

# The author's preface.

## What is State sovereignty?

A single scoundrel is enough to ruin the nation.

*Napoléon Bonaparte*

One great personality is enough to save the country.

*Voltaire*

Many extraordinary events have taken place lately in different parts of the world. The Arab Spring, the collapse of multiculturalism in Europe, youth riots in major European countries and the 'Occupy Wall Street' movement are just a few examples to mention. The world is changing rapidly. What is more, these changes are clearly not for the better. All those things that were clear, secure and solid yesterday are now becoming unstable. The international financial system is falling apart at the seams, and that can be seen with the naked eye. Just ten years ago those who would speak of the dollar crash or of the Euro-zone decay, would perhaps have been regarded as insane and would have been recommended to see a doctor. Now these matters are discussed night and day on all TV-channels. This news is on the front pages of newspapers.

Let us look at ordinary people. What should they think of these events? Should they applaud the victory of the opposition in the Arabic countries

and the establishment of democracy there? Or rather worry about the defeat of government forces and growing instability? Should they sympathise with the youth riots in the developed countries or rather regard these young people as just having too much of a good thing? Or, maybe, they had better simply forget about all that and go to see a football game? But even there they will come across football fans, nationalists, tolerance issues and many other unpleasant things? And finally — consider the conspiracy theories about the end of the world and the aliens. So, what should they do? Let us look at it more closely.

And we should start with state sovereignty. Without this concept we will never grasp the essence of what is happening...

There are currently over two hundred states on Earth. These states are very different, just like human beings are. There are large and small ones, rich and poor ones, famous ones and completely unknown to the majority of the world's population. Among these nations there are those with advanced economies and those with decaying ones, those growing and those wasting away. Some die out, some grow older, and others are propagating vigorously and growing younger year by year. So, what is this factor that determines whether a nation is developing or stagnating?

Let us compare it with the factors, influencing the life of a human. Those are plenty: parents and upbringing, attitude of a person towards the things they are busy with, their love of learning. Health is important and even one's birthplace has certain significance. One cannot ignore friends, bad habits, luck. Happy or unhappy marriage plays its role, too. All in all, it is a mosaic of accidents that determines the life of a human being. And so, people live, get older and work following the waves of destiny. They pursue their goals. Or — which also happens — they sink to the very bottom.

But there is one *sine qua non* condition of the phenomenon called human happiness. It is not by chance, that I address happiness in this context, since it is happiness, which has to be the criterion of human existence; happiness, and not success, interpreted differently in different cultures. *Human happiness presupposes autonomy*. One has to make decisions by oneself; one has to carry responsibility for the consequences of those decisions. *In the same way the 'happy' life of the state requires this state to be autonomous*. This self-determination of the state is called State Sovereignty.

State sovereignty means supremacy of the state within its borders as well as its autonomy in the international affairs.<sup>1</sup> State sovereignty is incompatible with any interference from the outside. A sovereign state is the one to decide for itself and to reap the fruits of these decisions. The country itself has to determine its path of development; the head of the country has to do things that are good for the country and that make the country prosperous. The power is sovereign only if this criterion is chosen as the basic one for defining of state policy — exactly as an adult is independent only if they are free to decide themselves about their family. It may happen that the benefits of certain decisions will not be immediate, and will not always be obvious; yet the criterion 'make it better' will always guide a normal person in actions concerning their family.

Is this not the case of modern states as well? Is this not the case that the statesmen of different countries are striving hammer and tongs for the sake of their countries? Is this not the case that while looking at the political map one sees a lot of independent countries that bravely move across the rough sea of politics and economics?

Alas, it is not; the reality is completely different. It is exactly the opposite. *Nearly all countries of the modern world are forced to conduct policies that are very far from their national interests.* The examples are not hard to find, you will find them in today's newspapers. What do Poland, the Czech Republic and Bulgaria need the deployment of the American antiballistic missile elements on their territories for? Do they need it to defend themselves from the missiles? I would like to highlight two points in this context. Firstly, these countries are NATO members, and this alliance, where the USA and Britain rule the roost, has, in compliance with its regulations, to protect them from any military attacks. Secondly, it is not very clear whose missiles these countries are going to defend themselves from. Some say that this refers to Iranian missiles. Yet for some obscure reason the ABM is being deployed closer to the Russian borders than to the Iranian ones. Whereby would it not be more logical to deploy the system in the proximity of the hazard and not in another part of the planet. Furthermore, the Iran of today simply does not have missiles which would be capable of reaching Poland or the Czech Republic, and it is not clear when Iran will get such missiles. Maybe the ABM is being deployed in Europe 'just in case'? In case Iranians

