

Many respondents were unable to name a single scientist, leading to a top-10 list that bunched together Nobel Prize winners with dead scientists, television hosts and a hostage negotiators.

The sometimes startling answers are a direct result of television, which is the sole information source for many people these days, said Irina Palilova, a sociologist with the Levada Center, the independent polling agency that carried out the survey.

"This poll reflects that people just don't understand what the elite is and can only come up with names of figures who are popular in the media," said Olga Kryshtanovskaya, head of the Center for the Study of the Elite in the Russian Academy of Sciences.

"Members of the elite are those who rule and decide, but the public knows little about those people," she said.

As such, Putin was followed on the list of the political elite by ultranationalist politician Vladimir Zhirinovsky, whose fist-waving antics are often shown on television. Third place went to Communist leader Gennady Zyuganov, whose complaints about government social reforms got significant television coverage in January, when the poll was conducted. Also on the list were State Duma Speaker Boris Gryzlov (4), liberal politician Irina Khakamada (5), Prime Minister Mikhail Fradkov (7), and one-time political heavyweights Yabloko leader Grigory Yavlinsky (9) and Mayor Yury Luzhkov (10).

After Pugacheva, the list of cultural figures included Oscar-winning film director Nikita Mikhalkov, crooner Iosif Kobzon, comedian Yevgeny Petrosyan and pop singer Nikolai Baskov. Not a single writer, artist or philosopher made it into the cultural top 10.

The Center for Investigative Reporting

The Center for Investigative Reporting is a nonprofit news organization dedicated to exposing injustice and abuse of power through the tools of journalism. Led by a staff in San Francisco and powered by a nationwide team of independent reporters and producers, CIR is organized along three functions: as a journalism venture fund, investing in promising

investigations at their early stages to give them a chance in the increasingly competitive news marketplace; as a documentary production house, producing investigations for television and radio; and as a publicity firm, maximizing the impact of the best investigations from the journalism community by promoting them to decision-makers, citizen groups and our journalism peers. Together, these activities equip citizens with the information they need to participate fully in the democratic process and bring about needed changes in laws, regulations, and the operations of government, corporations, and institutions.

Currently, CIR is focused on three beats or topic areas: Social and Criminal Justice, Environment, and Science and Technology. Over the years, reporting beats have also included Health, Education, and Politics and Money, among others.

International Relations

The world of the early 21st century is a global community of nations, all of which coexist in some measure of political and economic interdependence. By means of rapid communication systems – radio, television, and computers – much of what happens in one place is quickly known almost everywhere else. The speed of transportation in modern aircraft also makes it possible for people to get around the globe in hours instead of days or weeks.

The modern world community was not, however, created by communications and transportation alone. The present global situation is new to history and owes its origins to a variety of factors that include the great conflict of World War II, the post-war breakdown of colonial empires, the long rivalry between the former Soviet Union and the United States, and the fast-growing economic interrelationships of all nations, large and small.

The Conduct of International Relations

Each nation has three foreign-policy goals: physical security – the freedom from outside attack and internal revolution; political security – the freedom to run its own affairs without outside interference; and economic

stability and development – the freedom to trade in world markets and to satisfy its own population's demands for goods and services.

Nations traditionally dealt with each other on a one-to-one basis or in strategic alliances in pursuing these goals. But in the complicated arena of the modern global community, it is more common to work through organizations. To meet the needs of international cooperation, a vast number of organizations of all types have been created.

Organizations

The most comprehensive international organization was founded in 1945 – the United Nations and its many affiliates. Regional associations include the Organization of American States (1948), the African Union (founded as the Organization of African Unity in 1963), the League of Arab States (1945), and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (1967). These organizations deal with the whole range of political and economic issues in their areas.

