

CHAPTER 1

Politico-military Basics of Security in Asian Pacific Region

1.1. Subject and content of security and stability in APR, its distinctive features toward European system

Up to now, the entire system of security in APR is not finally formed. The region has ample quantity of separate economic organizations - ASEAN (and its Forum for Security cooperation), NAFTA, STES, Forum of APR Economic Cooperation (APEC), and the variety of different politico-military alliances -Australia, New Zealand, Great Britain, Malaysia, - Australia, New Zealand, the USA, - bilateral alliances - Japan - the USA, the USA - Republic of Korea, and other. Process of theirs development is going on.

Until recently think that the security of state at the regional level is possible to provide via allied relations with the USA and strengthening own armed forces. Just therefore here the wide web of agreements of security at multilateral and bilateral principles, headed by the USA, is formed. It is known that politic-allied relations, as directions for providing of security, are based on military superiority over enemies. Therefore realization in practice of such method is not promoted for stability. Further, it results in growth of military spending and levels of equipment of country.

At the same time, as a distinct from Europe, Asia has a lack of effective active and enough strong many-sided political and military institutes. Europe has the European Community, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), the Council of Europe, NATO, as well as other organizations, formed at last decades on the post-Soviet space. Some of it includes states, located in Europe and Asia, such as CIS, SCO, CSTO, which are the special bridges between European and Asian organizations of security.

In Asia, in some degrees ASEAN, the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) for security questions, APEC are more feeble organizations in correspondent with Europe. Neither Russia nor China or any other countries of Eastern Asia are not included into ASEAN. APEC is not more than an advisory body. Finally, Asian security is not provided only by the multilateral agreements, but by the bilateral agreements in partnership with Washington, first of all American-Japan Treaty of Security, and the community of the USA and Republic of Korea, that is a worry factor for other countries of the region. It is obvious that thereby in conditions of deepening of regionalization the widening of existing organizations (ASEAN+1, ASEAN+3) is conducted and new organizations (The East-Asian Community: EAC) are formed.

Such difference between Europe and Asia is stipulated by the historical features. In Europe the international system was fixed by Westphalia Treaty (1648). The new system was based on principles of sovereignty within the frame of state boundaries and nonintervention in outside situation. It was defined that the threat for the national security is the violation of defined boundary by forces. This system had been operating till the end of XX century. But peoples understood its inefficiency away back at years of the Cold war. The powerful military communities of NATO and WPO stood against to each other could be called into action at any moment in consequence of the debugged war machine. And the presence large nuclear arm at opposing sides, in case of use, could cause inconvertible consequences for whole world civilization. Recognition of its danger brought to appearance of new organizations such as the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE in future), to appearance and development beliefs, lay foundation for processes of arms and force reductions, and transformation of whole European system of security.

Disintegration of the Soviet Union finally left behind problems, generated by ideological antagonistic contradictions, and confrontation of two opposite systems equal to these contradictions. New problems and threats appeared which made peoples of Europe to find new approaches to the transformation of security system, based on the principles of collective and universal security. Events of 11.09.2001 in New York played the important role. Tragic consequences of international terrorists' organizations completely made an end of traditional approaches to the security and stability providing.

It became obviously that threats can not proceed only from the activity of other states, but also from the independent organizations which operate on the territory of sovereign states and pursue the incongruous aims with the intentions of these states. Strategies of age of the Cold war are not applicable any longer in Europe, but also outside. Deterrence against aggression doesn't work against the enemy who doesn't have the territory it has to protect. And diplomacy doesn't work if enemy ignores any limitation of its purposes and for its attainment uses the method of destruction of blameless people and makes the governments to accept its provisions. Method of massive terror against the background of running mass destruction weapons, organized crime and other unconventional threats forms danger problems for many independent states. In the past decade, there isn't any state, in spite of its power, which can independently stand against these and others unconventional threats.

Unlike Europe, Asia-Pacific Region has its own specificity. This specificity concludes in the presence of significant differences of political and ideological orientation in the international relations and the presence of vexed economic, territorial, national ethnic, religion and other contradictions which in special conditions can become into armed conflicts. The current situation in APR is characterized by the composite plexus of negative and positive factors and trends, the most important of them are the following:

- Widening of cooperation between states with developed market economy (the USA, Japan, ASEAN countries) and between states, which keep allegiance of its streamlined

socialistic type (China, Vietnam, North Korea).

- Intersection of interests of Russia, the USA, China, Japan in this part of the world, with increasing antagonism between the USA and China, rivalry between China and Japan.

- Increment of inequality of economic development of countries of the region, which is aggravated by the consequences of economy globalization.

- Safety of variety of serious hotbeds of tension, generated by the international political confrontation (the Korean peninsula, Taiwan), in other cases by the unsettlement of territorial demarcation problems, the presence of territorial pretensions of ones states to another (between Japan and Russia, Japan and China, Japan and Republic of Korea, China and Republic of Korea, around the islands in South China Sea between China, Vietnam, Philippines, Malaysia and Brunei).

- Widening of the USA economic domination, active use globalization, international economic, financial organization for realization its egoistic interests.

- Tendency of countries to create regional economic communities and institutes such as ASEAN+1 (Russia), ASEAN+3 (Japan, China, Republic of Korea) for adaptation to globalization and protection from its challenges.

- Serious misbalance of military potentials of different countries of the region under the absolute military superiority of the USA, based on bilateral and multilateral politico-military alliances with APR countries and powerful potential of Navy and forward presence forces.

As the answer this misbalance, People's Republic of China active increases its Air Forces, Naval Forces. In this turn, Japan develops quality of Self-Defense Force, Democratic People's Republic of Korea develops mass destruction weapons. Now, there are six of eight most numerous armies of the world in the region. In the issue military indicators of main countries of the region are increased year in year out. Dynamics of military expenses of majority countries of the region is supported at rather high level, its part constitutes (except Japan) from 2,5 to 3,5 percents of gross domestic product. Herewith in Japan, where military expenses are limited by the constitution for 1 percent, together with absolute sizes of gross domestic product, it is rather high.

The dynamic of military expenses of main counties which belong to North-East Asia is shown at Table 2. Governments of these countries consider that high expenses for armament are fully justified and there is no need to conduct international control over it.

Table 2: Dynamic of military expenses of main counties of North-East Asia in the last ten years (1996-2006).

