

The truth and fictions about the place and role of Russia in the world

The Statement of the President of the Russian Federation to the Federal Assembly

Part 2

"Kuz'kina's mother," or the real place and role of Russia in the world

Putin devoted the third part of the presidential speech to the military power of Russia, its offensive nuclear forces, and said in the spirit of a corn-fan Nikita Khrushchev, who threatened the West with "kuzkina's mother"; and who did not understand it, Khrushchev revealed this Russian metaphor, saying: "We'll bury you."

Before moving on to the military theme, it makes sense to return to some affirmations of the author's statement about the place of Russia in the world. Putin's judgments on this issue are unusual and, as the existentialists say, are born in a transcendental world, not connected with the mundane world.

Let me remind it: Guarantor of the Constitution inspired his listeners with an essential forecast, saying:

Russia should not only *firmly entrench in the top five of the world's largest economies*, but by the middle of the next decade to increase GDP per capita one and a half times. This is a challenging task. I am sure we are ready to solve it (italics mine).

First of all, it makes sense to note that those who wrote this statement for Putin, and I guess, as also he himself, plainly do not understand such a simple thing as the lack of a direct link between the economic power of the state (even with a high level of GDP per capita population) and real well-being of its citizens. The US has the most powerful economy and about 60 thousand dollars per person per year (GDP), and despite this, the number of needy citizens exceeds 50 million people. Under capitalism, economic growth, the increase in its parameters, – as follows from the laws of capitalism, – simultaneously enriches specific segments of the population and destroys others. This axiom, as already noted in the first part of the article, Mr. President, apparently does not know. This is from the field of theory. Now let's see what happens in practice.

Let's touch on a few details. In the first part of this article, I mentioned that in order to achieve the goals of joining the countries with a population whose average life expectancy is "80 plus" it is required to have GDP per capita of at least \$ 20,000, although most of the "eighties" exceed \$ 30,000.

According to the forecast of the Economist, in 2018 the GDP per capita of Russia's population will be 10,719 dollars. By the middle of the next decade, that is, by 2025, the president promises to increase it only by one and half times. So, this is 16,079 dollars. With this amount, Russia is going to enter the club "80+". This amount effectively crosses out the word "must." This number, by the way, corresponds to the present level of being in the former Baltic republics: Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. Even this amount is an achievement and a "difficult task."

But in this phrase, another lie is voiced, or it is an elementary misunderstanding of the economy. The president said that Russia should gain a foothold in the "five largest economies of the world.» What makes him think that Russia is already in this "five?"

This figure, which the President and the Prime Minister spoke about, have repeatedly voiced in all their official speeches. However, at the same time, they are keeping silent about the fact that *these calculations were made on purchasing power parity (PPP)*. These are the so-called statistical tricks, which do not give a real idea of the economic potential of countries. PPP can only be used for comparison living standards of different countries, and even in this way, the result is very rough, because consumer basket, from which this parity is compiled, is too different in quantity and quality of goods in different countries. For example, the French include in such basket 250 titles, in the US – 300, the British – 350, the Germans – 475, and the Russians only 156. Once again: *GDP calculated according to PPP, is just an indicator of the standard of living*. For comparisons economic power, it is necessary to use market currencies at current prices.

These currency ratios show that in 2016 the GDP of the Russian Federation was equal to \$ 1,283,162 million, providing it with **12th** place in the world, with a share of 1.7% in the world economy. Ahead of Russia were not only the leading economic powers of the world (the United States, China, Japan, Germany, Britain, France, Italy) but also India, Brazil, South Korea and even Canada with a population of 37 million people. How does the president want to entrench the country on the fifth position, if it is on the 12th? Moreover, I am sure that in the years Russia will inevitably fall out from the "Twenty" if the country does not return to the rails of socialism. Besides, I want to draw attention to the fact that the 12th place means that *the country's economic potential has declined by seven positions in comparison with the tsarist Russia of 1913*. It was then that it occupied the fifth place. Rollback for a hundred years!

It makes sense to pay attention to Mr. Putin's announced: "Russia today is one of the leading powers with a strong *external economic potential* and defense potential." On the Russian defense potential, I will comment on this further, but now – about the foreign policy potential.