The Cold War spawned a number of regional mutual-defence alliances. The best known were NATO, formed in 1949, and the Warsaw Pact, signed in 1955. NATO was a military alliance formed to defend western Europe from the Soviet Union; the Warsaw Pact was the Soviet counter-alliance. ANZUS – a security treaty between Australia, New Zealand, and the United States – was signed in 1951. The Southeast Asia Treaty Organization was formed in 1954 and disbanded in 1977.

Many international and regional organizations have evolved to deal with the financial needs of the global community. There are too many to be able to list them all, but some of the leading ones include the International Monetary Fund, the European Union, the Caribbean Community, the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries, the World Bank, the International Finance Corporation, the African Development Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank.

Foreign Policy

All the complex devices and attitudes that a nation develops to use in its interactions with other nations make up its foreign policy. Policy formulation is the responsibility of specific government agencies - the United States Department of State or the British Foreign Office, for example.

In the United States the direction of foreign policy is the task of the president, though in many matters he must have the approval of the United States Senate. Other agencies also contribute to formulation of policy. Among them are the National Security Council, the Department of Defence, and the Central Intelligence Agency. Since foreign policy in the early 21st century can be quite complex, other agencies may also contribute information. The World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, for instance, keep abreast of economic conditions in most countries and play a major role in offering foreign aid.

Each national government operates worldwide through its embassies and consulates. An embassy is the highest official representation one nation maintains in another. Normal diplomacy is conducted by ambassadors and their subordinates. Consulates deal primarily with commercial issues and the protection of the economic interests of their nationals. A consul is not a diplomat and therefore cannot take up duties until the host nation grants permission. A nation has only one embassy in a given country, but it may have several consulates.

Treaty on European Union Common Provisions

Article 1

By this Treaty, the HIGH CONTRACTING PARTIES establish among themselves a EUROPEAN UNION, hereinafter called "the Union", on which the Member States confer competences to attain objectives they have in common.

This Treaty marks a new stage in the process of creating an ever closer union among the peoples of Europe, in which decisions are taken as openly as possible and as closely as possible to the citizens.

The Union shall be founded on the present Treaty and on the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (hereinafter referred to as "the Treaties"). Those two Treaties shall have the same legal value. The Union shall replace and succeed the European Community.

Article 2

The Union is founded on the values of respect for human dignity, freedom, democracy, equality, the rule of law and respect for human rights, including the rights of persons belonging to minorities. These values are common to the Member States in a society in which pluralism, non-discrimination, tolerance, justice, solidarity and equality between women and men prevail.

Article 3

1. The Union's aim is to promote peace, its values and the well-being of its peoples.

2. The Union shall offer its citizens an area of freedom, security and justice without internal frontiers, in which the free movement of persons is ensured in conjunction with appropriate measures with respect to external border controls, asylum, immigration and the prevention and combating of crime.

3. The Union shall establish an internal market. It shall work for the sustainable development of Europe based on balanced economic growth and price stability, a highly competitive social market economy, aiming at full employment and social progress, and a high level of protection and improvement of the quality of the environment. It shall promote scientific and technological advance.

It shall combat social exclusion and discrimination, and shall promote social justice and protection, equality between women and men, solidarity between generations and protection of the rights of the child.

It shall promote economic, social and territorial cohesion, and solidarity among Member States.

It shall respect its rich cultural and linguistic diversity, and shall ensure that Europe's cultural heritage is safeguarded and enhanced.

4. The Union shall establish an economic and monetary union whose currency is the euro.

5. In its relations with the wider world, the Union shall uphold and promote its values and interests and contribute to the protection of its citizens. It shall contribute to peace, security, the sustainable development of the Earth, solidarity and mutual respect among peoples, free and fair

trade, eradication of poverty and the protection of human rights, in particular the rights of the child, as well as to the strict observance and the development of international law, including respect for the principles of the United Nations Charter.

6. The Union shall pursue its objectives by appropriate means commensurate with the competences which are conferred upon it in the Treaties.