Countries	Military expenses (bill. of The USA doll) every year/					
	1996	1998	2000	2002	2004	2006
China	15 300	17 800	23 000	31 100	35 400	
DPRK		1 343	1 379	1467		
Russia	9100	7 100	9 300	11 400	19 000	24 200
Republic of Korea	12 539	12 398	12 801	13 533		
USA	298 058	296 530	301 697	335 706	455 000	500 000
Taiwan	9606	9 723	7 815	7 295		
Japan	45 293	45 394	45 793	46 727	42 000	45 600

The penetration of India and Pakistan into number of nuclear-weapon states and active rearmament these countries can be added to these factors, it proves about essential influence on the military policy of other states, APR too.

Named features, as well as negative trends and factors are deepen by current lagging of the region behind European processes of forming international security organizations, real disarmament and consolidation of democratic principles, observance of human rights, conserved instability of domestic situation and various level of economy and social development of states. Thereunder, European developmental model cannot be correctly used for formation of more effective security system in APR. The usage of positive experience in limitation and reduction in force and armaments in Europe seems more difficult.

And still, in spite of presence of named and some other alarm events, the situation in APR is stable. Can current security system in future provide stability in this region?

It is difficult to deny that bilateral relations are still protecting certain value for the support of regional stability. Especially it concerns American-Japan relations. Nuclear guarantees of the USA and American contingent dislocated in Japan serve for other countries as evidence that Japan will not undertake high measures for rearmament.

But this system of “checks and balances” in the sphere of security falls to pieces as far as the alternation of generations of leaders-politicians, which are regulated by profound changes in the regional and global politico-military situation of preparation of overall national strategy.

The relations between the USA and Japan are changing in the direction, cause disquiet of other Asian countries. Tokyo, warned nuclear threat on the part of Pyongyang and increasing of military power of People's Republic of China, reconsiders its attitude to the necessity of powerful defense forces and forms for it a legislative base - the fact which proves inconvertibility of its process. Dispatch of peacekeeping forces in Iraq and latter conflicts with North Korean Navy give evidence that Japan tries to behave like ordinary country.

The next problem connects with mutual relations between the USA and Republic of Korea. As presidents Kim Dae-jung and Roh Moo-hyun had been in power last 10 years, a new generation of Koreans appeared. This generation intends to reconciliation with North Korea, but not to confrontation. Most of South Korean young people regard that the USA are more serious security hazard than power structure of Kim Jong Il. This sense appeared in consequence of diplomatic blunder of administration of President Bush at the beginning of thirteenth period his government, feared of rapprochement two Korean States. Administration prudent wrecked "Sunshine policy" of Kim Dae-jung, which was pointed at reconciliation with North Korea, thus provoked revolt of whole generation of South Korean young people, against stereotypes of Cold War.

Outwardly, alliance of the USA and South Korea looks reliable: cabinet of Roh Moo-hyun dispatched own peacekeeping forces in Iraq, tried to demonstrate allegiance to good relations with the USA. However, incomprehension can repeat easy, in future enlarge in spirals in situation when Korean criticize the USA of superfluous hostility against Pyongyang, and Washington will negative react to unfavorable, according to its opinion, attitude from South Korea.

Such trends afford ground come to a decision of possibility to stepwise degradation of regional security system, formed at second half of 20 century.

But what can change it? Resorting to some aspects of European APR. For example, as for solubility of problem of stress drop, limitation and reduction of force and armament, in the region, special optimism infuses next its measure: historical political, ideological and military confrontation comes short of scale and character to that confrontation, which was in Europe. It differs from those by favorable qualitatively quantitatively characteristics of level armament and military equipment and medium density of its concentration. Most of regional countries have wish for following the course of establishment and development of good neighborly relations, beliefs and all-round cooperation. Rise of activity of integration processes between the regional states in economic sphere.

Altogether, APR and states of Eastern Asia are far from formation interstate structure like European Community. Here, integration cooperation comes to life, firstly, at level of Asian-Pacific economy cooperation, secondly at level of subregional groups (ASEAN+1 etc.), thirdly at level of bilateral interstate connections. It is possible to add projects of formation free trade area of Japan with Singapore, Republic of Korea, Mexico, Chile, and China with ASEAN.

In North-East Asia significant step forward within the frame of regional economic integration was taken by Japan, China, Republic of Korea, coordinate its activity in financial, trade and investment spheres. They formed tripartite commission develops projects of common energy circle, monetary union, free trade area, free business area of Northeast Asia, transportation corridor from Northeast Asia to Europe (through the Russian territory), Northeast Asia Development Bank. Russia likewise the USA plan interest to cooperation like partner in these subregional projects. It appears that full engagement of Russia into regional integration processes - question of time.

In recent years, in system of foreign relations role of ASEAN countries well grown up, cooperation between ASEAN and international people's community is enlarged. In 2005, in Kuala Lumpur, was ninth summit ASEAN+3, starring China, Japan and South Korea. Traditional summits ASEAN+1, include first in history - Russia - ASEAN also was here.

Besides, based on operating mechanism of "ASEAN + 3," as well as of India, Australia and New Zealand was proclaimed formation of new perspective interstate community - Eastern-Asian community. This community at its complex political and economic potential may have huge effect on the world processes and become serious counterbalance to politico-economical influence of the USA.

In prospect, in the estimation of M.L. Titarenko, director of Institute of Far East of Russian science academy, with attaching of Russia to Eastern-Asian community, it is possible to form common integration community in Northeast Asia - sui generis Eastern-Asian community. According to his opinion formation of such interstate subregional institutes like regional countries macroeconomic and financial policy coordination council, Northeast Asia Transport and Environmental Assets Development Council, Northeast Asia Research and Technology Policy Council. These institutes, called to provide attraction of resources for solution of problems, at the same time might become a basis of infrastructure of integration Eastern-Asian Community.

On the other hand, successful development of processes of economic integration might create conditions for solution of problems in sphere of military security. In the capacity of first step to rapprochement of views of different states of the region for this problem can be coming together of its military doctrines, or at least, most important political and strategic doctrinal regulations.

1.2. Doctrinal views of main states of East Asia, necessity of its simultaneous analysis and coming together of doctrinal principles and regulations for the assistance to regional security

The contents of military doctrine of one or another state always appeals for its neighbors. In recent decennaries, this interest is aggravated for a score of reasons. In capacity of main reasons we consider: firstly, cardinal changes and intensive development of globalization

processes, primarily in spheres of economy and finances and informatics. Following facts become its consequence: firstly, substantial transformation of foreign relations system, strengthening of interrelation interdependence of different countries; secondly, possibility of most vagarious and pernicious aftermaths of military conflicts not only for belligerent states but also for whole world civilization because of intensive rise of capabilities of armament systems and military equipment systems according to range, accuracy, power and time of death-dealing effect. This inevitably leads to diffusion of borders between threats to national security and international security; thirdly, threats get another features, become global in show, its “bearers” in many ways are abstracted and untransparent.

