

THE WORLD AT THE CROSSROADS OF SECURITY PROCESSES

Mitar Kovac¹

¹ Director of the Eurasian Security Forum, Belgrade, Republic of Serbia,
mitar.kovac21@gmail.com

Received: 9th September 2022

Accepted: 15th September 2022

Original scientific paper

Abstract: *The article discusses the basic aspects of security processes of disintegration of states and integration processes in Europe and the Eurasian area. After the collapse of the Warsaw Pact, NATO gradually continued its march to the East, causing permanent crises and conflicts in many countries along the value line of division that is imposed and established between individual countries in the Eurasian space during the Ukrainian crisis. All the great powers of the modern world want to influence the process of Eurasian integration and realize their interests in that part of the world. In terms of human and natural resources, it is the central area of the world. Therefore, the integration processes, conflicts and wars, which take place in the Eurasian space, have a huge impact on global security. This conflict, in recent times, is representatively reflected through the civil war in Ukraine, which in its course and with the direct and indirect participation of the great powers will significantly define European security and outline key solutions for global security in the future. A multipolar world is certain, it is only a question of the cost and suffering of the people until it is accepted by the influential power centers in the West.*

Keywords: *International relations, security processes, European Union, Eurasian integration, Russia, USA, Ukrainian crisis.*

(introductory lecture of the forum - work by invitation)

INTRODUCTION

International relations after the Cold War established a new distribution of power and influence in the world. Shortly after the dissolution of the Warsaw Pact and the collapse of the Soviet Union, individual former Soviet republics, motivated by common interests and historical closeness, began a new model of integration processes in order to reduce the consequences of the breakup and improve mutual relations. In addition to their geographical proximity, numerous connections and interdependence that were established in the USSR also contributed to this.

In the context of the processes that are carried out in the function of a significant reconstruction of international relations with the aim of changing the distribution of power of the main actors in international politics, various integration processes are successfully developing in Eurasia, which resulted in the creation of several regional organizations, starting with the

Commonwealth of Independent States, the Customs Union, The Collective Security Treaty Organization and the Shanghai Cooperation Organization complement each other and create a broad platform for cooperation and partnership. In addition to being a huge expanse in terms of territory, Eurasia also has significant demographic potential and natural resources. From a geopolitical point of view, this entire space is also extremely important because it significantly affects the state of global security.

Bearing in mind the centuries-old competition of the most influential states in the international community to expand spheres of influence and realize their own national interests, the contradictory processes of the disintegration of sovereign states and the creation of supranational integrations, to which the powers of sovereign states are transferred, are still taking place today. This especially applies to the European Union, which is based on its way of governing and representing states, a discriminatory and unequal organization in which the national interests of the leading and most developed states are favored.

Under the influence of the US, the EU seeks to expand gradually, often in line with NATO's eastward expansion, through the process of admitting new states from the former Warsaw Pact. Such a purposefully instructed process led to many crises and local wars and was particularly reflected in the emergence and course of the Ukrainian crisis, as well as the start of the war between the NATO pact and Russia on the territory of Ukraine. Russia could no longer allow such a trend of expansion, primarily NATO, and even the EU, which directly threatens its vital national interests. The Ukrainian regime's terror against the Russian people led to a civil war. The Russian population does not want to stay in such a state that is Russophobic and has banned its basic rights.

The world is at the crossroads of security processes, through which a new multipolar world order is being built. All this is refracted through the war in Ukraine.

2. THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE NATO PACT TO THE UKRAINIAN CRISIS

After the disappearance of the Warsaw Pact, NATO had the hidden goals of the gradual transformation of the Eastern European countries and their acceptance into membership, even though it was claimed at the beginning that this would not happen and that it would not happen with the countries that were part of the USSR. With the end of the Cold War and the unification of Germany, unrest arose in Europe with a large number of internal conflicts that turned into civil wars. Many of these countries fell apart and under the influence of the USA and Germany, new countries were recognized and promoted as former communist creations. According to the process of creation of new states and state creations, new nations were promoted according to political criteria, which historically did not exist in the Twentieth Century. That process, after the civil war in the former SFRY, continued further in the east, with a small break after the strategic design of the concept and vision of NATO, in the new geostrategic context of international relations.