History of Diplomacy: from Ancient Times to the Middle Ages

Diplomacy has been practised since ancient times, though its function has greatly changed. There is evidence of diplomacy practised as early as the 14th century BC in ancient Egypt, and records dating to the 9th century AD have been found in western Africa. Records of treaties between the city-states of Mesopotamia date from about 2850 BC. Full texts of treaties between Ramses II of Egypt and Hittite leaders dating to around 1280 BC have also been uncovered.

Some evidence of ancient diplomatic practices is more indirect. For example, the Bible contains significant evidence of the diplomatic relations of Jewish tribes. Inscriptions on the walls of abandoned Mayan cities (in present-day Mexico) indicate frequent exchanges of envoys. In South America, envoys dispatched by the Incas may have been sent as a prelude to conquest rather than to establish good relations with neighbours. Chinese diplomacy dates from the 1st millennium BC. Following unification of its many states in the 3rd century BC, China emerged as the largest and best-governed society in the world. For many centuries, however, its foreign relations were limited mostly to border defence and matters involving trade. Ancient India practised an equally sophisticated but very different diplomatic tradition. For India, foreign relations were determined by self-interest, and emphasized espionage and diplomatic manipulation.

Modern international relations are rooted in the tradition of ancient Greece. The Greeks developed diplomatic archives, a diplomatic vocabulary, and principles of international conduct. The earliest evidence

of Greek diplomacy can be found in Greek literature, notably in Homer's *The Iliad* and *The Odyssey*. The first Greek diplomats were heralds, who were recognized as inviolable.

Rome adapted Greece's diplomatic policies. Envoys were received with great ceremony and magnificence and granted immunity. Roman envoys sent abroad carried written instructions from their government. For large responsibilities, a *legatio* (embassy) of 10 or 12 *legati* (ambassadors) was organized under a president. *Legati* were leading citizens chosen for their oratorical skills.

Roman law, which stressed the sanctity of contracts, became the basis of treaties. The Romans merged the laws applied to foreigners and to foreign envoys with the Greek concept of natural law – a code applying to all people and derived from nature rather than from human invention - to create a "law of nations." After the western Roman Empire collapsed in the 5th century AD, the sanctity of treaties and the law of nations were preserved by the Roman Catholic church through the Middle Ages. These ideas later became the basis of modern international law.

After the fall of the western Roman Empire, many diplomatic traditions disappeared. Diplomacy continued to thrive, however, in the eastern Roman Empire – also known as the Byzantine Empire or Byzantium – and in the Roman Catholic church. Aiming to awe and intimidate foreign envoys, Byzantium's rulers marked the arrival of diplomats with spectacular ceremonies. Byzantium produced the first professional diplomats. These envoys were required to be polite, to entertain lavishly, and to encourage trade. After Byzantium's collapse in 1453, much of its diplomatic tradition lived on in the Ottoman Empire and in Renaissance Italy.

The Roman Catholic church, under the leadership of the popes, conducted an active diplomacy after the fall of Rome. The prestige of the church was so great that, at every court, papal envoys took precedence over the envoys of secular rulers. This tradition continues today in countries where Roman Catholicism is the official religion. Papal envoys sent to secular rulers carried letters of credence that assured the host rulers of the envoys' authority to represent the pope. These practices were later adapted for secular use; many continue to this day.

History of Diplomacy: from the Concert of Europe to the Cold War

The Concert of Europe to 1914

At the end of the 18th century, the French Revolution and the attempts of Napoleon I to conquer Europe overthrew the balance of power between the major European countries. After Napoleon's defeat, the Congress of Vienna was convened in 1814 to set new boundaries and recreate the balance of European power. The Congress established four classes of heads of diplomatic missions and an order of precedence among them. A distinction was made between great powers and "powers with limited interests." Only great powers exchanged ambassadors. Until 1893 the United States had no ambassadors; like other lesser countries, its envoys were only ministers.

