

Researcher's name and surname: **Victoria Panova**.....
Citizenship(s): **Russia**.....
Organization: **Oriental Studies Institute: School of Regional and
International Affairs of the Far Eastern Federal University (at the
signing MoU – MGIMO-University)**.....
Email: **Victoria.panova@gmail.com; panova.vvl@dvfu.ru**
Phone: **+7916 801 5190**
IBAN or Bank account number.....

WHAT PEACE? WHICH WORLD ORDER?

Questions to the project researchers

1. BIOGRAPHICAL QUESTIONS

1.1. What are the main elements of your biography and intellectual development?

First challenging experience came yet at the end of High School when I went for a year of exchange studies to the USA, which changed my attitudes to life and broadened scope considerably

For 20 years I remained loyal to one place – MGIMO-University, first as a student, then PhD and also lecturer and then professor. Although my activities were not limited to MGIMO and I spend several months on different internship and visiting fellowships in Cambridge, London School of Economics, PUC-Rio. Since 2003 remained actively engaged with the University of Toronto team directing Moscow office of the then G8 and then joining into research and summit activities of the G20 and BRICS. Among biggest achievements I would also name being part of the small team responsible for organizing the Civil 8 in 2006, Civil BRICS in 2015; working on a Track 1.5 and 2 levels of BRICS as strategy planning advisor for National Committee on BRICS Research. Huge experience and new horizons are also opened up with the Women 20 format launched by the Turkish G20 Presidency and supported and continued by the incoming Chinese hosts.

Next big step, which doesn't overrun all previous achievements, since I'm intending to stay actively engaged on all those 'club governance' tracks, is my recent move to live in Vladivostok to act in the capacity of the Director of the Oriental Studies Institute of FEFU.

1.2. What are your specializations? Your research topics?

Global governance, 'club' governance, military and political security, international energy security, sustainable development, civil society and its role in promoting international agenda

1.3. How do you define yourself professionally?

Always searching for new heights

1.4. What major books or articles have you written?

Numerous articles and book chapters in Russian (BRICS security agenda ahead of Ufa and Global governance in energy: myth or reality in International Organizations' Bulletin; BRICS and potential for cooperation in Observer magazine; On the benefits of 'club mechanisms' in International Trends, publications of Russian Academy of Sciences books, Russian International Studies Association (chapter plus co-edited volume), active contributor to Russian International Affairs Council on the G20, G8/7, BRICS, the UN); chapter in the Textbook on Contemporary international relations on international organizations

Russia nos BRICS: Visao e Interpretacao Pratica. Semelhanças e Diferenças. Coordenacao dos BRICS dentro das Estruturas de Instituicoes Multilaterais. Article in Contexto Internacional (PUC), Vol. 37 – No.1 – Janeiro/Abril 2015. Pp. 47 – 80

Russia's 'Soft' Policies towards the Baltic States. Chapter in The different faces of "soft power": the Baltic States and Eastern Neighborhood between Russia and the EU, eds. T.Rostoks, A. Spruds. Latvian Institute of International Affairs, 2015.

Universal Access to Health Care: Russian View of Global Health Governance Prospects. Chapter in In Search of Stability, Security and Growth: BRICS and a New World Order. – New Delhi: Observer Research Foundation, 2012.

The G8, the European Union and Climate Change and Energy. Co-authored chapter with John Kirton and Future Role and Reform of the G8. Co-authored chapter with Peter Hajnal in European Union in the G8: Promoting Consensus and Concerted Actions for Global Public Goods // ed. By M.Larionova, Ashgate, 2012

Foreign Economic Policy of the Russian Federation: the Constraints and Opportunities of the Baltic Dimension. Chapter in The Economic Presence of Russia and Belarus in the Baltic States: Risks and Opportunities// ed.by A.Spruds, Riga, 2012

More earlier published works could be cited if needed

1.5. Are you involved in any association or civic engagement? If yes, please specify.

Member of the BRICS Think Tank council; co-chair of the Civil BRICS process

1.6. Do you have one or few websites?

Not personally, only institutional

1.7. Are you part of a research or action network? If yes, please specify.

G8/7; G20 and BRICS Research Group of the University of Toronto

1.8. Have you lived or worked abroad? If yes, please specify how long and where.

From couple months to a year in the USA (Chicago), the UK (London, Cambridge), BRICS Policy Center (Rio de Janeiro, Brazil)