That's how the Ukrainian crisis arose, following the same logic of conflicting interests, which has a strong impact on changes in regional and global security like never before after the Cold War. The crisis in Ukraine led to the fact that the ministers of defense of NATO members decided to open new command centers in Eastern Europe, said the Secretary General of the Alliance, Jens Stoltenberg, on February 5 in Brussels. NATO's plan to open new command centers in Eastern Europe has been hailed by some politically motivated experts as a sign that the Balkans will not be ignored. The alliance's defense ministers agreed to establish commands and bring units to Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland and Romania. The opening of these centers is the first phase of the militarization of Europe, along the already established

line of value division and conflicting interests of the leading powers of the NATO pact towards Russia. That step comes "in light of the changing security climate east and south of the Alliance's borders, according to a NATO statement. The new centers in six eastern, allied countries will ensure that "we have the right forces, in the right place, at the right time," said NATO Secretary General Jens Stoltenberg. "Our decisions make it clear that NATO is determined to defend all allies against all threats from all directions", he added.

The command centers in Eastern Europe justify themselves by strengthening regional security, say some of the so-called trained analysts of the security situation in Europe and the world. According to Adrian Cioroianu, a Romanian historian, writer and former foreign minister, "NATO's decision to establish command centers is not a declaration of war but indicates the instability of the Alliance's eastern borders." Experts point out that the new NATO centers are the result of the crisis in Ukraine in order to show that NATO remains "great support and protection for its allies" in this part of Europe. The establishment of permanent NATO and US military facilities, such as the missile defense base in Devesel and new command centers, is a significant political message to Russia that Romania will not return to its sphere of influence. However, it should be known that this is only one side of the coin, so it can be said that the consequences of such a decision have not been considered, because NATO facilities become a legitimate target in a possible conflict with Russia or the security organizations of which it is a member. This positioning of NATO hints not only at guaranteeing security in specific regions and institutional strengthening and greater human capacities at the external borders of the Alliance, but also at the accumulation of military forces along the imaginary line of conflict between the interests and value systems of the leading countries of the West and the East.

Simultaneously with the strengthening of military forces, NATO is putting pressure on the countries of the Western Balkans to distance themselves from Russia in every way and to join the sanctions introduced by the West, primarily the USA and the leading EU countries. The statements of the politicians of the western countries are also in this context. Washington continuously exerts pressure on Serbia on issues concerning the relations between the EU, Russia and Serbia. In this context, the statement of the former US ambassador to R. Serbia Montgomery, "that he is worried about Serbia, because the EU threatens not to open chapters in the negotiations," and that Serbia should distance itself from Russia and join the sanctions of the West.

The Ukrainian war episode is only an indication of the conflict situation in which the expansion of the Euro-American factor has been stopped and pacified, if only for a moment. The West will not give up its expansion beyond the borders of the Russian sphere of interest without major traumas, because it is the logic of force that can only be changed by force. The parade of American soldiers in combat vehicles and with weapons through the countries of Eastern Europe, which actually looks more like the march of the "victorious army", is primarily a political message to Europe and a warning that America has no intention of giving up control over the old continent. Although everything, in many ways, looks like another somewhat childish propaganda exercise, in essence it is a very clear and serious symbolic manifestation of American power and Washington's European policy.

Under the pretext of the danger from Russia and the Ukrainian crisis, the American conquest of Europe and a "heavy hug" that will surely hurt are on the scene. This is the essence of this phase of the generation of the Ukrainian crisis and the tightening of relations with Russia, regardless of how incredible it sounds from the point of view of media propaganda and politicians' statements. Since the First World War, when America entered the international and European political scene, the constant of American policy has been to not only establish control but also to prevent any connection between Europe, primarily Germany, with the East,

with Eastern Europe and Russia. And that is the American goal to this day. For decades, that goal was effectively realized by generating fear of communism and the Soviet Union. Hence the American support for the rise of Nazism in Germany, which is a historical topic that is persistently suppressed. With the later practically American occupation of Europe and the fabrication of the Cold War, America managed to separate Western and Central Europe from its East. To that end, American support for the formation of European integrations, which ultimately led to the European Union, is crucial.