---

<sup>1</sup> [http://www.glossary.ru/cgi-bin/gl\\_sch2.cgi?R0pDuxzkgwxyiltt:p!xywup](http://www.glossary.ru/cgi-bin/gl_sch2.cgi?R0pDuxzkgwxyiltt:p!xywup).

invent, assemble and launch a missile of the newest generation?! Well, let us suppose, they have indeed invented one. And even have assembled a couple of dozens. The questions remain the same — why should Iran immediately attack somebody? Why should Iran aim at Poland — or the Czech Republic? What harm did these or other Europeans — such as Romanians or Bulgarians inflict on Iranians? The questions hang in the air, and the things, mentioned in this context by American politicians resemble a smokescreen.

As for today, the probability of Iranian missiles attacking the West is the same as that of aliens landing in California.

The benefit to Eastern-European countries from these actions is questionable, to say the least. Their security will not develop whereas they will inherit a lot of problems. As a matter of fact, the positions of the American missiles will be immediately exposed to attacks of Russian nuclear warhead missiles. On the other hand, it will be impossible to track what kind of rockets Americans shelter in the launching silos. Who can guarantee that these missiles are just an air defence weapon? What if they are equipped with nuclear warheads, too? Indeed, the proximity of the missiles to our borders drastically reduces their flying time to Russian towns and strategic objects. It was exactly the argument that made American diplomats so eloquent during the Caribbean crisis — yes, it would have taken just a few minutes for a missile to attack the USA from Cuba. So, today's Russia cannot help reacting either. As a result, people living in Poland and the Czech Republic who gained nothing from deployment of the American ABM in terms of security, now risk coming under the crossfire of Russian nuclear missiles. So what is that big reward for these countries, can anybody explain to me? Well, the leaders of these countries will be tapped on the shoulder during the next summit meeting and will be titled 'democrats' by human rights activists. It does not sound like a very generous reimbursement for the constant fear of being attacked by nuclear missiles, does it? Would you settle for putting a barrel of petrol in your own apartment to get a discount for your rent and a tablet on your door with the inscription 'An excellent household apartment'? No? Then that is not the point.

The questions arise one by one. **Are the leaders of these countries, who jeopardise their citizens without gaining anything worthy instead really freestanding?** Are they really freestanding, those masking their misconduct with talks about some hypothetical threats corresponding to nothing in reality? The answer is evident — no, they are not. And that means that the

country behaving in such a strange way has no sovereignty. In the modern world only a very small number of countries can proudly claim Absolute State Sovereignty. It has always been the case — there have always been those who drive and those who are driven, mother countries and satellites, seniors and vassals, slave-owners and slaves. Nothing changes but the style and the pattern of the curtain which hides this uncomfortable truth from the majority of the population. *The states enjoying the sovereignty in its full range can be counted on the fingers of one hand.* Normally the situation looks as follows: the state has its flag and its president. And that is it! These are the alpha and omega of the sovereignty of some 'proud and independent' country. Deeds, words and acts of this state are imposed by its 'partners'.

In 1985 these sovereign countries were the USSR, the USA, Great Britain and China. All the rest had to more or less coordinate their steps with the 'big brothers', whose struggle against one another formed the main subject of the world politics. In just a few years' time, the reality looks far less promising for us. Today the Absolute State Sovereignty is maintained by Great Britain and the USA, two world powers forming the skeleton of the policy-makers, and China, which stepped in the shoes of the USSR, and which is now the country with the world's highest rates of economy growth.<sup>1</sup> Did we miss anybody in our list? I am afraid not. *Today's Russia is not among the countries with the Absolute State Sovereignty.* Our country enjoys only a restricted, partial sovereignty, the acquisition of the Complete State Sovereignty is the object of the unseen struggle carried out at the moment. Sometimes this struggle spills over onto TV-screens and the pages of newspapers in the form of news of the next terrorist attack or the 'earthshattering' international meeting.

The internal problems of today's (as well as of yesterday's, though) Russia derive directly from the loss of the Complete State Sovereignty. Before we find out when we lost it, we have to clarify the terms. So, what is the Complete State Sovereignty?