The share of this "powerful foreign economic potential" in the world trade (in 2015 and onwards) does not exceed 2%. As for exports, (share 2.1%, 15th place in the world), Russia rolled back to the middle of the second ten and roughly equaled to such economies as Indian, Mexican and Taiwanese. By import, (a share of 1,2%, 23rd place) it has left in the middle of the third ten, on a level Poland, Thailand, and Malaysia. On the world stage, except for Europe, Russia as a trading state is virtually invisible.

And in this connection, it is necessary to know the basics of theory and practice of the world relations.

These are two parameters: 1) *the share of GDP* and 2) *foreign economic activity* (this also includes investment activity) determine the *country's place* in the *geo-economic* space. From this point of view, Russia as a "pole" (this is an economic concept) can appear only on the territory of the former USSR, even without being a regional power on the European continent. Following *the law of the pole*, it is necessary, at least twice the excess of the GDP of the state following it. Russia's economic power not only does not exceed but is inferior to the four states of Europe (Germany, England, France and Italy). And if we take into account the place of the state in the world within the framework of the concept of polarity, the positions of the US and Russia are just not comparable. The gap is an order of magnitude. Therefore, to impersonate a great power with this share in the world economy can only people who understand entirely neither the essence nor even the manifestation of the world economy.

Preliminary it is worth remembering the following statement: *the place and role of a state are different concepts*. The first is defined through the parameters of economic power; the second is calculated through the foreign policy potential (FPP), which is an indicator of force, to which I will return.

* * *

Now let us turn to the military aspects of the official message of the President. From the very beginning, the president boasted: "The Syrian operation showed the increased capabilities of the Russian Armed Forces." Does Guarantor of the Constitution not even read the Russian newspaper? As soon as he announced that the Russian troops had defeated ISIS gangs, completed their mission and withdrew their troops from Syria, suddenly "some militants" by the New Year (2018) defeated the Khemeymim airbase, destroying four Su-24 frontal bombers, two multi-fighters Su-35S and one military transport aircraft An-72, as well as destroyed the ammunition depot, which exploded from detonation after the mortar shell exploded. Before that, in November 2017, "increased opportunities" for some reason did not prevent the destruction of aircraft that did not even make combat sorties but simply suffered from disasters due to technical deficiencies or incompetence of pilots. The last case is the crash of An-26, where 39 people died. (Although, according to another version, Islamists brought it down). The "destroyed" ISIS bands suddenly come to life and do not allow the withdrawal of

peaceful people from the Eastern Guta region (the second Aleppo).

What are this “increased opportunities” means, when the Russian military power with the use of missiles, combat aircraft, military equipment almost three years cannot destroy a gang of militants, consisting of approximately 30-40 thousand people? Moreover, the most shameful thing is the statement of victory over the ISIS groups despite everything remained in its starting place. Gangs operate, and the regime of Bashar Assad, which is backed up by Moscow militarily, is at the door of death.

It is important to note that Russia has spent several billion dollars on the war with militant bandits. The cost of bombing in Syria ranged from 2 to 3 million US dollars a day for the Russian budget. The question is, for whom or for what people die? Suppose someone says, for the sake of preserving the legitimate government of Syria. What for? Where from did this love for Syria come? Isn't the core for this love the anti-American orientation of Assad's policy? If this is so, then why does it concern Russia?

What is the essence of Russia's national interests in the Middle East? Why Russia spends colossal sums and sacrifices own people? As a rule, the military presence of the great powers is motivated by economic benefits, which, they say, should be supported by the presence of the army in all cases. So the US is doing this and before that the United Kingdom did. Russia does not have economic interests in the Middle East. Its aggregative trade with all countries does not exceed 2% in this region. What, in the end, Russia is doing there? There is the only answer: for the interests of the Military-Industrial Complex (MIC), which now for political correctness is to be called the Defense Industry Complex (DIC), and the Ministry of Defense. In this case, it does not matter how it is called; the essence lies in the business: in the arms trade, and also for production and testing of new armament species. In other words, these are not the interests of Russian people, but the interests of the military oligarchy of the country. This business kills soldiers who fight, as they are told, for their own country; also that business is impoverished the entire population of Russia since the money spent on war is withdrawn from the state budget for solving social and economic problems. So boasting about the capabilities of the Armed Forces in this direction is utterly indecent. This money lodged in the pockets of generals and chiefs of the military-industrial complex.