Following Napoleon's return and second defeat in 1815, the victors in France's defeat – Britain, Austria, Russia, and Prussia – signed the Quadruple Alliance. This called for periodic meetings of the signatories to consult on common interests and to maintain peace. This created the Concert of Europe, in which the victors agreed to make key decisions as a group, thus re-establishing a balance of power. France was admitted to the alliance at the first meeting of the Concert, held at Aix-la-Chapelle in 1818.

During the 19th century, the world underwent many political and diplomatic changes. In Europe, power shifted from royal courts to cabinets; kings were replaced by ministers at international meetings. European diplomatic practices spread throughout the world. Newly independent colonies of Latin America adopted the European system without question. After US warships forced Japan in the 19th century to trade openly with the West, Japan rapidly adopted Western political, economic, and diplomatic practices.

Unlike Japan, China resisted Western protocols. In the late 18th and early 19th centuries, European envoys to China faced demands that they lie face-down on the ground ("kowitz") before the Chinese emperor in order to be formally received by him, a practice they considered humiliation. This disagreement led to military confrontation by British and French

forces, who refused to withdraw until the Chinese court agreed to receive ambassadors according to European practices.

World War I to the Cold War

The Russian Revolution of 1917 produced a new great power, the Soviet Union, that rejected the political values and diplomatic practices of the Western world. The Soviet Union later entered peace negotiations with Germany, substituting propaganda for power, and appealing openly to the urban workers of other countries to exert pressure on their governments.

Conference diplomacy was revived during World War I and continued afterwards, especially during the 1920s. Following the armistice that ended the war, the Paris Peace Conference took place. A key component of the peace programme proposed by US President Woodrow Wilson was the desire that the results of diplomatic negotiations would be made public.

The Paris conference adopted many of the Congress of Vienna's measures, such as the distinction between "powers with general interests" and "powers with special interests." The peace conference and affiliated negotiations were conducted in English and French after the United States joined Britain in world councils.

The peace negotiations created the League of Nations as the first permanent major international organization. The League introduced parliamentary diplomacy in a two-chamber body, acknowledging the equality of countries in its lower house and the supremacy of the great powers in its upper one.

Despite the presence of a Latin American bloc and a few African and Asian countries, the League of Nations was predominantly European. The League's later ineffective handling of international crises was aggravated by the absence of the United States, whose Senate refused to ratify the peace treaties by which the League was created.

Diplomatic practice was deeply affected by the rise of totalitarian regimes, which generally rejected negotiation and compromise. The Soviet Union viewed all capitalist countries as enemies, and used each concession it won as a basis to press for another. Nazi Germany under Adolf Hitler was equally indifferent to diplomacy. Hitler honoured the terms of the

treaties he signed only when they suited him, and intimidated those with whom he negotiated by making threats. The Munich Pact of 1938, signed by Britain and France in an effort to avoid war with Germany, became a symbol of the failed policy of "appeasement." The Pact allowed Hitler to annex part of western Czechoslovakia without military challenge from the great powers if he agreed to refrain from further invasion. Within a year, however, Hitler annexed the rest of Czechoslovakia and invaded Poland.

After World War II, the countries of Europe were divided into two hostile military alliances - the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), dominated by the United States, and the Warsaw Pact, dominated by the Soviet Union. The Cold War between the United States and the Soviet Union – a period of suspicion and conflict short of direct war – took place under the constant threat of nuclear catastrophe, leading to endless disarmament negotiations, summit meetings, and crisis management.

The NATO

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) is a political and military alliance between the United States, Canada, and numerous European countries. Established in 1949 as a defence against the Soviet Union and its eastern European allies, NATO changed its membership and its goals following the breakup of the Soviet Union in 1991. NATO headquarters are in Brussels, Belgium.