2. SEMANTIC AND LINGUISTIC QUESTIONS

2.1. How do you define "peace" and "World order" in your language? What do these terms mean?

In Russian peace (мир) could have two meanings – state of calmness and peaceful coexistence, but also the world as a whole, which I personally would explain with the

initial peace loving nature where the whole world and living in the world is associated with living in peace

World order – Russian classical view is opposite to World Society (being neutral World Community - it is seen in a) westphalian sense of communication between states as primary actors; b) necessity of order as opposed to chaos; c) equality of states regardless of their political, social and economic status when one talks of rule-making

To give a definition to the W.O. – system of international relations governed by the range of principles of foreign policy behavior and set of agreed specific determinants, range of acknowledged sanctions for breaking those rules; powers and right of certain countries to enforce those establishments; political will to use those rights and powers.

2.2. What are their synonyms and antonyms?

Peace – planet, entente, calmness, society, light, nature, friendship, serenity

Antonyms – animosity, war

World order – establishment, ranking, regulation

Antonym - chaos

2.3. Do you personally use these concepts? Do you consider them relevant? Are they limited? If yes, please specify.

I consider concept of peace to be much wider than mere absence of war and allowing for comprehensiveness and thus in some instances even allowing for extra illusions

World order is more limited, it could be seen as the world systemic arrangements which still exist even when there seems to be disorder and lack of efficient institutions directing this order

2.4. What does "harmony", "balance", "disorder", "chaos" mean in your linguistic and cultural area? Are there different interpretations? If yes, please specify.

Harmony – coherence, linkages, mutual consideration, consent, agreement, could also mean term in musical theory

Balance – equilibrium, has professional meaning in finance and accounting

Disorder – breaking of order, chaos; sometimes could be used to account for mass revolts

2.5. In which languages do you read?

Russian, English, French, basic - Spanish

2.6. Which languages do you speak?

Russian, English – fluent, French – working proficiency, Spanish and Polish - basic

2.7. In which languages can you write?

Russian and English; French will take too much editing

3. CONCEPTUAL QUESTIONS

3.1. Which main concepts do you use in your analysis of power?

Mostly adhering to a variety of realist concepts, balance of power, geopolitical concepts. Concept of state power primarily in attributive (resource-oriented) terms, although can't absolutize and some aspects of behavioral (context-oriented) approach should be considered

3.2. Which secondary concepts do you use in your analysis of power?

3.3. According to you, what is the importance of the differences between “violence,” “force,” “strength” and “power”? Reference is made to the distinctions between auctoritas and potestas, potential and potestas, Macht and Gewalt, power and violence (Hannah Arendt), wealth and power, or economic strength and military strength (Paul Kennedy), autorité and pouvoir (Aglietta and Orlean see Glossary in progress), pouvoir and puissance? Please comment on similar words that are used in your own language to describe and explain national situations and international relations.

Power is most comprehensive, could be attractive and welcomed by other actors (as in the soft power or further – smart power concept), force and strength imply potential and ability to project power and have others recognize this extra benefits, while violence is rather sign of weakness when other actors for various reasons do not recognize one's right for privileged position.

3.4. What concepts do you use when describing international relations?

Remain within the realistic domain, or rather evolution of realistic paradigm (Waltz, Gilpin, Mearshimer; in Russia Kissinger and Brzezinsky are very popular.