Besides, how can the president be able to say: "Such people, such officers as our pilot, Guard Major Roman Filippov, will never be among the others!"¹ Whom did the president mean? Americans? English or French? The Chinese? Who are these "others"? The Russian president believes that only Russians can perform this kind of heroism. He probably does not know that not only all "Yankees" are insulted by such a phrase, but all the peoples of the earth who are ostensibly incapable of heroism.

* * *

¹ This is about the pilot, shot down in Syria, who bravely fought with the militants when he already falls on the ground.

So now let's see the essence of the military position of the Russian state in the understanding of the president. We will leave the weapon aside for a while.

The Guarantor declares:

It should be noted that in our military doctrine Russia reserves the right to use nuclear weapons only in response to the use of illegal defeats against it or its allies or in case of aggression against us using conventional weapons when the very existence of the state is under threat. Everything is distinct, precise, and concrete. In this regard, I consider it as my duty to state the following. *Any use of nuclear weapons against Russia* or its allies with small, medium and any power, we will consider as a *nuclear attack* on our country. The answer will be immediate and with all the ensuing consequences (italics mine).

This statement suggests that the military doctrine of the Russian Federation allows an attack on its country using nuclear weapons. The question is, who did come up with such a crazy idea? Any politician must clearly understand that such an attack means a retaliatory strike, that is, a thermonuclear war, as a result of which not only states, but the entire planet is endangered. What is the point in such an attack, if you cannot get any advantages? Did Putin's advisers not enlighten him about nuclear parity, which creates the situation of mutually assured destruction (MAD), implying unacceptable damage for either side?

All the details of mutually assured destruction have been established even in the period of confrontation between the US and the USSR. What has changed now, what prompted the president to make such a statement? Has someone violated parity? Does American missile defense violate it? Moreover, does the US not always offer the talks on the reduction of strategic nuclear forces, which Russia refuses? Why does this pandemonium happening around a potential nuclear aggressor?

So, this is the essential part of the president's message about new types of missiles and nuclear weapons. Bragging one of them, Putin with joy declares:

A low-flying, barely noticeable cruise missile carrying a nuclear warhead with practically unlimited range, unpredictable flight trajectory and the possibility of bypassing interception lines is invulnerable to all existing and prospective systems of both missile (ABM) and air defense (ADS).

If so, as the president says, why is it necessary to constantly raise the noise around the anti-missile defense? If you have already overtaken the Yankees in offensive weapons, then enjoy the advantage and rejoice. Why then disclose their advantages? This is similar to Khrushchev's threat of "Kuz'kina's mother."

But it makes sense to pay attention to the fact that Putin boasts of *offensive weapons*. That is, the weapon of attack, and aggression. The US is focused on *defense policy*, that is, *missile defense* (MD). Defense is not an attack, and it is not aggression. Is the US not

entitled to protect its national security from possible aggressors, especially those who boast of improving their offensive weapons?

Therefore, Putin voiced more than a weird message, when he again defiantly boastfully announced:

I hope that everything that was said today will sober any potential aggressor, and such unfriendly moves towards Russia, such as deploying an ABM system, approaching NATO's infrastructure to our borders, and the like, from the military point of view, become ineffective, with financial unjustifiably costly and ultimately just meaningless for those who initiate and do it.

Again. What kind of potential aggressor can we talk about *in the state of military-strategic parity*? The ABM system is a *defensive* system. Its deployment is natural under conditions when the Russian leadership, not being conformed to the realities, threatens with the introduction of offensive weapons. This leadership began to resemble the great genius of the Korean people Kim Jong Il, who promised to wipe out the vile American imperialism.

What Putin said is a reflection of the collective insanity of the Russian generals, and the Ministry of Defense. Think about the fact that Lieutenant-General Viktor Poznikhir, First Deputy Chief of the Main Operations Directorate of the Russian General Staff, spoke about the US missile defense a little less than a year ago:

The means of the US missile defense system already today have the potential to intercept Russian and Chinese ballistic missiles and pose a threat to the strategic nuclear forces of Russia and China. In the future, these opportunities will increase.