The original 12 members of NATO were Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, the United Kingdom (Great Britain), and the United States. They were joined by Greece and Turkey in 1952, West Germany in 1955 (replaced by a united Germany in 1990), Spain in 1982, and Hungary, Poland, and the Czech Republic in 1999. These were followed in 2004 by Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia, and Slovenia, bringing the number of members to 26.

The heart of NATO is expressed in Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty, in which the signatory members agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an

attack against them all; and consequently they agree that, if such an armed attack occurs, each of them, in exercise of the right of individual or collective self-defence recognized by Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, will assist the Party or Parties so attacked by taking forth with, individually and in concert with the other Parties, such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force, to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area.

NATO invoked Article 5 for the first time in 2001, after terrorist attacks organized by exiled Saudi Arabian millionaire Osama bin Laden destroyed the World Trade Centre in New York City and part of the Pentagon outside Washington, D.C., killing some 3,000 people.

Article 6 defines the geographic scope of the treaty as covering "an armed attack on the territory of any of the Parties in Europe or North America." Other articles commit the allies to strengthening their democratic institutions, to building their collective military capability, to consulting each other, and to remaining open to inviting other European states to join.

Origins

Great Britain, the Soviet Union, and the United States fought as allies during World War II. But as soon as the war ended in 1945, the alliance disintegrated. The United States, with its democratic government and free market economy, had developed into the world's leading political and economic power. The single greatest power in Europe, however, was the Soviet Union, with its Communist system and government-controlled economy. The rest of the European nations were economically and socially devastated.

The Soviet Union, despite its own wartime losses, wasted no time in incorporating the weakened nations of eastern Europe into a chain of satellites along its western frontier. In addition, Communist political parties gained influence in other parts of Europe, seemingly increasing the likelihood that the Soviet sphere of influence would spread. Meanwhile the United States, Great Britain, and France had drastically reduced their military strength in Europe after the war's end. A general sense of weakness and vulnerability pervaded western Europe.

In 1947 United States President Harry S. Truman announced that the United States would aid anti-Communist forces throughout the world. This policy became known as the Truman Doctrine. In 1948 a Communist coup overthrew the government of Czechoslovakia and aligned it with the Soviets, causing alarm in western Europe and the United States. In the same year the United States launched the European Recovery Programme, or Marshall Plan, which aimed in part to resist Communist inroads by reviving the region's war-torn economies. The Marshall Plan poured billions of dollars of aid into Europe. However, the Soviet Union did not allow its eastern European satellites to participate in the plan.

Not everyone had faith in economic solutions alone. Many advocated greater military spending and planning to counter Soviet strength. This brought about the immediate precursor to NATO – a defensive alliance known as the Brussels Treaty, concluded on March 17, 1948 (one month after the coup in Czechoslovakia), by Belgium, France, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, and the United Kingdom. It was generally believed, however, that without the assistance of the United States the treaty would not deter the Soviets. Therefore the United States, along with Canada, was consulted about an enlarged defence arrangement. On April 4, 1949, 12 countries signed the North Atlantic Treaty in Washington, D.C. In Article 5, the heart of the treaty, the member nations agreed that "an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all."

The creation of NATO was among the most important events in the early years of the Cold War. For more than 40 years this tense rivalry pitted the Soviet Union and its supporters against the United States and its allies.

BRICS

BRICS is the acronym for an association of five major emerging national economies: Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa. The grouping was originally known as "BRIC" before the inclusion of South Africa in 2010. The acronym BRIC was coined by Jim O'Neill in a 2001 paper entitled "Building Better Global Economic BRICs".

The BRICS members are all developing or newly industrialized countries, but they are distinguished by their large, fast-growing economies and significant influence on regional and global affairs; all five are G-20 members. As of 2013, the five BRICS countries represent almost 3 billion people, with a combined nominal GDP of US\$16.039 trillion, and an estimated US\$4 trillion in combined foreign reserves.

The foreign ministers of the initial four BRIC states (Brazil, Russia, India, and China) met in New York City in September 2006, beginning a series of high-level meetings. A full-scale diplomatic meeting was held in Yekaterinburg Russia, on 16 May, 2008.