All in all it should be said that systemic approach is the basis of the Russian school of thought. Yet during the Soviet times there were two main branches of thought in IR – in IMEMO and MGIMO, with the first one more concentrating on the theoretical analysis of the western IR theories, while MGIMO TIR school (Mark Khrustalev et al.) with the systemic approach oriented towards practice and outcomes

3.5. According to you, what are the main reasons of ongoing conflicts? In specific regions? In the world in general?

Resource factor didn't disappear worldwide, it only witnessed with a shift of importance of different resources and additional impact of the ones not on the agenda before that. Intercivilizational conflicts rather do not arise in their own right, but countries lying in the 'civilizational border' territories suffer due to geopolitical reshuffle and power struggle

3.6. Within which theoretical framework do you make your analyses?

Combination of comparative and systemic analysis

3.7. To which fields of research, other than your own, do you often refer?

Economy and finance, environmental studies, military security

3.8. Do you think that societies need "totems", symbolic references, national mottos (*L'union fait la force, In God we trust...*) in order to manage conflicts? Why?

Idea is needed for any society not only to manage conflicts, but to retain *raison d'être*, to consolidate people preferable not on a negative basis (external enemy) but to achieve common ideal, follow some mission. People also need some significant charismatic figure in order to be able to mobilize and live through unpopular measures if going through crisis. Russia is a good example of the necessity of having strong leader and symbols (from the heroic past, of the genuine Russian character) to avoid chaos – centuries-long hope for a 'good tzar' who could solve all the problems and show the proper way

3.9. If so, do those "totems" seem universal or proper to each culture?

Seems that post-modern societies lost such 'totems' (or rather replaced them with those counter to traditional societies and values) and this leads to a certain loss of direction among people of those societies

3.10. If you find the question relevant, to which main symbolic references in your country do you refer in your country? In your culture? What is your culture?

Great Patriotic War and WWII legacy with the victory of Russians against Nazis are by all means at the top.

3.11. Do you think that the concept of Nation-State is an outdated concept? Why? If yes, with what would you replace it?

I'm from the country that makes part of the core group of countries struggling against attempts to derail concept of sovereignty and approaches Nation-States as main actors in the UN Charter sense

3.12. To which authors do you often refer? In your country? Abroad?

The ones earlier referred to (Waltz, Gilpin, Kissinger, Brzezinski, Huntington etc.), Russian – Primakov, Khrustalev, Kosolapov, Tsygankov

3.13. How would you characterize the international system today?

In transformation, unpredictable evolution and outcomes, rigidly competitive

3.14. Which authors and colleagues are closest to you? In your country? Abroad?

Alexander Dynkin, Feodor Voitlovsky, Alexei Fenenko, Alexei Voskresenski, Andrei Baikov, Paul Saunders and the National Interest team, Charles Kupchan, was happy to get introduced to GIPRI activities and collection with Gabriel Galice; some opinions go in line with Tatiana Shakleina. Good read by earlier mentioned Khrustalev, Primakov, Kosolapov, Tsygankov; but also Arbatov, Baranovsky

Interesting but often contested and divergent from my own views – Dmitri Trenin

3.15. Which authors and colleagues are the furthest from you? In your country? Abroad?

Either extreme judgemental opinion is a difficult read

4. GEOPOLITICAL QUESTIONS

4.1. How could we define the legitimate interests of a State that triggers or gets involved in a conflict outside its borders? What role is played by disinformation, incomplete information, and the manipulation of public opinion in the decision-making mechanisms of government, in regard to initiating, or participating in, armed conflicts, or destabilization, or violence in certain countries?

I believe legitimate interests lay in the domain of national security defense – vital survival and ones not to risk compromising sovereignty, territorial integrity, political stability
Incomplete information played negative crucial role in the Soviet government decision to enter Afghanistan. Although in Russia manipulation of public opinion or absence of such doesn't influence much the decision-making process, it is usually made upon evaluation of the situation within rather narrow political circle based on the information and analysis supplied by national military and foreign policy experts. Public opinion could be 'prepared' with the decision taken

4.2. What are the “founding documents” of your country? Which dates?

Russian Federation Constitution was adopted December 12, 1993. Was affirming not only the collapse of the Soviet Union, but also internal political changes happening around the shooting of the Russian White House (Parliament (Verkhovny Sovet) by Yeltsin). Amendments to the Constitution were adopted in 2008 and 2014 respectively

In fact, previous Soviet (1977) and Russian Federation of the USSR (1978) Constitutions by mere analysis of the text could be considered as the most advance and democratic in the world (including insistence to introduce the Decalogue of the Helsinki Process, not done by capitalist countries)