Times are changing, so the instruments of American control over Europe and its isolation from the East have become weaker and weaker. In such circumstances, the historical destiny of Europe to turn towards its east and Russia surfaced. With the disintegration of the bloc division of Europe and the affirmation of globalization and the breaking down of borders, that historical destiny of Europe got its new chance. Europe thus naturally, not because some political elite really wants it or has a secret plan, turned naturally again towards Eurasia in terms of cooperation, primarily in the field of energy, economy and resources. The USA has felt this and wants to prevent that trend. It is simply a natural process. Without its east and Russia, Western Europe, which declared itself "the only Europe", is not a continent, but only a peninsula of Asia, which it was until a few centuries ago. Europe is only whole and tension-free when its east and west meet and without any lines of division within it. America, however, has no intention of losing control of Europe. The first step was to rush the European Union to expand into Eastern Europe so that the countries of the East would be loyal to America for their European destiny and to become an American rather than a European political instrument. In this, America succeeded to the greatest extent in political control over the European Union. This is the American "new Europe" versus the "old Europe", if by chance the EU tries to profile itself as an independent political entity and, led by Germany, cooperates with Russia or becomes "too close" with it.

Germany is fatefully, culturally, and economically oriented towards the East, primarily towards Russia. America does not accept that natural process and now, when it has largely used up its political arsenal and failed to regain control, it is turning to strengthening its military presence and generating fear of the outbreak of a new war in Europe. After 77 years since the Second World War, America again wants to use military force to create new forces in Europe under the guise of the Ukrainian crisis.

However, it is uncertain how this process will develop further. By far the most effective instrument of American power in Europe, NATO is showing some signs of weakness. There is less and less necessary agreement within the European NATO members. For example, the European members of NATO rejected the invitation of Eastern European countries to station their soldiers on their territory as a guarantee of defense against "Russian aggression" and did not even accept to participate in military exercises in the Baltic. They were only soldiers of the USA and the Baltic republics. In most countries of Eastern Europe, there are US military installations, not NATO. The question arises whether NATO is a sufficient instrument to survive the test of a regional war in Europe.

Everything suggests an increased militarization of Europe, which raises doubts that politics will gradually turn into the language of military power and wars that would devastate it and throw it into the trap of international influence. In this light, a recent statement to a Polish newspaper by one of the American ideologues, Zbigniew Brzezinski, in which he advises the Poles to prepare for war, is interesting. The timing of the statement coincided with the parade of American soldiers. Although this advice was given in the context of the crisis in Ukraine and the "Russian danger", the experienced Brzezinski was not, however, clear against whom that war could be. It is clear that America has no intention of letting go of control over Europe

and it is clear that Europe and Germany are the key American problem in this part of the world and they want to use them at any cost in a new campaign against Russia.

Everything seems to be preparing for that collision of opposing interests of the USA and Russia through the creation of the Ukrainian crisis and its course. The US Congress passed the "Prevention of Russian Aggression Act" last year. During the next two years, the so-called NATO Security Fund should be created in Europe, which would include Ukraine, Georgia, Moldova, Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Macedonia, Montenegro, Kosovo and Serbia. Diplomatic platitudes about harmonizing weapon standards, joint training and cooperation in peacekeeping missions conceal the intention of further militarization of Europe through NATO's new role in the Ukrainian crisis. The USA is obviously increasing its military presence around Ukraine and in it, and in that way is intensifying the geopolitical confrontation with Russia.

The fact that the differences between American and European policies regarding relations with Russia are becoming more and more obvious does not worry Washington, because the USA counted on such an obstacle to its plans because it has a large number of EU members who follow its policy and look first at Washington and only then at Brussels. The EU cannot exist without the will of the US, which is clear even to the leading members of the EU. In addition, the USA, unlike Europe, does not depend on Russia either economically or in terms of energy. The negative consequences of the sanctions do not affect the USA, all the costs of the Ukrainian conflict fall on the richest EU countries.

The USA hopes that by supplying weapons to Ukraine, it will cause additional economic problems for Russia, as a result of which the citizens of that country will lose confidence in Vladimir Putin and, in the end, the power will be transferred to some kind of "new Yeltsin", so that Russia will lose its importance and stop be a geopolitical rival of the USA and a possible long-term partner of China. As long as Russia is as strong, united and determined as it is now, there are no realistic chances of NATO imposing a solution to the Ukrainian crisis through war.

3. THE EUROPEAN UNION AS A FACTOR OF SECURITY

Almost all the so-called Europe's visionaries in Germany, from the end of the First World War onwards, advocated the idea of Europe as a federal state, as opposed to De Gaulle's idea of Europe as a community of sovereign states, but the federalization plan was implemented slowly, step by step, starting with a single market for coal and steel, economic communities and unions until the complete federalization of Europe, established by the Treaty of Lisbon. The Treaty of Lisbon is essentially the Constitution of the European Union. Today, the EU is trying to be a federal state in the full sense, with a number of problems and contradictions and inequalities in decision-making mechanisms. EU laws are above the laws of member states.