Goldman Sachs did not argue that the BRICs would organize themselves into an economic bloc, or a formal trading association, as the European Union has done. However, there are some indications that the "four BRIC countries have been seeking to form a 'political club' or 'alliance", and thereby converting "their growing economic power into greater geopolitical clout".

On June 16, 2009, the leaders of the BRIC countries held their first summit in Yekaterinburg, with Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva, Dmitry Medvedev, Manmohan Singh, and Hu Jintao, the respective leaders of Brazil, Russia, India and China, all attending. The summit's focus was on means of improving the global economic situation and reforming financial institutions. They also issued a declaration calling for the establishment of an equitable, democratic and multipolar world order.

In the aftermath of the Yekaterinburg summit, the BRIC nations announced the need for a new global reserve currency, which would have to be "diversified, stable and predictable". Although the statement that was released did not directly criticize the perceived "dominance" of the US dollar – something that Russia had criticized in the past – it did spark a fall in the value of the dollar against other major currencies.

In 2010, South Africa began efforts to join the BRIC grouping, and the process for its formal admission began in August of that year. South Africa officially became a member nation on 24 December, 2010, after being formally invited by the BRIC countries to join the group. The group was renamed BRICS – with the "S" standing for South Africa – to reflect

the group's expanded membership. In April 2011, the President of South Africa, Jacob Zuma, attended the 2011 BRICS summit in Sanya, China, as a full member.

The BRICS Forum, an independent international organization encouraging commercial, political and cultural cooperation between the BRICS nations, was formed in 2011. In June 2012, the BRICS nations pledged \$75 billion to boost the lending power of the International Monetary Fund (IMF). However, this loan was conditional on IMF voting reforms. In late March, 2013, during the fifth BRICS summit in Durban, South Africa, the member countries agreed to create a global financial institution which they intended to rival the western-dominated IMF and World Bank. After the summit, the BRICS stated that they planned to finalize the arrangements for this new development bank by 2014.

However, disputes relating to burden sharing and location have slowed down the agreements.

In 2012, Hu Jintao, who at the time was President of China, described the BRICS countries as defenders and promoters of developing countries and a force for world peace. However, some analysts have highlighted potential divisions and weaknesses in the grouping, including significant economic instabilities, disagreements between the members over UN Security Council reform, and India and China's disputes over territorial issues.

CONCLUSION

Быстрые и существенные изменения в информационных технологиях, экономике страны и во всём мире вызывают потребность в высококвалифицированных специалистах, способных применять знания, умения и навыки в своей профессиональной деятельности, требуют повышения уровня их компетенции в области выполнения перевода текстов политической и экономической тематики. Этой цели и служит учебно-практическое пособие «Перевод общественно-политических материалов с английского языка на русский». Именно в рамках этой дисциплины происходит профессиональное ориентирование студентов, формируются навыки письменного перевода текстов по актуальным проблемам внешнеполитической деятельности Российской Федерации.

Пособие включает четыре модуля, каждый из которых состоит из четырех текстов и системы упражнений, направленных на активизацию и закрепление лексики, а также анализ переводческих решений.

Структурирование дисциплины по нескольким модулям помогает совершенствовать основные положения теории перевода, а также поэтапно формировать переводческие компетенции студентов для их будущей профессиональной деятельности.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Основная литература

1. *Гладков, Г. И.* Последовательный перевод с русского языка на английский с использованием системы переводческой скорописи : уровень С1 : учеб. пособие / Г. И. Гладков. – М. : МТиМО-Университет, 2009. – 246 с.

2. *Корецкая, О. В.* Talking Politics in English: Textbook. Обсуждаем политику по-английски : учеб. пособие / О. В. Корецкая. – 2-е изд., испр. – М. : Валент, 2016. – 100 с.