4.3. What are the major events that shaped the history of your country?

Peter the Great reforms and Katherine the Great imperial stretch, War against Napoleon (1812), abolition of servage (1861), Bloody Sunday and First Russian revolution (1905), February and then October revolutions of the 1917, both World Wars (1914-1917 – with Bolsheviks withdrawing even if Russia considered as potential beneficiary after the end of 1918 and Versailles conferences further on; as well as 1939-1945, while for Russia biggest impact – Great Patriotic War itself (1941-1945); Helsinki Final Act, Gorbachev and dissolution of the USSR, end of Yeltsin's regime and chaos of the 1990s

4.4. According to you, what are the major historic events of international life? Why?

Both World Wars – the last one finally led to realization that bad peace is better than the good war – European consolidation under American command + American unprecedented enrichments with both wars and remaining safe far away territory allowing for leadership position in the 20th and start of 21st centuries; start of decolonization process and self-realization of the so called Third World Countries, that allowed for attention at least during the Cold War to their actual economic and social situation, even if on a limited scale; Cuban Missile Crisis with the balancing on the brink of global nuclear catastrophe; dissolution of the USSR and attempts of untamed dictate on the part of the United States openly claiming (NSS 2002 and further) undesirability to allow for comparable competitor to arise from the ranks of other countries around the world

4.5. To which foreign country do you feel the closest? Why?

Most people feel themselves as European but had mixed feelings with the events of the last couple years. India used to be seen as eternally friendly. Majority of those born in the USSR still have trouble distinguishing former Republics as foreign countries. Latin American countries (Cuba, Argentina, Brazil etc.) seem logically close.

Funny enough the USA seems to be considered the country with people 'like us' vis-a-vis Russians

4.6. To which foreign country do you feel the furthest? Why?

Sweden – too orderly and rule-based

4.7. What are the major internal challenges of your country today?

Mentality that the 'grass is greener' abroad and lack of desire to work for a change apart from a very small amount of people. Economic challenges and 'besieged fortress' approach

4.8. In twenty years?

Degraded systems of education and healthcare, already in critical state and further deteriorating with the modern reforms

4.9. What are the main assets of your country today?

High quality human resources, rich history and culture, high resistance ability; vast mineral and natural resources

4.10. In twenty years?

Hopefully same remains, although as stated earlier future HDI and demographic quality are endangered

4.11. On the scale of 1 (minimum) to 5 (maximum) indicate the appropriate position of your country today in the following areas:

Economic	1	2	3	4	5
Financial	1	2	3	4	5
Monetary	1	2	3	4	5
Political	1	2	3	4	5
Military	1	2	3	4	5
Scientific	1	2	3	4	5
Cultural	1	2	3	4	5
.....	1	2	3	4	5

4.12. On the scale of 1 (minimum) to 5 (maximum) indicate the appropriate position of your country in twenty years:

Economic	1	2	3	4	5
Financial	1	2	3	4	5
Monetary	1	2	3	4	5
Political	1	2	3	4	5
Military	1	2	3	4	5
Scientific	1	2	3	4	5
Cultural	1	2	3	4	5
.....	1	2	3	4	5

This is rather wishful thinking, can't suggest realistic assessment, impossible to do any projection in current conditions

4.13. What are the major threats for your country today?

Terrorism and desire to recreate 'sanitary cordon'

4.14. In twenty years?

Likely to lie in the area of high-tech achievements – weaponization of space and untamed proliferation of irresponsible ‘space states’, cyber threats, new types of weapons and drones, terrorism likely to remain

4.15. Rank in decreasing order the nations that you consider to be the biggest threats to world peace?

IS.....

Saudi Arabia.....

North Korea.....

USA (or rather anglo-saxon tandem).....

.....

.....

.....