After September terrorist acts in 2001, in the USA it was manifest that counteraction of all these negative fact events involves coordinated actions on international community with revelation and prediction of military threats and effective counteraction against it.

Against this, at last deccenaries in military sphere is designed and develops landmark line of military cooperation - reconcilment of military doctrines of different states for demilitarization relations between them, strengthening of international peace and stability, joining together efforts of concerned states for counteraction to attempts of its violation.

Principles and content of military doctrines become theme of international consultations and talks, and its results are recommended for pinning in international talks. For example, in 1983, United Nations General Assembly passed resolution 38/75, which criticized formation, promotion, development and propaganda of political and military doctrines, are called prove the rightfulness of use of nuclear weapon. In 1990, 21 of December, this organization passed remarkable resolution. It is said in the resolution that armed forces of all countries must do next missions of war prevention, individual and collective self-protection, and join actions according to V11 of United Nations Charter concerning threats for the world, violation of the world and aggressive acts, that “defensive potentials represent original requirements of defense.”

Now, these adjustments are realized in many national doctrines, including Russian military doctrine.

In Europe, since the middle of 80 years, the seminars on discussion of the military doctrines and coordination doctrinal installations with the purposes of strengthening the international peace are regularly carried out (last of them was carried in the beginning 2006 year). Opening of the first Viennese seminar concerning the military doctrines, Dr. And Mok, in that time former minister of foreign affairs of Austria, said: “the military doctrines seminar is a historical step in a direction of political safety, is based on cooperation.” Time confirmed correctness of these words.

In the plan of above it is necessary to note, that increase of a role the APR in system of the international relations, and also presence here of problems in the sphere of military security actualize activization of dialogue under the military doctrines here again.

Saved by us, the experience of job in the sphere of formation of the military doctrines

gives the basis to make a conclusion that the comparative analysis of doctrinal installations should be spent according to complex techniques. In account it is necessary to accept not only military potential of one or another state, but also political intentions of its politico-military administration, and also degree of practical preparation of the country and its armed forces to their realization. Separately they can be regarded only as the factors of potential military danger, which at all are not a basis for feverish answer-back military preparations, for death of economic resources of the state in a fortification structure, which then will become over with grass nepenthes.

Conversely, it is necessary to strengthen good-neighborhood relations, to wash away an image of an enemy in consciousness each other, to form transparent sphere of military activity, with the method of active dialogue under the contents and orientation of the military doctrines. It not pacifist slogan, it is a vital axiom, likewise that any political-diplomatic efforts can be effective only in the event that they base on sufficient for a defense of the country military power.

Not accidentally, in the military doctrine Russia (besides, as well as many other states) refused from traditional personification of threats a priori. Indeed, point at concrete opponent, it is necessary to carry out appropriate military politics. Thus the exact address definition of state - enemy will predetermine its answer-back and adequate reaction, that fraught for arms race. Therefore in the military doctrine it is enough to define the factors, with which the military threats are caused. For example, in the Russian military doctrine is quite objectively specified, that today and in the nearest prospect politico-military situation is defined by such factor as reduction of danger of initiation of large-scale war, including nuclear. But, alongside with it, there are processes of formation and strengthening of the regional centers of force, which pretend to more significant a role in the world community. The process of development of states, formed at the end of the last century is not completed. And on such background especially dangerous become: activization national-ethnic and religious separatism; use for achievement of political purposes extremely wild-eyed methods of struggle, such as terrorism, and exit of these forms on the international level; strengthening of regional arms race; proliferation of the weapon of a mass destruction and equipment for its delivery; an aggravation of an information antagonism; escalation of local wars and armed conflicts.

In view of it in the Russian doctrine is predicted (and full has proved to be true practically), that destabilizing influence on politico-military situation will render:

Activity of wild-eyed nationalist, religious, separative, terrorist movements, organizations and structures and expansion of scales of terrorism organized criminality, trafficking of the weapon and drugs;

Distribution of the mass destruction weapons and equipment of its delivery;

Attempts to ignore existing mechanisms of maintenance of the international security (first of all UN);

Use of the military-power actions as a means “of humanitarian intervention” without the sanction United Nations Security Council, around of the conventional principles and norms of international law;

Infringement by the separate states of the international contracts and agreements in the sphere of restriction of arms and disarmament;

Use by the subjects of the international relations information and others (including nonconventional) means and technologies in aggressive and expansionary purposes etc.

Possessed experience shows, that with the purposes of the comparative analysis of the military doctrines of the various states from the methodical point of view their key provisions are expedient to divide into three groups.

The first group can include doctrinal provisions of the states of the region having a similar orientation.

The second group is provisions on which in the different countries exist essential distinctions.

The third group is an area, where the divergences doctrinal views objectively are available, but there are also opportunities of their rapprochement.

Certainly, the task consists not in making monotonous the doctrines of the various states. The analysis is necessary that such distinctions correctly were understood and were perceived by all interested parties. That there were no ambiguities concerning what methods one or another is going by to provide the security, where there is a threshold of application for these purposes of military force, as the political intentions and military activity of one states will have an effect on regional stability and safety others.

As shows the analysis, similarity of a substantial part pronounced doctrinal installations of the USA, People's Republic of China, Russia, Japan and some other states of East Asia, basically, is shown:

- with the purposes of (protection of the country and allied states from aggression from the outside);

- in an orientation of the military doctrines (everywhere - defense);

- in a recognition of the nuclear weapon as politico-military means for restraint of aggression and necessity of active counteraction to distribution weapon of mass destruction and technologies of its manufacture;

- in expansion of a spectrum of tasks of the armed forces. Except traditional, - on protection of the vital interests of the state, - peacekeeping, antiterrorist tasks, and also for the prevention and liquidation of consequences technogenic and spontaneous failures and accidents are assigned. In some sources the decision of new tasks is assigned to the armed forces in frameworks so called “of operations of a not military type.”

It is necessary to notice, what is it similarity can seriously be broken by new nuclear strategy, discussed in the USA. With its acceptance the American militarians receive the right for preventive application of the nuclear weapon against terrorist organizations in case of

creation by them the threat of application of the weapon of a mass defeat against America. In definition of a spectrum of sources of military danger and threats the similarity of the military doctrines of the various states is only partial. It caused by objective historical and other factors. As to the particularly military doctrine of Russia, already now in it there is a number of other countries, rather close with the doctrines of the region of estimations on many threats to safety. In particular, - connected with activization of activity of the international terrorist groupings, and also saving in various regions of the world by the centers of the military conflicts and zones of instability, development of military technologies and means of the armed struggle, distribution of the weapon of mass destruction and equipment of its delivery.