Isn't it the absurd phrase of the high-ranking military official, talking about the US's ability to *defend* itself against enemy missiles? The ability of the US to defend itself is seen as a threat to the offensive potential of the Russian Federation and China. Interception is not an attack, but a defense. This also saddens for another momentous representative of the military elite, the head of the Central Research Institute of the Air and Space Defense Forces of the Ministry of Defense of the Russian Federation, Sergei Yagolnikov, who, to the preceding reasoning added that the American anti-missile system could bring down Russian intercontinental ballistic missiles as early as the 150th second of flight.

The potential aggressor is extremely upset by the possibilities of protecting the future goal and is not shy about talking about it publicly. This is the mentality of the highest military-political elite in Russia. Such an elite does not understand why Russia is at the bottom of the list of rated safe countries in the world? In this list, it occupies 143rd line from 162 countries, 19 places ahead of Afghanistan (last place). The USA on this indicator is on 55th place.

Well, now about the very "weapons" that the two military men mentioned a year ago either did not know or were hypocritical. It is a question of new types of offensive weapons, "having no analogues in the world" (read from the United States).

Firstly, it is the Sarmat ICBM with practically no limits on the range of its use. Secondly, it is a missile with a small nuclear super-power energy installation (so far without a name), capable of maneuvering as long as necessary, bypassing the ABM system. Thirdly, it is the hypersonic air-missile complex "Dagger", whose missiles fly at a speed exceeding the speed of sound by a factor of 10. Fourth, the new unmanned underwater nuclear weapons, which are named by the president as "fantasy." Fifth, Russia has the latest laser weapons. Sixth, the serial production of the newest strategic weapon, the Vanguard complex, was started. He maneuvers at hyperspeed, under conditions of plasma formation.

And that is not all. In conclusion about weapons, Putin said: "I did not talk about all our developments, but for today it's enough." And, noting that "all these weapons is not reserve of the Soviet Union, but new developments."

I'm not a specialist in weapons, and therefore I'm not going to give an assessment of the technical capabilities of these weapons. But knowing the unlimited ability of the country's leaders to lie, I can assume that much of what is said is just a bluff reminding me of the American SDI program (the Strategic Defense Initiative) known as the "Star Wars", to which Gorbachev's team bought. In response they put forward so called the de-ideologized doctrine of "new thinking." With its "help", the destruction of the Soviet Union began. SDI could not be implemented in principle because of technical and physical obstacles, but it worked as a military-political myth, effectively crushing the superpower. Even if the president said it is technically possible, it will still resemble the Russian Tsar Bell, made in the 16th century, the largest in the world, which never once ringed. It's the same with "fantastic weapons". A lot of sane people in Russia share this position. Here are some statements on this subject.

So, the economist Andrei Movchan is not without humor draws parallels between the president's description of the unique nuclear missile and the "Yo-mobile", noting that Russia with all oddities and absurdities in different spheres can be called the E-country.

In the same vein, the well-known politician Nikolai Travkin also reacted to the message, titled his article "There is nothing to veil before dear compatriots", stressing in it that the authorities have chosen the right tactics, deciding to convince people of the country's ability to make a terrible death for others.

There are the results of a survey of readers conducted by the news media NEWSru.com:

Do Putin's theses indicate a new arms race?

Yes – 69.18% (851)

No – 21.71% (267)

I do not care, in any case it would not be better - 9.11% (112)

Do you agree with Putin that Russia needs these weapons to "encourage our partners to negotiate"?

Yes – 31.46% (387)

No – 68.54% (843)

Do you believe that the weapons named by Putin really exist in Russia?

Yes – 27.48% (338)

No – 72.52% (892)

What awaits Russia after Putin's announcement of a "militarized" message?

Even more financial and social problems – 79.18% (974)

Revival of national pride and power – 12.20% (150)

Now the West will start negotiations with Russia – 8.62% (106)

After the message, did you want to vote for Putin in the March 18 elections?

Yes – 18.05% (222)

No – 43.41% (534)

I generally will not vote – 38.54% (474)

Such results were unexpected for me. I thought that people would overflow with happiness, but instead he was wiser than his leader. However, these are emotions. There are the opinions of specialists and scientists. As it turned out, they were surprised by the weapons Putin told about, and consider this to be bragging, not a description of the actual missiles. So the head of the Institute of Space Policy Ivan Moiseyev is perplexed:

There is some confusion: such things are impossible, and are not needed in general. You can not put a nuclear engine on a cruise missile. And there are no such engines. There is one such megawatt-class engine in development, but it is a spacecraft, and, of course, no tests could be conducted in 2017 – well, if in 2027 such an installation will be tested.