4.16. Which non-state actors are threatening world peace at the present time? Tomorrow?
Once again – IS and affiliated terrorist organizations

4.17. What are the new forms of war today? Tomorrow?

Hybrid wars, for both time frames

4.18. Are you familiar with the “non-military war operation” referred to by the Chinese authors Qiao Liang and Wang Xiangsui? If so, what do you think about this concept?
Not familiar

4.19. What are the major threats for your continent?

Unstable Middle East and fundamental Islamism, environmental damage

4.20. What are the major threats for our planet?

Geopolitical competition for redistribution of influence with the ability and potential of mutually assured destruction (MAD) with the current level of weapon development; inability to find long-term solution and set stable and inclusive mechanisms; environmental damage (climate +)

4.21. Do you consider nuclear weapons as a threat? What are the main actions to be taken against proliferation? At the regional level? Globally?

Nuclear weapons when with the limited amount of responsible states play stabilizing role of containment and guarantee against radical steps on the part of the opponent. Further efforts to establish nuclear-free zones, more efficient export control and disincentives for states to acquire nuclear military potential. Ideally – non-politicization of the issue and ability to talk ‘non-official’ countries to join in the NPT as non-nuclears

4.22. How do you assess the threats of cyberwar? For your country? In the world? What solutions would you propose?

Occasional attacks already happen in different countries. Not possible to approach solution until a) ICANN is the primary company to give out domain names; projects like BRICS cable – impossible; ITU has no role; b) more conciliatory measures are taken to pacify governmental control vs full freedom approach

4.23. Do you consider terrorism to be a major threat? How would you define it? What kinds of terrorism can you distinguish? How to prevent or fight them?

At the moment by all means at the top of all threats. Terrorism should be considered any direct activity to inflict (mass) civilian casualties irrespective of political aims of the terrorist. To start with it is vital to agree on a joint Convention to define terrorism. Further actions would rather be matter of technic

4.24. How do you assess the robotization of war?

Dangerous development, since countries possessing such potential would be eager to take decisions to start a war

4.25. According to you, how important is the growing shortage of water within the next decades? What solutions would you propose?

Remains a political issue, isn't that difficult to solve. Although it is complicated taken 224 rivers belong to international river basin. Look at the example between India and Pakistan – while remain with difficulties with regards to Kashmir, that same region has impeccable water management – never broken by either side. In Central Asia water distribution between

the countries presents political problem, could be solved by means of engineering know-how (cascades, pools in the countries in the lower parts of rivers etc)

4.26. According to you, who are the main allies of your country? Why?

In a way of a joke might repeat earlier statesmen's words of the allies of Russia being its army and fleet

4.27. According to you, who are the main opponents of your country? Why?

Equally or even stronger countries striving to arrange for a circle of not-loyal to Russia states

4.28. According to you, what are the opportunities as well as geopolitical risks related to competition and future rivalries in the exploitation of the seas?

A number of countries either didn't sign the convention of 1982 (UNCLOS) or signed but didn't ratify (the USA) which leaves those countries in a preferable position

4.29. According to you, what are the opportunities as well as geopolitical risks related to competition and future rivalries rivalry in the exploitation of outer space?

It's weaponization; extreme amount of outer space debris, competing navigation projects

4.30. Regarding geostrategy, what are the different schools of thought in your country?

Pre-history of Russian geostrategy and geopolitics is connected with the names of N.Danilevsky, K. Leontiev, N.Trubetskoi, L.Gumilev, although scientific formation of the Russian geopolitics happens only in the last decade of the 20th century. It's specificity opposed to 'continental' and 'oceanic' schools lies in the fact that it developed not simply in the continental area, but within the Eurasian Heartland (if taking Mackinder terminology) and isn't limited to geographic area but also has value characteristics, based in a way on a single information space with specific spiritual and religious factors.

4.31. Who are their leading personalities?

Earlier authors see in 4.30, today one can turn to K.Gadzhev, A.Panarin, V.Tsybursky, A.Dugin

4.32. What are their main characteristics?

Emphasis is given to primarily cultural, spiritual, civilizational aspects of national development

4.33. How would you define “*leadership*”, “*unilateralism*”, “*bilateralism*”, “*multilateralism*”, “*unipolarity*”, and “*multipolarity*”? In the context of today’s reality? Ideally?