After the large-scale operations which have been carried out by the terrorists on Caucasus in 1999 (intrusion into Dagestan), in the USA in September, 2001, terrorist acts in Moscow, Tokyo, Paris and in many cities of Southeast Asia there is no doubts that the international terrorism and connected with it smuggling of the weapon, trafficking drugs, ethnic-religion extremism and illegal migration have turned to the factors undermining security not only the separate countries, but also stability all over the world.

On some data, today in the world is totaled about 500 illegal terrorist organizations. The cumulative budget in sphere of a terror is estimated annually from 5 up to 20 billions dollars that is comparable to the military budget of Russia. As a result of terrorisms began capable to spend not only separate actions, but also large-scale terrorist operations, has got an opportunity thus to bid defiance to whole world community. The national doctrines of the countries APR can take into account this fact.

Addressing to listed by us is higher to the factors of military danger stated in the military doctrine of Russia, we could be convinced that in her the due attention is given to this question. Moreover, in Russia at an official level of terrorism in modern conditions is considered "as one of means of achievement of political ends various extremist, nationalist and other organizations," that the war lifts it on one level with such extreme means of policy, as war.

From here and attitude in Russia to terrorism not only in the conceptual plan, but also in practice. The successful realization of operation for destruction of the intruded gangs of the international and Chechen terrorists in Dagestan in July-August 1999 and its end in Chechnya became possible as a result of organization of the centralized control system on behalf of join headquarters by a grouping armed forces on Northern Caucasus and close interaction between the Armed Forces of Russian Federation, other armies, military formations and bodies.

After relapses of terrorism in territory of the central-Asian states it has been recognized necessary to unite effort interested in joint struggle with terrorism of all states CIS. The real step in this direction is made: by the decision governments of the CIS countries (Yalta, October, 1999) it is created interstate antiterrorist center. The regional antiterrorist structure is

created and within the limits of the Shanghai organization of cooperation. Effective measures on counteraction international terrorist's organizations are undertaken by the Organization of the Contract about collective safety. With a view of strengthening counterterrorist potential of the organization was about the list of the terrorist and extremist organizations generated on the base of national lists. The uniform list terrorist is formed, the extremist-terrorists organizations concerning which - member CSTO takes each state engagement to take corresponding criminal or administrative measures.

Steps on strengthening of Joint Forces of Fast Deployment of the region of Central Asia (JFFD CAR) are accepted. So, in planning of JFFD CAR their possible escalating depending on developing conditions is incorporated. With opening the Russian avia base in the Kant (Kyrgyz Republic) has been essentially strengthened aviation component of JFFD. And creation of the Russian military base in territory of Tajikistan essentially strengthens not only southern boundaries of our union, but also all military component of organization. Besides are created constantly operating a working commission of experts concerning struggle against terrorism and extremism, and also working group on counteraction to illegal migration. It will allow developing target offers in spheres of struggle with aforementioned threats at the regional level, to coordinate measures for its neutralization and to exclude parallelism in activity of CSTO and other organizations, acting the post Soviet space.

It is also necessary to note, that the important step in sphere of coordination of measures for counteraction financings of terrorist activity and legalization of criminal incomes is reception of CSTO of the status of the constant observer in the Eurasian working group created in October, 2004. It enables to unify national legislations in sphere of struggle against financing terrorism. At the same time there is a process of formation the practical mechanism of coordination of activity of the countries-members of CSTO in into the sphere visa, migratory and boundary policy. In Russia perfection antiterrorist legislation proceeds. The significant part of accepted laws is directed on creation of legal bases of use of Armed forces of the Russian Federation for counteraction of terrorist activity with military means that will allow them to solve corresponding problems. The federal Defense law is supplemented with new item, according to the Armed Forces can participate in counterterrorist operations with the usage of military means is given to the Armed forces. As a result of acceptance of the law of Ministry of Defense of Russia will not have the right, but also it is obliged to have the divisions of special purpose intended for performance it is direct problems of anti-terror. These divisions should be provided by corresponding arms and are trained to special tactics of actions. Means for it should be registered by separate line in the budget of military department.

The legal field of application of army will be and to extend further. So, the President of the Russian Federation Vladimir Putin suggested to deputies of the State Duma to specify and the order of use Armed Forces at suppression of the international terrorist activity by them outside the territories of Russia. It is supposed, that the decision on a direction for

performance of antiterrorist operations will be accepted by the head of the state to limits of the country of military formations on the basis of the corresponding decision of Council of Federation of Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation. Thus the president - Supreme commander in chief begins to define the general strength involved formations BC, areas of their actions, problems, term of stay and the order of replacement. The formations of Armed forces participating in such counterterrorist actions will be completed on a voluntary basis military men passing military service under the contract after passage of preliminary special preparation by them.

The great value in national and in international scale is given struggle against terrorism and in doctrinal documents of the USA which recognize terrorism as transnational threat. In the report of the American president "Strategy of national security" the USA in following century (December, 1999) is devoted to this problem independent section. In it is spoken, that the United States consistently realize from effort on revealing and punishment of terrorists and are measured to detain and prosecute those persons which threaten the American citizens. "We do not do any concessions to terrorists. We to the full use legal mechanisms for punishment of the international terrorists; we take measures for restriction of activity of foreign terrorists and their networks in our country and we expand practice of application financial sanctions against those who supports terrorists. We also take measures on reduction of number of terrorist bases abroad and to counteraction to support of terrorists from other countries, and also we help the foreign governments to strength their national opportunities with the given sphere. Until terrorists will threaten the American citizens, we reserve the right to self-defense with the aid of drawings of impacts on bases of terrorists and on those who finance them and is active support." On the basis of partnership in business of struggle against the international terrorism in the Russian and American military doctrines there were installations about an opportunity and expediency of drawing on bases of terrorists of anticipatory impacts.