Robert Schmucker, a German professor of aviation and space technology at the Technical University of Munich, too, can not hide his surprise, saying: "I can not imagine that they [the Russians] can create a small flying thermonuclear reactor."

By the way, many noted such an absurdity, namely: to illustrate the intercontinental ballistic missile "Sarmat" used graphics 7-year-old.

* * *

And now it makes sense to consider the reaction of a potential enemy – the US. After all, it was to them that Putin's appeal sounded: "Nobody listened to us. Listen now. " I have to upset the Russian president. The fact is that despite this insistent call to "listen", in the US Putin's speech and his bragging about new types of nuclear

weapons reacted somehow passively, which contrasted sharply with hysterical excitement on Russian TV and the media. Either the American public is tired of Mr. Putin's "historical speeches", or his current problems turned out to be more important, I do not presume to judge, but in any case, the reaction to the speech from the "Americans" seemed to me unworthy of her epoch-making content. Nevertheless, something was said after all.

For example, The Wall Street Journal reacted like this: "The Pentagon did not consider it necessary to say anything about Putin's speech in public and only stressed that the US missile defense is directed against rogue states, and not against Moscow."

Other newspapers noted that Putin's speech will cause an escalation of tension in US-Russian relations and a new and expensive round of the nuclear arms race. And this, the American press underlines, will be greeted with delight by the US military-industrial complex. As the expert on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons Gary Seymour stated, "Putin has become the best friend of the U.S. nuclear arms industry.»

Many experts are convinced that talking about fantastic weapons is nothing more than a bluff. According to the *New York Times* reporters, "American officials said the nuclear cruise missile was not yet operational, despite Mr. Putin's claims, and that it had crashed during testing in the Arctic" (NYT, March 1, 2018). Such a bluff, experts believe, is not accidental, since the very current military doctrine of the Russian Federation is built on lies and erroneous assessments.

The same newspaper points out that in this connection, many specialists in the theory of bluff in Russia (it turns out that even a whole science of "Russianbluff" has arisen) cite a lot of cases from the recent history of the country about unsuccessful launches of missiles and their premature collapse, which already calls into question Putin's boasting.

"The real surprise in among all of this is a nuclear-powered cruise missile," said Douglas Barrie, a senior fellow for military aerospace at the International Institute for Strategic Studies in London. "It was talked about in the '60s, but it ran into a lot of obstacles. To the extent that the Russians are seriously revisiting this is pretty interesting." (ibid.)

Other experts stressed that one should not take seriously this non-existent weapon: conversations about him in the message were necessary for the internal audience to inspire her with at least the highest military achievements against the backdrop of the deplorable state of the economy and the lives of ordinary people.

The Pentagon believes that many of the new plans that Mr. Putin announced last week to bolster his arsenal – including undersea nuclear torpedoes, nuclear cruise missiles and other new weapons – are years away from deployment. (NYT, March 5, 2018)

Many experts and scientists are more concerned not with the technological parameters of weapons, but with militarized rhetoric, which only intensifies the tension between the two countries. Senator Ben Sasse, a Nebraska Republican, said that "the problem is not technical," but political, given the United States' impressive cyberarsenal. (ibid.)

And here are some of the West's statements about Putin's message as a whole. It will be useful to read to those national chauvinists of Russia who believe that Russia showed the "kuzkina's mother" to this West. And that's how the West reacted to this "mother". I give quotes without comment. (From InoPress, March 2, 2018.)

"Unfortunately, Putin's nostalgia for the Soviet way of thinking and power of the Soviet model does not allow him to see the true lesson of that era: Russia can not win an arms race," writes *The Times*.

"Instead of winning the support of the Russians, guaranteeing them political, economic and social rights, Putin once again chose to legitimize through militaristic nationalism, patriotic fervor and confrontation with the democratic West" (Spanish *El Pais*).