Leader is the country that is prevailing others by integral potential, possesses necessary resources in order to play important role in social, economic and political processes, has recognized authority and is responsible in front of the others for its political and economic course

Unilateralism – situation when one country is by far prevailing others with its cumulative potential and tries to set its own policies in accordance with its interests irrespective of other countries’ needs – could lack responsibility, empathy, desire to negotiate if can manage by itself. Unipolarity – when all important decisions are seen as legitimate only if they are coming from that prevailing country (by itself with attempts to impose this view among satellites and other members of international community

Bilateralism – situation with the two of such countries prevailing by cumulative potential, which doesn’t predict inevitability of conflict though – could be cooperative

Multilateralism – more than three countries having comparable potential to lead on the international arena along with their ability and desire to work on common issues together

4.34. Do you believe that the concepts of “power” and “empire” are relevant? Why?

Power notion hasn’t disappeared at all, the country has wider range of possibilities to achieve its aspirations with enough powers behind its claims

If we look at the definition offered by Neil Ferguson – empire is a state where one nation imposes its will, institutions, cultural components over other people’s, then this terms remains relevant

4.35. Would you suggest additional or alternative concepts? If so, please specify which and why?

I do believe in opportunities offered via resources (all types) a country possesses and thus power concept.

4.36. What do you think about the ongoing transpacific and transatlantic trade projects? What implications and consequences for your country?

This has to be studied in more details by economists after thorough analysis of the founding documents, which I never did. Although judging from the information flowing from analytical articles – both TPP and TTIP seem to be a well-founded instrument to retain and increase American influence over member countries. Should be studied by each country with regards to its long-term interests – a lot depends how Europeans see their future and its vital elements. E.g. Marshall Plan and further European integration project was American sponsored and while bringing risks of creation of super-powerful subject in Europe still allowed for subtle control and specific development in the interests of the USA. Seems to be beneficial in general for Europeans. Neither of those trade projects directly concern Russia. It is out of both of them, even if suggested by State Secretary J.Kerry the China and Russia weren't excluded and were welcome to join in. TPP seems to have more disastrous consequences for China and is in direct competition with China-sponsored multilateral projects in the area.

4.37. What do you think about the stakes, opportunities and risks related to the exploitation of the Arctic?

Risks related to unknown effect intense exploration of the Arctic is to bring, mostly environmental. Among most realistic potentials for the next 'hot spot' attribution due to militarization and too intense interest proclaimed by non-Arctic states. Opportunities rather lay in the area that it could be seen as a testing ground for mutually acceptable international arrangements agreed to by group of countries that aren't able to dominate over either of them and aren't allies. Arctic is also an extremely valuable environmental asset remaining.

4.38. How do you conceive the future of Africa?

Interestingly this continent continued to have reputation as the one needing most help and donors primarily talking of funds for Africa, at the same time if compared by regional growth rates – was among the highest globally. Rich continent still in neo-colonial state. Programs as NEPAD have proper directions of Africans deciding and solving their problems themselves, but is made in a manner of 'bigger brothers' helping younger ones, which preserves this mentality and puts obstacles with regards to full-scale development and true independence

4.39. How do you see the future of Asia?

Power shift to Asia will continue, so it is likely to turn into long-term center of global politics with Europe remaining on the outskirts of power play (in fact, ongoing conflicts in European part of the world prove this thesis. In the times of deadly weapons big powers aren't interested in coming into direct clashes and conflicts (as was the case during the Cold War) often remain methods to 'measure' each others' capacity at the periphery.

4.40. How do you see the future of Europe? Of the European Union?

Had the chance to remain 'moral' judge for the globe and retain symbolic but important powers, which was greatly discredited after a series of events at the start of the 21st century. Greatest achievement of the European Union was freedom of movement it gave to its citizens, migration crisis could put this unquestionable achievement in doubt.

4.41. How do you see the future of the Americas (North and South)?

North America isn't likely to decline as to lose its global reach any time soon, will continue power projection and remain the most powerful, even if not most trusted or loved country. South America seems to be going through transformational processes once again, with a number of loyal to its northern neighbor dictatorships fading with the 'left wing wave' the process seems to be reversing, not unhelped by the USA. Mistakes of the current governments greatly contribute to this reverse process (as in Brazil et. al)

4.42. What do you think about the creation of the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank? What implications do you see? What are the implications or consequences for your country?