The European Commission is entirely supranational and all European Commissioners are expressly prohibited from listening to any advice from their countries of origin. They must work exclusively in the interest of the Union and not in the interest of the Member State. Only the Commission has the right to propose laws and supervises, directs and has authority over the entire legislative process.

The different extent of representation of member states in the European Parliament is one of the indicators of the fundamental inequality of peoples and states in that highest legislative body. Thus, the representatives of small nations and states are often outvoted in the decision-making institutions of the EU and cannot exert their influence on the creation of documents and laws, nor on the creation of policies and key decisions. Small and medium developed

countries in the EU are more in a blackmailed position, exposed to pressure and represent a cover for the interests of the most developed and powerful countries of the West.

Due to such a discriminatory decision-making system, instead of calming down the situation in Europe, the EU, under pressure from the USA and Great Britain, Poland, Romania and the Baltic states, is developing a further escalation of the crisis, which can lead to unforeseeable consequences for regional and global security. Poland plans to build border towers along the land border with Russia's Kaliningrad region. The six towers will be up to 50 meters high and will send images to polish border guards who monitor the 200-kilometer-long border. The recordings from the towers should record the activities on the Russian side of the border, and the information obtained should help Ukraine, but also the entire European Union in creating a policy towards Russia. It is the official justification for the financing and implementation of such an insane project, which is basically warmongering and reminds us of the towers, wire and reflectors that are a symbol of a divided Europe, a symbol of violence and a prelude to further conflicts and wars. Only unenlightened people are not aware of the consequences of those moves, which are essentially security and civilizational problems. Who is bringing Europe back 84 years to the eve of a new European and world war? This is a big issue that is not being discussed honestly and in good faith in official places in the UN and the EU. Such a move by Poland was certainly not planned or adopted in its national institutions. Skeptics would certainly say that the move that Poland has decided to take is also a kind of confirmation of the preparation of both Russia and the whole of Europe for the possibility of new conflicts on European soil.

According to such unreasonable measures and investments that are made to the detriment of the citizens of the member states, the European Union has clearly decided to directly participate in the construction of the line of division of the EU itself towards Russia and its allies. All of this is done by the leading EU countries under the guise of protecting the sovereignty and territory of the member states on the eastern borders. Such measures cause additional aggravation of the crisis and mutual distrust. There are many EU members who under pressure accept such decisions from Brussels, but the majority of the people of those countries are not behind such decisions, because they recognize in these measures the further militarization of Europe and the introduction of suffering and suffering in the future.

Due to the greed of multinational companies and the increasingly open march to the East of the most developed countries of the West, Russia has rightly felt the danger and is taking measures to stabilize and protect national security and vital national interests. There is also news from Russia about the expansion of the Russian military presence in the Arctic. According to available information, Russia has installed missile systems in that area. In addition to the missile system, fighter interceptors and a new radar on the island of Nova Zemlya in the Arctic Sea will be deployed in the ore-rich area, Major General Kirill Makarov confirmed. In recent years, the Russian military has been increasingly present in the far north, at a time when Moscow is laying claim to large parts of the Arctic landscape in order to secure its rights to exploit oil and gas. Due to the melting of the ice, the Arctic is becoming an increasingly important waterway, which has led to territorial disputes between several countries.

Conflicts of major powers around and in Ukraine can become a trigger for new crises and wars around the world. Some leading countries of the European Union, under the guise of protecting citizens, have decided to make it clear once again that "Ukraine is an enemy and an enemy of Europe". Such a thesis is essentially warmongering and an untrue message for the public, which is looking for an enemy of Europe in Russia. The attempt to create such a front and exclusivity will primarily fall on the heads of the protagonists of the failed strategic concept

of a violent march to the East towards new strategic resources and their uncontrolled exploitation. It is the logic of capital that cannot always pass and that leads to crises and wars. All past campaigns to the East, with the involvement of European resources or a group of European states, only brought suffering, death and destruction. And this strategic concept of sanctions against Russia, the militarization of the drawn line of the borders of the EU and the countries that strive to become future members, will lead to the destruction of the essence, meaning and original values of the EU. Such an instrumentalized and militarized EU will not be able to survive.