That these installations are not the simple declaration, confirms the fact assault the USA in 1998 of a series of impacts on the Osama bin Laden's base located in Afghanistan where there were key elements of a terrorist network which served as training camp for thousand terrorists from all countries of the world. American Armed Forces also have struck on factory in Sudan (Khartoum) which, according to investigation, entered into a network of the bin Laden and made components of the chemical weapon. It is remarkable, that, allocating itself powers on struggle against terrorism in universal scale, the American management did not recognize for the time being the similar rights behind other states, in particular beyond Russia, even within the limits of its national borders. In the same message it is spoken: "The actions undertaken by the Russian party in the Chechen Republic cannot be justified by necessity of maintenance with her of the legitimate right for protection of territorial integrity of the state, and also its citizens from terrorism and lawlessness." It is necessary to notice, that the situation with application of similar double standards cardinal changed after known

terrorist operation of the same bin Laden's Islamic extremists against the United States in the September of 2001, lead already within the limits of the America. After that Russia and America steel partners in antiterrorist struggle. And it is quite natural, for transboundary character of actions of the international terrorism demands association of efforts of all states and the international organizations for maintenance of due repulse to this harm.

Serious changes become ripe in the United States and in the field of the military planning. Minister of Defense D. Rumsfeld, speaking about problems in the field of defense, formulated in new strategy of defense on 21 century (the Analysis of a condition and prospects of development of defense “is completely stated in the document,” presented to the congress of the USA on September, 30th, 2001). Has emphasized, that planning in sphere of defense last years was substantially defined by poverty of imagination - loop on a small set dangers which were more likely habitual, than probable. Therefore, it has declared, we should transfer the centre of gravity in our system of defenses- of planning from model which starting moment was threat and which till now dominated over the theory of our defense, on the model leaning forces and means, necessary in the future. Instead of concentrating attention to what will appear our next opponent or where there can be a war, we should concentrate on methods of actions of the possible opponent - and, accordingly, to develop new opportunities for its restraint and defeat.

Instead of planning large-scale conventional wars on the sharp assigned theatres of actions we have to predict our new enemies who may rely on an element of surprise, deception and who may also use non-usual weapon (for example, the airliners as a missile) to accomplish their aims.

It appears that this innovative strategy of development of the US military doctrine can interest in war analytics and planners in other states which cooperates with the US in the geopolitical and strategic spheres.

The problem of terrorism in military doctrines of other states is not so discussed as it is in Russian and American doctrines. At the same time the Chinese doctrine says that “different terrorists and extremists forces are still endangering the international community.” But it doesn't endanger China. The Chinese representatives said about this at the international conference in the Far East Institute RAN. We can agree or disagree with this, remembering the secession movement in Tibet and Xinjiang Uygur Autonomous Regions and readiness of extremists forces (at least in this region) to use terrorism for creation of a new independent state. But Chinese experts aren't cheating. Even potential terrorists can't recline on any success due to sensible progress in economic and social spheres as a result of carrying reforms combined with the effective system of control and counteractions against the attempts to break the constitutional order. Nevertheless, the Chinese management is solidary with other members of the international community in their antiterrorist protection.

The term “military doctrine” isn't used formally in Japan. The reason is the Constitution which formally proclaims refusal of creation of Armed Forces. Otherwise, the main views of

military doctrine are in the program documents of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Department of National Defense which define foreign and military policy and in the instructions and manuals of use Self-defense Forces. These views are regularly published in the “White Book.”

According to the views of military community, there are two types of possible aggressions against Japan: direct and indirect. The indirect aggression (it can be also terrorism) is understood as an appearance of any political, economic, social and other riots and uproars inside the country and their development, supported from outside, in the civil war.

In case of this aggression Armed Forces must provide necessary support to Public Security Forces in quelling antigovernment demonstrations.

As we can see there is not any document in Japan military doctrine about any direct terrorism threat. But, according to that, one of the requirement to Armed Forces is its trained personnel and equipment for the operations of “disaster control and counterterrorist protection, and also within the UN peacekeeping forces.” Possibility of this threat can’t be eliminated.

In recent years Japan military doctrine views were significantly modified. As some mass media informed, the Parliament of Japan adopted some laws in 29th of October 2001, entered the way to the counterterrorist campaign outside the country. These new laws vest power in Japan Self-defense Forces to provide logistic support to the members, headed by the USA, of counterterrorist coalition and to take security measures for American bases in Japan. These laws and the support of Japan to the coalition are important not only for the counterterrorism campaign, but also for the strengthening American-Japan relations in future. Japan also provides humanitarian economic support to an affected country and cooperates on the solution of refugees problem.

The new program of national security, adopted by Japan Parliament in 10th of December 2004, considers international terrorism and proliferation of mass destruction weapon and means of its delivery as new threats. It also emphasizes some other factors of instability as the situation at the Korea Peninsula and the Taiwan Strait, presence of large group of forces with nuclear weapon in the region (Russia and China), and also Armed Forces modernization in some countries of APR.

A new program explicates Japan approaches to the development of international cooperation in interests of safety and stability in the world. In this sphere it’s supposed to concentrate main efforts on the counterterrorism protection, conflict prevention, exclusion of proliferation of mass destruction weapon and means of its delivery. Japan intends to conduct cooperation with the international community on providing the security of international sea lines.

Japan liberal-democratic party is planning in its program, adopted in September 2005, to explore the question of development of common law which will provide possibility of immediate response in different situations (“The Basic Law of International cooperation.”) It

plans these steps in interests of the international cooperation (with using laws “About special counterterrorist measures” 2001 and “About special measures of assistance with reconstruction of Iraq.”)

According to these doctrines, the working conception of “basic defense forces” accommodates to requirements of creation of multi-functional universal forces capable for the effective response to different threats and resistance terrorism inside or outside Japan.

Our analysis (even so short) of terrorism problem as one of the actual current threats shows us the necessity of evolution in future of the doctrines on this question in the different countries.

On the other side, even the implementation of all-sides developed military doctrines will have some difficulties till a new international law basis, in common with national laws, will be created. Up to now the international community didn't develop a term of international terrorism. This fact makes difficult the effective and collective counteraction of this threat to the national and international security. Every state uses its own legal acts and national norms in the definition of the features of political terrorism. There isn't any agreement in the world on the international counterterrorism protection which has any special provisions dedicated to the action of terrorist organizations.

It's seemed to us that not every state is ready for the correct definition which can become a wall against invisible terrorism support and using for its long-term aims as it was during the idealistic and geopolitical confrontation of the “cold war.” The common and acceptable definition of international terrorism for every state must be formed even for a light forward impulse. This definition must be written to the UN documentation. Unfortunately this aim wasn't reached at the UN General Assembly which was held in September 2005. Great hopes were pinned on this summit, but the common definition of terrorism wasn't adopted again.

The uncontrolled proliferation of mass destruction weapon is the other similar and, in the same time, dissonant element of military doctrines of APR. During one of the common press-conferences of Russian and American Ministers of Defense S.Ivanov and D.Rumsfeld (Kremlin 3rd of November 2001) it was announced that “the presence of access to the types of mass destruction weapon becomes priority-oriented and bulls on solving terrorist problem. Our countries acknowledge this.”