AIIB is the biggest failure of the foreign policy of the USA, since its closest allies joined in it. With regards to investment funds – it is true that even a number of newly created institutions won't close the gap of infrastructure investments needed globally. At the same time, AIIB is clearly the project to foster Chinese economy and strengthen its regional presence. Neutral for Russia

4.43. What do you think about updating the Silk Roads? What would be the impact or consequences for your country?

There's complementarity (even if not direct and with the need of making mutual concessions and regard new projects development) between the OBOR and Russia's Eurasian integration projects

4.44. Do you know other projects that merit attention and commentary? Which? Why?

4.45. What do you think of politico-military alliances such as NATO, SCO (Shanghai Cooperation Organization), CSTO (Collective Security Treaty Organization), OSCE (Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe), and BRICS?

NATO and SCTO are the alliances, incomparable by potential and with different purposes. NATO outlived itself and is rather in order to justify its existence generating new threats. The rest mentioned aren't alliances. SCO could be seen as a proper and most adequate out of currently existing basis for Eurasian countries' cooperation, especially after decision on India and Pakistan. OSCE if back to its roots with three equally important baskets, not just the third one. Also if it comes out as genuinely neutral observer and mediator, it will be most relevant to manage conflicts and build trust between its members. Should have a bigger role in Ukraine if full impartiality is introduced.

BRICS isn't an alliance and should be analysed along with similar mechanisms like the G7 or the G10

4.46. How would you develop or transform them?

I already mentioned some suggestions or pre-conditions for higher role for OSCE. All in all, as was numerously argued, it didn't accord with the general atmosphere back in the end of 1980s with the end of the Cold War to retain NATO as an alliance. It was but logical to put an end to existence of both NATO and Warsaw Pact (interestingly, from the very start, Warsaw Pact, created later than NATO in response to Western Germany entrance into North Atlantic Alliance, contained in its founding treaty article that member-countries would strive to a comprehensive and inclusive institution to be formed to secure peace and security in the whole European and Euro-Atlantic area). TO make a long story short, I'd greatly advocate the situation when OSCE playing higher role and providing for comprehensive security and trust-building in the area instead of both NATO or CSTO (even though CSTO has more immediate tasks to secure stability with a number of problems still to be solved, while NATO lacking tasks within its own area rather provides for insecurity introducing illegitimate military hand of the USA in other parts of the world.

4.47. Do you think the UN should strengthen its role in the field of peace? How? In security? How?

This is again the question of reform, financing and military forces of the United Nations, which hasn't been resolved since the task was tabled back in 1946. It certainly should strengthen its role in those areas, since it is the only globally recognized legitimate institution with the UNSC having comprehensive mandate to provide for peace and security. The only way at the moment, to eliminate options when military actions are taken bypassing the UNSC, which is highly unlikely with lack of incentives for strong powers to follow non-beneficial decisions for them. E.g. it was seen as a huge victory when the USA and UK along with it 'came back' to the UN format after the invasion into Iraq. Opponents to the invasion took pleasure out of making those two edit resolution four times before it was finally adopted. At the same time, it didn't provide for any disincentive or sanction against the aggressors, instead allowed for a kind of post-factum legitimization.

4.48. What other international fields of activity should be developed?

Remaining highly contested area (UN reform), the Organization should put more efforts into developmental issues. In fact, it is not only up to countries to fulfil SDGs, but the UN as principle body should suggest and elaborate strategies and actively monitor undertaken activities, help mobilize resources for supporting projects. In a way it is already achieving more in those areas and thus arguments around UN inefficiency miss out on this area of Organization's activity. Probably could also be more active in highly sensitive area around internet governance, non-weaponization of outer space, fair and equitable trade agreements (regional commissions working together with the WTO to offer expertise of new integration, trade, investment and other areas of cooperation etc.)