It consists of five different sovereignties:

---

<sup>1</sup> As examples of a country with partial sovereignty; Germany, France and India can be mentioned. Do you trust to find your country in this list, dear reader? Can you with hand on heart, quite honestly say that the government of your country acts in the interests of your country, and does not act under the pressure of Washington or London?

1. *The recognition of the territory of the country by the international community, the flag, the national emblem and the national anthem.*
2. *The diplomatic sovereignty, implying the ability to pursue an independent international policy, which means that the state should be free to choose its own friends and its own enemies. If you are on good terms with Iran, you will never care that the power in this country is held by the Ayatollahs who are not popular in the USA. You can punch the aggressor in the face and you need not worry that this aggressor is the democratically elected president of Georgia.*

Once the diplomatic sovereignty is achieved, objective processes start immediately and dictate the necessity of obtaining two further sovereignties. It is a well-known fact that military power and a strong economy are the only factors the diplomats have real respect for.

So, the third and the fourth sovereignties will be:

3. *The military sovereignty — the ability to rebuff an aggressor and to provide security for yourself and your allies;*
4. *The economical sovereignty — the economical and industrial development, providing for further advancement of the country out of its internal reserves.*

Is that all? No. There is also a fifth sovereignty, and as our history instructs it is the most important one. The lack of this is the first step that leads into the abyss.

5. *Cultural sovereignty.*

Let us refocus. Solely in the case of all five sovereignties being present is it possible to speak about the Complete State Sovereignty. If we consider all the modern countries from this point (or reconsider the history), we will immediately notice that practically every country lacks one or several of the abovementioned points. For instance, today's Germany doesn't have military sovereignty. German armed forces amount to ca. 250 thousand people.<sup>1</sup> Here it can be recalled that by the time Hitler came to power in 1933, the effective strength of the Weimar Republic's army had reached 100 thousand people, with which Germany was considered completely disarmed, as good as having no army at all! Yet at the time when the country

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.rodon.org/polit-100903111615>.

of beer and sausages was full of strength and was actively developing, the corresponding figures were radically different. Just before the First World War in 1914, the peace-time strength of Germany was 801 thousand people. Is this an argument indicative of the German aggressive character? No. In the same year, France had the disposal of a regular establishment numbering 766 thousand.<sup>1</sup> Today, the population of Germany amounts to 83 million, i. e. it has grown by 20%, and its army in comparison with 1914 has shrunk to a quarter of its size.<sup>2</sup> What does it mean? Nothing but the lack of military sovereignty in Germany.

Yet if anybody stated that a large army in today's world is an anachronism, I would refer to the article concerning the US Secretary of Defence, Donald Rumsfeld, just to give them a general idea of manpower of the American Army: 'Currently the armed forces of the USA amount to ca. 2.6 million men and women, from which 1.4 are on the active service, 876,000 of guardsians and reservists are in the military bases, and 287,000 form the special trained reserve.'<sup>3</sup> Why then is the US so reluctant to reduce its huge army, even given the enormous yearly budget deficiency?<sup>4</sup>

It is because a strong army is the *sine qua non* condition for having Complete State Sovereignty. And equally importantly, it is a possibility for one country to deprive other countries of their sovereignty at its behest, exactly as the USA has done with Iraq, and as it has done with Yugoslavia.

The rules in politics would never change, just as the desire of street boys to be strong and muscular so that nobody could offend them. Germany has a small army because it has delegated a part of its sovereignty to NATO and 'personally' to the USA. Germans have no military sovereignty, and therefore no diplomatic sovereignty, whereas their economical sovereignty is evident. The German economy is the biggest in Europe, and Germany is the top GDP country of the euro-zone. So, why does Berlin send its soldiers to Afghanistan? Because Berlin is not allowed to act otherwise.

---

<sup>1</sup> The population of Germany numbered 67 million, and the population of France 39 million. That's why the 'militarization' of Germany was less than that of France percentage-wise — 1.2% against 2%. (*Isaev A. V. Antisuvorov. Moscow: Exmo, Yauza, 2004; [http://militera.lib.ru/research/isaev\\_av1/04.html](http://militera.lib.ru/research/isaev_av1/04.html)*).

<sup>2</sup> <http://germany-germaniya.de/naselenie-germaniya.html>.

<sup>3</sup> [http://grani.ru/Politics/World/US/Us\\_politics/m.74496.html](http://grani.ru/Politics/World/US/Us_politics/m.74496.html).

<sup>4</sup> In 2010 it will amount to 1.4 trillion US dollar.