The problems of uncontrolled proliferation of mass destruction weapon after the terrorist acts in the Tokyo metro, mailing messages with Siberian plague in the US and some other states, appearance of information about Osama's nuclear weapon made some statesmen and military men to change their points of view. It became evident that internal instability of some nuclear states (for example, situation in Pakistan during holding the counterterrorist operation of the USAF on the Afghanistan territory) creates the opportunity for criminal fanatics to capture nuclear arsenals. It causes the real threat to thousands of people in the different countries. We must find the exit from this situation in cooperation.

Talking about the substantial differences in the military doctrines of this region states, we can say that they are mostly dedicated to estimations of the national and international security and also the methods of their liquidation.

For example, some provisions of military doctrines of East Asian states base on nonconfidence and suspiciousness to each other and stipulate force solution of disputes. The differences in the countries estimates of military intentions of each others are the indicators of differences of views on the security problems. In particular China is seriously concerned over the remilitarization of Japan and possibility of creation of a new full-scale military organization in it. The especial disquietude is caused by Japan potential possibility of the creation of nuclear weapon and also by availability of political intentions to realize these possibilities, which were spoken about continually by the head leaders of government and opposite parties in recent years. It's remarkable that the same anticipations were expressed by American experts of late years. They paid the great attention to the creation in Japan capacities of spent nuclear fuel recycling – the problem which drew the great attention of the international community in the context of Iran intention to begin its own spent fuel recycling. In the relation with this, many foreign specialists confirmed that in recent years a lot of different excursions of the war conflict with Japan were studied in the Chinese Military Science Academy.

But in another turn Tokyo also worried about military and technical modernization in China. For the first time in the program document of Japan government concentrates its attention on necessity of careful monitoring of tendencies in China military policy, which is holding now the modernization of Missile Nuclear Forces, Air Forces, Naval Forces, spreading the sphere of Navy influence in the world sea. Inclusion of this provision into the program actually means official acknowledgement of threat Japan from China and necessity of taking corresponded resistant measures. In our days it is being realized practically and it's affirmed by the measures of the reinforcement of Japan Self-defense Forces in southern Japan.

Meanwhile, every of these mentioned countries doesn't consider its own war intentions as the threat somebody. It means that in recent years hardly some countries, enhancing its nuclear power, allow accomplishing control and limitation in this sphere.

Another factor, which demands on closing the positions of this region states on the subject of the contents of military doctrines and the creation of cooperative security mechanisms, is that with the reducing naval power of Russia a vacuum power space appeared in Asian-Pacific Region, which can be filled by other countries. It is showed in the armament race in the region. We talked about it detailed in the appendix 1.1.

It seems to us important to hold the profound discussions over the estimates of threats within the seminars on the military doctrines between military specialists and scientists from China, Russia, the USA, North and South Korea, Japan and other states, interesting in this sphere. This discussion can help all countries with realizing reality or fiction of threats grades

within the military doctrines and theirs conducting, and also it can help with estimating possible measures to realize the intention in the war security sphere.

The second difference between the military doctrines is an attitude to the question of creation and participation in the political-military alliances. Russia considers that the participation in closed military organizations like the alliances between the USA and Japan and the USA and South Korea in peace-time help disintegration states as “who is not with is against us.” It won’t solve the problems of security for all and separate states in face of new threats. Before we said that the conditions of final removal of dividing obstacles of the XX century came in and many countries realized this. But to create a new common defense system in region we need the consolidation efforts of all countries interest in this.

As we can see the second important object of comparative analysis of military doctrines consists in that the evolution of new military and political doctrines must be held only in total accordance with the UN security conception: without any damage to anyone. The experience of the Shanghai collaboration organization confirms possibility of this perspective way.

The idea of widespread development of international relations on the principles of strategic partnership has some prospects for the formation of new military doctrines. In spring 1996 Russia and China decided to develop “equal in rights and reliable partnership for the strategic collaboration in the XXI century.” On July 16th 2001 the Treaty of neighbourliness, friendship and collaboration was signed. This treaty and the successful solution of boundaries problem have the significant bilateral and international importance. When the boundaries between Russia and China became a line of peace and neighbourliness and after the successful implementation of the treaty of trust strengthening in military sphere and Mutual Reduction of Forces and Armaments in the boundary district, it helps to direct means and resources not for building defensive belt, but for the economic development and raising the standards of living. We can see same progress in the trade-economic cooperation.

On November 1998 Moscow and Tokyo signed Moscow declaration where they proclaimed the course towards the creation of relations of “the long-time constructive partnership equitable to the strategic and geopolitical interests.”

Professor A.Bolyatko said that, “as a distinct from the military cooperation of alliances, concluded in searching for the potential enemy and planning cooperative actions against him, the strategic collaboration consists in searching partners to solve common security and development problems.”

To talk about the doctrines provisions we can suppose that the development of common methods of solving disputes can be submitted on the basis of equal rights, mutual trust and cooperation. These methods can be the following:

- the provisions of newly adopted documents can’t include any contraventions of international laws in;

- the priority role of the UN Security Council on solving problems of international region security must be mentioned in the military doctrines;

the regulation of procedure of using military force in the international peacekeeping and counterterrorist operations (the last one can be also peacekeeping as the actions of enforcement to peace) must include vested in the international law provision that these operation can be maintained only according to the UN Security Council and under its control.

The military departments (the main body of counterterrorism protection) could be assigned to the following objectives:

- taking liquidation measures of large terrorists organizations and illegal armed formations; measures of capture and blocking illegal arms, munition, fissile and toxic materials traffic; participation and development of monitoring system; participation in cutting financial and materiel support of terrorists groups;

- control of the forces and facilities on breaking the large-scale terrorists operations;

- development suggestions of government authorities to cooperate towards this direction between different departments on the national and international levels;

- coordination of actions on the security of nuclear facilities from the terrorist operations and mass destruction weapon operation.

The new supposed military doctrines must be checked by the different public organizations to isolate nonconformity of peace.

Thereby, despite inevitable differences the military doctrines (conceptions, strategies) of different states can't be in conflict with each other. We can't also eliminate a possibility of joint development documents of the region security as a result of seminars on the comparative doctrine analysis. For example, in frames of the interregion security structure, formed in frames of the East-Asian Alliance. We can notice here some features of crisis situations, forms and methods of theirs isolation (also with force using), the procedure of cooperative actions and force distribution (including all kinds of operation support) and other problems.