4.49. What do you think about current regional and continental organizations and their probable or desired evolution?

Before generally accepted rules are worked out in the spirit of consensus of all systemic powers it makes no sense to talk of further globally significant reform or evolution of either of organizations. We can currently talk of creation or adaptation of existing mechanisms and institutions in specific issues areas with limited number of participants with coinciding interests. Global threats offer more opportunities for evolution and reform, but so far had limited and temporary effect.

5. SUGGESTIONS



5.1. What theoretical or practical paths do you advocate following in order to allow your country to face its challenges? Do you differentiate “peace” and “security”? In what way?

Unfortunately we cannot repeat famous “Russia is concentrating” and cannot withdraw from international affairs temporarily without making it constant and losing important role and status. Unfortunately resources cannot be directed completely away from military means for the benefit of socio-economic development – something Russia needs most, more time and more favorable conditions for internal reforms. At the same time there’s need to work for lower conflict intensity with the Western powers, while preserving fundamental national security demands. Peace means security for Russia, its people, territory, people. Security along its borders and internally mean peaceful development.

5.2. What do you expect from your country’s allies? Which allies?

As mentioned earlier I do hope our Eurasian Union partners could be considered as allies, but practice shows that Russia does have partners, but not allies in its full sense.

5.3. What economic reforms (IMF, World Bank, WTO) would you suggest at the international level?

None until rival projects of regional or trans-regional level don’t fulfil or not fulfil expectations of their main beneficiaries.

5.4. What political reforms (UN...) would you suggest at the international level?

Should primarily reach consensus on representation in rule-making body, as well as look into optimization of the existent international organizations (e.g. plethora of energy-related institutions, while none is able to fulfil primary purpose of reaching consensual view on energy security in the interest of all participants – producers, consumers, transit countries, non-state actors etc.)

5.5. What reforms would you suggest in the field of security and military at the international level?

Re-introduce trust-building measures in Euro-Atlantic and globally; reconsider conventional arms treaty to include new types of weaponry used in TMA and maritime forces

5.6. What cultural reforms (UNESCO...) would you suggest at the international level?

UNESCO should be independent of political leanings or preferences of its donors, probably suggest pool of reserves (contributions) for several organizations which would exclude ability to dictate if 'wrong decision' is taken

Other activities could be taken on bilateral and multilateral level and should be subject to both intergovernmental and 'Track 2' process

5.7. In your opinion, which international projects should be given priority? In second place? Economic projects eliminating existing dominance of the post-industrial countries, infrastructure development, education and health projects (NCDs and infectious diseases padnemias)

5.8. What would be your personal proposals in connection with regional or international reorganization?

Already mentioned introduction of OSCE as the supreme and probably only organization to manage peace and security in Europe and Euro Atlantic instead of NATO or other organizations

Creation of the comprehensive and inclusive Energy Association to work out energy security definition, code of conduct for all the countries

5.9. Which language or languages will be dominant in 50 years? Why?

English will remain, Chinese gaining popularity but unlikely to be globally spoken, new attempts for the artificial language could be taken again

6. SUGGESTIONS FOR THE PROJECT "WHAT PEACE? WHICH WORLD ORDER?"

6.1. Which books would you recommend to your project colleagues?

Global "Perestroika": Transformations of the world order ed. By A. Dynkin and N. Ivanova, 2015

The rest I'd suggest for clearing Russia's role and approach to global institutions are in Russian

6.2. Which websites do you recommend about your country? About a foreign country?
About a subject related to the project?

A variety of materials published at www.russiancouncil.ru; currently English version of International organizations bulletin; ruskiymir.ru

6.3. According to you, which issues should be discussed with priority at the workshop on peace and world order? Please draft, at your convenience, a table of subjects.

Regional security: road map out of current crises and stability conditions

Institutional building on global and regional scale (organizations, regimes, clubs, ad hoc groups)

Comparative studies of core national interests of the biggest players (possibly with non-state actors included): competition and cooperation potential (conceptual, practical steps)

6.4. What type of project, related to the theme of peace, would you like to carry out with which partner?

Taken my current domain of work, I'd like to have Asia Pacific specific areas of research; 'club governance', environmental and energy security studies

Partner depends on the list of included institutions/people