The European Union itself is not yet sure of its future, nor has it profiled itself as an independent subject of international relations. It can be said more that the EU is fundamentally and in a strategic sense, an instrument of US policy, primarily in Europe and the Eurasian area. Many crises, such as the civil war in the former SFRY, the Ukrainian crisis, the Greek economic crisis, the Middle East with its security reflections on Europe, secessionist movements, and the unequal relationship between large and small states in the EU itself make it unstable and non-unique in creating a common foreign policy, security and defense policies. All these inequalities of peoples and states in the EU will be multiplied with the further escalation of the Ukrainian crisis and possible regional war in the future. Those contradictions and the consequences of conflict can make the essence of the EU meaningless, because it is organized in such a way as to affirm and realize the interests of its leading and most developed countries. Therefore it can be said that after the negative experiences of the Serbian people with Yugoslavia, communism, socialism, there is no rational reason to endanger vital national interests, under the guise of a better life, by including them in supranational integrations, such as NATO and the EU. The political and military neutrality of the Republic of Serbia, in these difficult times, is a framework that can affirm its national interests for a long time.

4. GENERAL CONTEXT OF INTEGRATION PROCESSES IN EURASIA

The process of integration in Eurasia in the Twentieth Century began primarily on the basis of a common communist ideology and then socialism, as a social order in the USSR. That order was first imposed by violence through revolution. That false ideology destroyed the national and religious freedoms of peoples and ethnic communities. The republics that made up the Soviet Union of Socialist Republics (USSR) from 1922 to 1991, during the period when they became a common state, were extremely closely interconnected, not only politically and geographically, but also through the common disposal of natural resources, energy reserves, and labor force, economic and transport infrastructure, defense and military potential, market, technology, science, education, culture and numerous other connections.

The collapse of the USSR led to a sharp deterioration in regional security. The dissolution of the Soviet Union and the USSR was not followed by the dissolution of NATO but accelerated integration processes in the West began. In the former members of the VU, separatism, terrorist organizations and various forms of confrontation and conflicts appeared among the newly created states. Bearing in mind all these unfavorable trends, Russia was also forced to influence the formation of new integrations. The response to those trends began on June 15, 2001, when the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) was formed, with a Declaration (<http://www.ehu.es/ceinik/tratados>) signed by the presidents of five independent states from the former Soviet Union and the president of the People's Republic of China. The basic function of this organization was the achievement of regional security, and the need for other forms of cooperation in the economy, culture, science, education and other areas immediately appeared. Today, SCO represents one of the most successful international projects. SCO (<http://www.infoshos.ru/>) members are countries that cover about 60% of the territory of Eurasia.

The main areas of cooperation between the member countries of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization are politics, security and economy. The Declaration on the establishment of the SCO states that the goals of the organization are "strengthening mutual trust, friendship and good neighborly relations, ensuring and preserving peace, security and stability in the region, building a new, democratic, just and rational political and economic international order".

The Collective Security Treaty Organization (CSTO) is another integration alliance in the post-Soviet space that deals with security. It was created in October 2002, in accordance with the Agreement on Collective Security of May 15, 1992. CSTO members are Russia, Kazakhstan, Belarus, Armenia, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan.

From a geopolitical point of view, the area of Central Asia has always had great importance for international relations, but only the development of political geography enabled the formulation of the first geopolitical ideas at the beginning of the last century, which look at the influence of geographical factors on political decisions from a global perspective. In order to highlight the geopolitical and geostrategic importance of this region in world politics, the British geopolitical theorist Halford Mackinder, in his work "Democratic Ideas and Reality", in 1919 designated the "Heartland" or "Heart of the World" as part of the Eurasian space "which is being drained towards the Arctic or within the continent", i.e. the area from which the rivers flow to the inland seas and the Arctic Ocean. The "Heartland" thus defined covers a huge area, a significant part of which is Central Asia. He believed that whoever could control this region can control the whole world (Mackinder, 1919).

With the end of the Cold War, Central Asia is developing into an important geostrategic and geo-economics region, which significantly affects all economic, political and security trends in the international community. With the collapse of the Soviet Union, new independent Central Asian states appeared on the global scene: Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan, stretching from the Caspian Lake to the western borders of China. Faced with the numerous challenges of the political and economic transition, they were quickly included in the geopolitical calculations of the world's powerful states.