Considering what we said before it is possible to suppose that the problem of discussion methods of military doctrines in the East Asia is becoming more current. Clear understanding of conformity and difference of security methods, theirs correspondence to new challenges to peace and stability could help elaboration recommendations on the further development defense doctrines.

1.3. Present models of regional security and stability in APR are based on cooperation, power balance and other point of view

In APR the wide network of bilateral and multilateral security treaties, headed by the USA, was formed. These treaties operate on the base of "forces balance" principle.

But search for the security mechanism wasn't being accomplished on the base of force balance principle only. The suggestion strengthening security measures in the APR, spoken

by the soviet leader M.Gorbachev during his visit to Vladivostok 1986 and Krasnoyarsk 1988, is an attempt to remove mentioned problem out this principle. These initiatives suggested holding a conference in APR like in Helsinki. The purpose of it was to reach the consensus between the states of region. These initiatives were not implemented. Because Gorbachev tried to copy Europe experience in the organizing of security systems without considering the specialty of APR. Under the opinion of foreign and Russian specialists these features are the following: first, there wasn't any transnational blocks system as it was in Europe; the second, the presence of China factor in the superpowers relations has no analogy in Europe; the third, there isn't any tradition of weapon control in Asia as in Europe; the fourth, the APR has a lot of unsolved territorial problems as in Europe.

But many countries considered American military partnership the best guarantee of its security as the USA provided the most effective protection from the potential threat. According to one of the lead scientists of region problems V.P.Oschepkova, it was the main reason of unwillingness to create the collective system in the APR. And for them Soviet suggestions were as the struggle of superpowers for the influence and initiative. That's why the region states had so careful reaction at that time.

Only after "the cold war" the aspiration of creation collective security mechanism of the APR states stopped being regarded as the superpowers intention for involving into theirs military-blocks confrontation. Perhaps, only after the end of "the cold war" the cooperation in the security sphere between the region states improved significantly.

In many states of the region the needs of economic development demanded the appearance of interests in taking a part in the creation security mechanism. In reality, in spite of the economic differences between states in the region, the prosperity of many of them has reached the level when the state can pay its attention to the security. Now these countries are seriously concerned with the threat conflicts, crisis, and international terrorism. As to Asia, this region became one of the peaceful regions long time ago where many countries save high temps of economic development. Therefore, they need a dialog on the security questions for the stable economic development.

Generally we can mark two directions of countries efforts for proving security. The first direction is modernization and maintain of Armed Forces. The second one is creation system of region security which can guarantee stability and peace there. The object of our research is the second direction.

In 90-th Japan, Canada and Australia made the proposal create the collective security mechanism in Asia. For example, on July 27 1990 during the ASEAN meeting in Djakarta Australian Foreign Minister Garat Avance proposed to hold "The Conference on security and cooperation in Asia." At the same year on the conference in Victoria (Canada) Canada Foreign Minister Joe Clark proposed to organize "The Dialog on security and cooperation in the Northern part of the Pacific Ocean." Russia also contributed in that direction. So Russian President B.N.Yeltsin during his visit to South Korea (1992) made a proposal to create the

multilateral dialog on every subareal level of APR and also to open the centre of conflicts isolation and to form the centre of strategic problems for the control of crisis.

1993 became absolutely new line in the creation new security system in the region. In July 1993 during the meeting of ASEAN Foreign Ministers on security problems adopted the decision to make the discussion of security problems regular from 1994. Then ARF was formed for the multilateral dialog on security problems on a permanent base. It ought to be remarked that in 1991 Japan Foreign Minister Nakayama propounded to form the ARF, but this decision “was removed.” After that Russia became a full-fledge member of this forum. China also showed readiness to partake in this region forum and came in these conferences.

As for China attitude to the ideas of creation region security mechanism officially during long time Beijing didn't have any clear position. The documents and representations of China authorities according to the definition position on any international problem traditionally confirmed that China sustains the relation between countries on the base of five principles of peaceful coexistence. Remember that these principles are the following: mutual respect for territorial integrity, nonaggression, non-interference in internal affairs of other states, equality and development of mutual beneficial relations. As we can see these principles had just a declarative character and were not useful for the estimation of China position in relation to the creation collective security in APR.

In estimation of Russian and China position to this problem it isn't hard to remember that away back in the fifties Moscow and Beijing were holding a dialog on the creation collective defense system in APR. This dialog was interrupted and continued only in the eighties. After the beginning of perestroika in the Soviet Union the idea of creation defense system in APR, offered by new soviet leader, got a response in China. At first new Moscow course was accepted guardedly in Beijing, but then the authorities in People's Republic of China came to decision that new Soviet suggestions can be aimed for reducing the role of war factor in the region. These changes was caused by the withdraw of Soviet forces from Afghanistan, the compromise position of Soviet Union in relation to Cambodian conflict, the decision of Soviet authorities to reduce forces and arms in closed to China region. And after that China paid much more attention to the followed decisions of Soviet Union in the sphere of security and cooperation in APR.

But the idea of creation collective security system was rather limited. So then only the question of creation supporting security mechanism (forming the system of political consultations) was discussed.

In compare with previous years the visits of Russian leader to Asia had an economic character at the second part of the nineties. And as a result of this the volumes of Russian defense sales to APR states increased. Russian suggestions to APR states in the sphere of region security were changed. For example, at the meeting of foreign ministers within the frameworks of ARF in 1997 Russian Foreign Minister suggested to create an effective mechanism of detection of developing conflicts. In particular, E.Primakov proposed to give

to ARF “more comprehensive” data about different types of weapon capable to destabilize situation in APR then to the UN.

The willing of coupled collaboration between Russia and China in the sphere of creation collective security mechanism appeared partially only at the end of the century. It can be explained as by the common interests of two states as by the personal interests of each state.

For example, as China experts confirmed that the strategic security aims of both states are allied or may be identical. Russia intends to build up the stable “belt of neighbourliness,” China plans to establish “peripheral conditions for peace and calmness.” In particular, the latter is written in China defense conception. According to this conception, it is necessary to achieve a peaceful and stable international surrounding of state. That’s why Beijing allots a task for the region security mechanism to eliminate any conflict with neighboring states and to save favorable conditions for the economic modernization.

According to the opinion of scientists from the Far East Institute RAN, the creation of collective defense and cooperation system in the region with participation of countries as much as possible is one of the aims of foreign policy of Russia and the Middle East Asia (MEA). They said that the strengthening of friendship relations with China on the base of economic collaboration and stable politic contacts can cooperate this. The strategic direction of Russian foreign policy is to save established politic relations with China and to close out gradually the possibility of military confrontations with this power not only by using the politic dialog, development of economic contacts but also by involving in different regional organizations, treaties and also in the defense sphere. Therefore Russia supported the suggestion of People’s Republic of China to form SCO. But in our days this organization, according to its member-states, doesn’t comprehend all the security problems of MEA. It concentrates activity generally on the problems of central part of Asia.