3. *Мухортов, Д. С.* Практика перевода: английский – русский : учеб. пособие / Д. С. Мухортов. – М. : Высш. шк., 2006. – 256 с.

4. *Коняева, Е. В.* Практический курс перевода. Английский язык : учеб.-метод. пособие / Е. В. Коняева ; науч. ред. А. А. Шагиева. – Екатеринбург : Изд-во Урал. ун-та, 2018. – 114 с.

5. Письменный перевод специальных текстов : учеб. пособие / Е. А. Мисуно [и др.]. – М. : ФЛИНТА, 2013. – 256 с.

Дополнительная литература

1. *Васильева, Е. Н.* Мотивация в формировании профессиональной компетенции будущего специалиста / Е. Н. Васильева // Актуальные вопросы лингводидактики и межкультурной коммуникации : сб. науч. ст. – Чебоксары, 2017. – С. 200 – 204.

2. *Гавриленко, Н. Н.* Теория и методика обучения переводу в сфере профессиональной коммуникации / Н. Н. Гавриленко. – М. : НТО им. акад. Вавилова, 2009. – Кн. 1. – 178 с.

3. *Брандес, М. П.* Предпереводческий анализ текста / М. П. Брандес, В. И. Провоторов. – М. : НВИ-ТЕЗАУРУС, 2001. – 222 с.

CONTENTS

PREFACE	3
Unit 1. PRESSING PROBLEMS OF FOREIGN POLICY OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION	4
1.1. Forcing to Peace	4
1.2. Recognizing the Independence of South Ossetia and Abkhazia by Russia	7
1.3. The Turning Point in World Development.....	11
1.4. Multivariant Behavior of States on the International Scene	14
<i>Texts for Self-Directed Activity.....</i>	<i>19</i>
Unit 2. POLITICAL ASPECTS OF DISARMAMENT.....	24
2.1. Interdependence of Globalizing World	24
2.2. Not Allow “the Cold War”	27
2.3. New Challenges and Threats	31
2.4. Internal and External Threats	35
<i>Texts for Self-Directed Activity.....</i>	<i>39</i>
Unit 3. ADDRESS OF THE RUSSIAN PRESIDENT TO THE FEDERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.....	43
3.1. About Society’s Ideals and Moral Principles	43
3.2. At the Cutting Edge of Innovation	47
3.3. The Role of Constitution in the Development of Russia's Statehood.....	50
3.4. Improvement of the Level and Quality of Representation in Government.....	54
<i>Texts for Self-Directed Activity.....</i>	<i>59</i>

Unit 4. RUSSIA IN THE WORLD COMMUNITY	63
4.1. The National Security Concept of the Russian Federation	63
4.2. Russia's National Interests (part 1)	67
4.3. Russia's National Interests (part 2)	71
4.4. Ways of Developing Russia's Democracy	75
<i>Texts for Self-Directed Activity</i>	79
SUPPLEMENTARY TEXTS	83
CONCLUSION	136
BIBLIOGRAPHY	137

Учебное издание

ПЕРЕВОД ОБЩЕСТВЕННО-ПОЛИТИЧЕСКИХ МАТЕРИАЛОВ
С АНГЛИЙСКОГО ЯЗЫКА НА РУССКИЙ

Учебно-практическое пособие

Автор-составитель
ЯШИНА Нина Кузьминична

Редактор Е. А. Лебедева
Технические редакторы Ш. Ш. Амирсейидов, Н. В. Пустовойтова
Корректор иностранного языка Т. И. Койкова
Компьютерная верстка Е. А. Кузьминой
Выпускающий редактор А. А. Амирсейидова

Подписано в печать 14.04.23.
Формат 60×84/16. Усл. печ. л. 8,14. Тираж 30 экз.

Заказ

Издательство
Владимирского государственного университета
имени Александра Григорьевича и Николая Григорьевича Столетовых.
600000, Владимир, ул. Горького, 87.