At that time, the Russian influence in the international community was too weak to sufficiently stabilize the region, and on the other hand, the influences coming from outside were insufficient to destabilize it more strongly, because it was certain that they would be faced with a reaction of Russia, regardless of its power at the time. Nevertheless, in that part of the world, a security and geopolitical vacuum was created, which opened the possibility for a fundamental change in international relations, especially their political-security aspects, and the establishment of new alliances.

In the current circumstances, for the US, Central Asia represents a strategically important area due to the fight against terrorism, but above all due to the huge reserves of oil and natural gas located in that area. September 11 and after the war in Afghanistan brought Central Asia into the spotlight of international attention due to its strategic importance for the West, as an important geopolitical space. However, it should be mentioned that the USA, in the period from 1922 to 1991, when the independent states of Central Asia were an integral part of the USSR, had very little contact with them and that, therefore, the American view of this area was rather "blurred", and in 1991 they faced the challenge of building relations with countries with which they had not previously cooperated much (<http://sr.wikipedia.org/>).

The idea of a single economic space was proposed at the beginning of the nineties of the last century¹, after the former Soviet republics declared their independence and formed the Commonwealth of Independent States. The integration project aimed to create a unified economic policy and create a unified commission to regulate customs tariffs and trade. In February 1999, Russia, Belarus, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan signed the Agreement on the Customs Union and the Common Economic Area, which provided for three stages of integration:

- Eurasian Economic Community and Free Trade Zone,
- Customs Union,
- Common economic space.

The Eurasian Economic Community (EEC, Russian: ЕВРАЗЭС) is based on the principles of the United Nations and international law, and has had observer status at the UN General Assembly since 2003. The Agreement on the Establishment of the Eurasian Economic Community was signed on October 10, 2000 in Astana, capital of Kazakhstan, and entered into force on May 30, 2001, after it was ratified by the parliaments of the member states². Members of the Eurasian Economic Community since its foundation are Russia, Belarus, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan. Ukraine and Moldova have had observer status since May 2002, and Armenia since January 2003.

The United States of America and its allies systematically criticize and try to disqualify Eurasian integrations, trying to portray them as the new USSR, as if they were logical and the only justified integrations in the West. As the then Secretary of State Hillary Clinton stated in December 2012: "The USA will not allow the reconstruction of the USSR in a new version under the guise of economic integration, which is being created under the coercion of Moscow" (<http://www.globalaffairs.ru>). Such unfounded theses serve to maintain the global advantage of the USA in modern international relations, preventing the coalition of the great powers and civilizations of Europe and Eurasia, primarily Russia, Germany, China and Japan.

It is characteristic that today the struggle for influence in Central Asia is being waged precisely between the EU and the USA, on the one hand, and Russia and China, on the other. All the mentioned powers have quite strong positions due to several historical, political, economic and cultural factors. The fact that Russia and the republics of Central Asia were part of the former Russian Empire and later the USSR, gives Moscow the opportunity to attract them into the sphere of its own cultural influence, in every respect. On the other hand, the USA is proposing to the region a new integration project, the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP). The central place in the realization of this plan is given to Afghanistan, and it basically envisages the reconstruction of what was destroyed by the war in this country. The essence of the American plan is that it expresses the will to manage Afghanistan through a new project, but not the willingness to invest money, but they hope and expect that the surrounding countries will do it for them (<http://vvv.profi-forek.org>).

In recent years, China has emerged as a leader in the region, compared to Russia and the US. Its future potential, along with its current wealth, are the best argument in negotiations with its neighbors. It invests mostly in Central Asia and provides political support to those countries and improves bilateral relations. China has for Central Asia its proposal of integration project

¹ This idea was presented by Nursultan Nazarbayev, the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan, in his speech at the Lomonosov State University in Moscow in March 1994, two years after the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) was founded.

² The Agreement on the establishment of the EEC was amended by the Protocols on Amendments of January 25, 2006 and October 6, 2007.

"Silk Road Economic Belt", which it strongly promotes. The project involves the construction of a new transport corridor that would connect China via Kazakhstan, Russia and Belarus with Western Europe.