MEA states have a common interest in relation to the main problem here, the problem of proliferation of nuclear weapon in the region. The source of it can be Democratic People’s Republic of Korea. In spite of some information about Pyongyang storages of strategic missiles with range 1,000km approximately, MEA states didn’t feel any threat from North Korea until Pyongyang representation on availability of nuclear weapon. After these events the nuclear threat gained a visible character. The nuclear arms race got a serious impulse. And it can come over many states in East Asia, particularly Japan and South Korea. Therefore, Russia, People’s Republic of China and other states of the region see the necessity for cooperation in the sphere of non-proliferation of nuclear and other mass destruction weapon, missiles and missile technologies and also solving these problems at the region level.

The development of multi-sides cooperation in the security sphere can help with solving old disputes in the bilateral relations and conflict situations between East Asian states. The experience of six-sides talks on the Korean peninsula problem affirms this development. As a result of these talks North Korea was withheld from further activity in sphere of nuclear

weapon producing in exchange for development of cooperation with other states in the sphere of peaceful atom under the control of IAEA.

However, there are some other objective reasons which prevent from the creation of cooperative organization of security support. The problem of leadership is the main obstacle to the creation multi-sides security promotion in MEA. Neither the USA, which are suspected by Asian states of neocolonial ambitions, nor Japan, which aggression during the Second World War isn't forgotten, aren't considered capable for this mission in the region. From here we can understand the caution with which the countries of the regions received the variant of the future security system proposed by the US Defense Minister D.Rumsfeld during his June 2006 lecture at on the role of the USA in the region at the fifth jubilee Asian Forum in security issues in Singapore. The minister proposed to the countries of the Asia Pacific Region to create a military-political alliance along the lines of NATO. He motivated his proposal by the fact that cooperation in the field of security between the countries of East and South East Asia, although it is expanding, but continues to go in the way of bilateral and trilateral alliances. "The matter will go forward much more effectively if an alliance of states is established in the region similar to North Atlantic Treaty Organization – NATO" – said the Pentagon Chief. Existing in the region multilateral alliances with participation of the USA, such as ARF in issues of security in APR and APEC, play, according to him, a useful role. But, the minister said, the process may stop, if Russia and North Korea "do not become more open." He also emphasized that Washington will closely watch the processes in other states, but East Asia states should not bypass the USA while establishing new regional alliances. We remind, that in December 2005 in the capital of Malaysia founding summit of East Asia community took place which got the name "Club-16," where Washington was not invited.

The idea of creation the system of stability in MEA hasn't been adopted yet by the most countries also for the reason that they aren't going to leave any solutions of vital questions of security depending on any international body. For example, China authorities take this position on Taiwanese and other territorial conflicts. It is on record that Beijing regards Taiwanese problem as the internal affair only and also China refused (May 1995) from studying the question of Spratly Archipelago within the frameworks of a multi-sides dialog. It agreed only to discuss this problem at the bilateral level. Nevertheless, China and Spartly pretenders signed the code of conduct in 1998, so called a treaty "to leave the conflict as it is now."

It is obvious that security problems in MEA have a bilateral character in many ways: the relations between Korea, China and Taiwan, the territorial dispute between China and Japan, the border conflict between Russia and Japan and etc. Thereby, there are some uncaused fears in states of the region that if a new system is formed their territorial disputes will be dallied off and won't be solved in their advantage. And some separated states (Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Republic of Korea) are afraid that this collective security system will block the problem of joining theirs' peoples for a long time.

Summing abovementioned, let's try to classify views of some domestic and foreign specialists, expressed on the issue of creation collective defense mechanism in MEA. From all variety of views we can mark three main approaches to the problem if the aims of suggested proposals are the main measures of classification.

The first, supported by Washington, supposes that the security mechanism must be constructed on the base of current bilateral relations between the USA and the region states, or creation of some regional military-political alliance similar to NATO. But it is becoming obviously that it is not enough for solving the problems of wide term "security" to have only bilateral or multilateral military alliances. The current term "security" is not limited by the military sphere only, but covers other spheres of international activity as economy, trade, ecology and etc. The end purpose of the second approach is the creation of a new regional international forum (like CSCE). It is important to mention that this idea isn't supported in our days. The third approach is compromise and takes the intermediate between the first and second. It supposes to direct the efforts of region states for the creation of security mechanism by the way of multi-sides dialog on security and cooperation problems. This approach has an advantage because it can give a possibility to reach the understanding of security between region states on the initial level. Started from consultations and multi-sides dialogs, MEA states which don't have any experience of cooperation in the security sphere will reach the understanding of the problem easily (Korean conflict, control of expenditures for armaments, territorial disputes and etc.).

One of the other serious circumstances, which we have to mention, is the community of many interests (from economy to security) of the biggest part of MEA states, including even the subareal states on MEA. Thereby, it is wise to use multi-variants approach at the process of creation collective security. This way supposes the movement from local agreements to extensive network of subareal organizations, ascension from methods of cooperation to more hardest.

At the end we should mention that the security cooperation connects tightly with the economic cooperation. Thereby, the cooperation in the sphere of region security as in case of the economic cooperation appears usually between the neighboring countries. On this basis we can suppose that the problem of creation collective security mechanism has the geopolitical character and it is one of regionalism demonstrations. It means that the tendencies to establish the atmosphere of trust and its formalization in treaties relations is normal process. Its purpose is the solution of regional security problems.

The relations between Russia and China can be a good argument of this affirmation. The essential measures of trust in the security sphere were taken between these two states: the leaders of two states approved of the manifest of nuclear non-first use against each other; decision of detargeting of strategic nuclear missiles on each other was announced; withdraw of forces from the borders district was accomplished and norms of force structure were also established; boundary settlement was finished; line between commanders of Far East defense

command and Sheignyung defense command was drawn; military delegations exchange was renewed and etc.

Analyzing everything we told before, we can mention that the evolution of defense systems is falling behind the process of threats appearance and development in our days. Particularly, it refers to non-traditional threats: international terrorism, hyper-ethnicism, narcotic business, criminal underworld and etc. and, in spite of states intentions to create the collective security mechanism, progress in this direction is rather limited.

It is recognized that many factors of region security in the conditions of globalizing world (in APR, too) are under the influence these processes. Now we will review these processes in details.