Russia's idea of the development of the Eurasian Union is aimed at preserving its leadership position in the countries of the post-Soviet space, where most of them are the countries of the former Soviet Union, while China, adhering to the idea of the "Silk Road Economic Belt", seeks to create a Eurasian economic zone, which would form China, the countries of Central Asia and Europe. That competition between the great powers is primarily motivated by the struggle for resources and competition in the economic and economic sphere.

Ukraine is a key country for Russia and for the leading states of the EU, the USA and their geopolitical interests in Europe and Eurasia. Kyiv's foreign policy, after the Cold War, was constantly changing, depending on the election results, pressure from the USA and the EU, the price of Russian gas transportation and the economic situation. Depending on the action of those factors, they were on the side of the West or turned towards Russia.

By including Ukraine in political, economic and security integration, under the auspices of the EU and NATO, the USA, in cooperation with the leading countries of Europe, tried to achieve its strategic goal of breaking out on the borders of the European part of Russia, in order to manifest a latent and permanent threat and a continuous crisis in the states on its borders, as well as by causing crises in the border areas in the west and south of Russia, tried to challenge and diminish its status as a global world power. The ultimate goal of the campaign against Russia and the East is essentially to bring under control the huge resources and the area of Eurasia, and then change the value system in those countries and create a larger number of new smaller states, following the model of the former SFRY. Many geopoliticians in the West make different analyzes about the need to divide Russia into several states and to destroy its imperial character and potential forever. Thus, according to their scenarios, Russia would cease to exist as a superpower, which throughout history was a dam for all empires and ultimately the judge of their disappearance. Also, Russia is trying to preserve Ukraine outside the process of its violent transfer to the side of the West, under the guise of democratization, as the cradle of its own ethnic and state-building identity, but also as a country that civilizationally, economically and militarily-strategically barrages the offensive space of the West up to the Russian borders (Stepic, 2013)..

Russia, without influence on Ukraine, has less importance for European developments and would remain more of an Asian country in whose lobby NATO's offensive combat forces would be installed. This would directly threaten Russia's security and reduce the reaction time of its defense system. That is why Russia has no alternative in terms of its national interests in part of Ukraine, especially in the east and southeast, where the majority of the Russian people live.

It is indisputable that Ukraine is deeply divided both nationally and religiously, into the south-eastern part determined to join the Russian Federation and the rest of the country, which is mostly determined to integrate into the EU and NATO, with the fact that there are parts in the west mostly inhabited by Poles, Hungarians and Slovaks. The political and territorial future of Ukraine is uncertain because it is a deeply divided society nationally, ideologically, religiously and socially, especially in terms of value systems.

5. THE FUTURE OF EURASIAN RELATIONS

The future of the European Union cannot be built on opposition and conflict with Russia and other Eurasian states. On the contrary, avoiding confrontations and erasing the lines and points of conflict is the way out for European and Asian countries to live in peace. That unique

continent, economically and security-wise, should function harmoniously, building mutual trust through constructive dialogue and developing and improving mutual cooperation. The movement of NATO to the East will lead, in addition to Ukraine, to new points of confrontation and for a long time will make the area of conflicts of interests in Eurasia unstable. When it comes to the effects of the introduction of sanctions and blockades, economic and even political, they only represent a sure way to new or deepening of existing confrontations and conflicts.

In Europe, on the basis of divisions and conflicting interests, two world wars began and caused the greatest consequences in the history of the human race, in terms of the scale of human victims and material destruction. The application of double standards in international relations and exclusivity, blockades and the use of force can lead this region, and subsequently the world, into a vicious spiral of violence from which no one would emerge victorious. The nations of Europe and Eurasia would suffer the most.

It remains to be hoped that the wisdom of the political elites in the countries of Europe and Asia will find the right way out in a compromise, and not in the constant deepening of the existing ones and the creation of new security divisions and problems. The accumulation of weapons and military personnel along the line of conflict and the construction of the so-called Anti-missile shield³ are a sure way to suffering, not to security and prosperity. If one's intention is for the EU and Russia to clash for a long time, then it can become a world problem and threaten European and global security in the near future.

The strategic partnership of the Republic of Serbia with the Russian Federation represents a strong confirmation of the historical and spiritual closeness and friendship of the two nations and a broad framework for strengthening overall cooperation. It is based on democratic values inherited by both countries, the principles of sovereignty, equality and territorial integrity of states, peaceful resolution of conflicts, mutual respect and benefits, non-interference in the internal affairs of other states.

6. CONCLUSION

European integrations, that is, the inclusion of new countries in the EU and NATO, formally take place without political coercion, on a voluntary basis, with full understanding of mutual benefits and obligations. In essence, these are all directed and directed processes, with the creation of public opinion in those countries, and if necessary, through the implementation of various forms of pressure and conditioning, and then dependence on those supranational institutions. The security problems in Europe became so much bigger that the former members of the Warsaw Pact were admitted quickly and without essential need, many of which did not even come close to meeting the requirements for admission to EU or NATO membership. After the dissolution of the Warsaw Pact, it was logical for NATO to dissolve as well and not

³ At the summit in Lisbon in 2010, the leaders of the NATO countries made a decision to build a missile shield in Europe, and the European Phased Adaptive Approach (EPAA) was accepted as the basis of the construction project. Although in the first phase of the project it was planned to install a radar in the Czech Republic, this country abandoned that plan in 2011. The problem that arose with the withdrawal of the Czech Republic was solved by the transfer of operational control over the American AN/TPY-2 type radar in Turkey (from the USA) to NATO in the winter of 2012. The reason for building a missile shield, both in the USA and in Europe, is the development of ballistic missiles in "unstable parts of the world" or, to put it less diplomatically, in "rogue states". In recent years, Iran has been cited, explicitly or implicitly, as the main source of anxiety. Russia opposes the construction of a missile shield in Europe, considering that its security is threatened.

to find a new meaning of existence and become an instrument of power of the largest multinational companies in the West, which are looking for new markets and resources under profitable conditions. It is a process of violent so-called globalization in the function of multinational capital.

After more than two decades after the collapse of the Soviet Union, Russia is increasingly finding its place in the multipolar world, and NATO sees its violent expansion as a problem for its national security. Over the last few years, Russia has made a significant effort to regain its international credibility and overall power. In this regard, it seeks to strengthen its position in Central Asia and to develop relations with the countries of the Commonwealth of Independent States, in order to preserve its leading role among the newly formed states, formed after the collapse of the USSR. By strengthening these countries and cooperating with them, Russia strengthens its national security. The future of Europe, the EU, Russia, China and other European and Asian countries is not in conflict and "drawing some new lines of division", but in cooperation and solving all problems, including security ones, peacefully. The persistence of the USA and Great Britain on the division of Europe directly threatens Eurasian security and brings it to the eve of war.

The secession of Kosovo and Metohija, despite international law and its unilateral recognition by the leading countries of the West, opened a new period of unrest and chaos in the future in Europe, Eurasia and around the world, through the strengthening of secessionist movements and the emergence of new states. That trend is likely to continue, especially since these secessionist movements, in addition to internal contradictions, were fueled by external factors.

Once international law is violated, by the application of military force and violence against a sovereign state, as was done to Serbia, it causes the emergence of such strong changes in international relations that they can hardly be controlled. That is why secessionist movements often start to flourish in countries that have violated international law and return like a boomerang with ill-considered moves and violence. The world today is in the transition of the global security system and the affirmation and profiling of the multipolar world. In that process, the positioning of the state and the people can bring benefits or consequences.

When empires are in conflict, any absolute alignment to any side, small states and peoples, which are in the conflict zone, brings mostly misfortune. That is why, after centuries of suffering and demographic destruction of the national being of the Serbian people, the preservation of military neutrality is of strategic importance for the Republic of Serbia and its positioning in international relations.

LITERATURE

Mladenovic, M, Kilibarda, Z. (2011). Shanghai Cooperation Organization, *Vojno delo*, 24-40.

Mackinder, H. J. (1919). *Democratic Ideas and Reality*, London: Constable and Co.

Parakhonsky, B. (2000). "Central Asia: Geostrategic Survey," Central Asia and the Caucasus Information and Analytical Center.

Scott, James Wesley. (2006). *EU Enlargement, Region Building and Shifting Borders of Inclusion and Exclusion*, Ashgate Publishing Limited.

Stepic, M. (2013). *Geopolitics of Neo-Eurasia*, Institute for Political Studies, Belgrade

Dugin, *Fundamentals of Geopolitics*, Chapter 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, p. 10 and 11, ELEKTRONIC LIBRARY, ModernLib.ru, http://modernlib.ru/books/dugin_aleksandr

Collective Security Treaty Organization, www.odkb-csto.org/media/presentation.ppt

Charter of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, <http://www.soi.org.br/upload/.pdf>