In the fight against the new superweapon of Russia, all anti-missile systems of America will probably be useless. "Nothing like this in anyone else in the world yet. (...) It's just fantastic, "Putin admitted and burst out with the praises of the new weapon: uncontrollable, invincible, irreplaceable. Surely he would like to add: the same as himself, - ironically Ellen Ivits of the German *Stern*. And she continues: "In a country where hardly something is honored and praised more than an army, demonstrating one's military superiority is the easiest way to win the hearts of citizens," the article says. "After Putin's speech, some Russians will proudly stick out their chests, pronounce toasts in their honor, rejoice in Russian power and gloat over the West."

But the reaction of my Canadian compatriot, professor of international relations and political science at the University of Toronto Orwell Brown in an article for *The Globe and Mail*.

He focused on nuclear weapons, because in this sphere, and only in this sphere, Russia can claim the status of a superpower." ... "However, the picture of the future of Russia can hardly be called optimistic." ... "Given that Russia's GDP is only a small fraction of the GDP of the EU or the US, the gap between Moscow's ambitions in the international arena and its internal capabilities is likely to increase." And concludes:

The large-scale spectacle and posturing of Putin before the whole world will not be able to constantly compensate for serious problems inside the country and the fact that Russia could not become part of the modern world. At some point, the Russian people will look over the screens and see that Putin is by no means such a big man as he claims.

This Canadian, of course, is an optimist. He clearly does not understand that in Russia the size of a person depends on the amount of power, and not on his personal qualities. It's not a person who colors a place, but a place – a person. Now it's not about that. Another thing is important.

The West, and above all the United States were not afraid of the threats of Mr. Putin. They did not believe in Russia's "fantastic" weapons, did not repeat the

criminal reaction of Gorbachev and the then leadership of the Soviet Union to the fictitious SDI program. In other words, the idea itself, because of what the militaristic buffoonery was organized, collapsed, multiplying the Kremlin's next miscalculation in the sphere of international activity.

* * *

And now it's time to return to the field of real politics, which is not based on propaganda bluffs and chatter, but on the laws of foreign policy and world relations. Once again I want to draw attention to the fact that Russia, like all other capitalist countries, including the United States, is a capitalist state. Therefore, despite any declarations, intentions or wishes, for example, about peace, security, etc., Russia obeys the laws of capitalism, based on the law of force. The current aggravation of relations between the US and Russia is caused by Moscow's attempt to violate a one-centered (unipolar) world, against which, of course, the US is opposed. In fact, there is a struggle between two predators, and not a struggle for a just peace. Only one predator – the USA – is stronger, the other, Russia, is weaker. But there is no fundamental difference between them.

Above I spoke about the real place of the country in the world on the field of geo-economics. It is time to say something about the geostrategic space within which the laws of force operate. To begin with, what is the center of power (which, I recall, differs from the "pole").

The center of power is a subject having the ability to subordinate the activities of other subjects or actors of world relations to their own interests. Depending on the scope of such control, the center of force may be local, regional or global.

Proceeding from this, the law of the center of power is formulated as follows:

the transformation of the subject-pole into the center of power presupposes the presence of a foreign policy potential (FPP), the volume of which exceeds the competitor's foreign policy potential at least two times at the regional level and four times at the global level.

This is due to the fact that FPP must cover the four main regions of the world: Europe, East Asia, Latin America, and Africa together with the Near and Middle East.

FPP is one of the important objective indicators of the scale of the foreign policy process. Usually it is calculated from the budget of the government, whose articles are clearly aimed at international activity. In particular, they are the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Ministry of Defense, the Ministry of Foreign Trade, special services (FSB, CIA), external propaganda, etc.

Here I will confine myself to the first four organizations, since external propaganda is not clearly spelled out in the budgets of countries.
Format the table

Foreign Policy Potentials (FPP) of the US and Russia in 2016				
(in billions of dollars, in% to the budget)				
	Russia		USA	
M. Defense	26,7	12	595,7	15
MFA	1,5	0.7	29,8	0.8
Int. activity			50,5	1.3
MFT	4,1	1.8	10,4	0.3
Intelligence	1,0	0.4	20–15	0.5–0.4
Total	33,3	14.9	651 (706,4)	9–17.8

Note: Ministry of Foreign Affairs – Department of State, Int. activity. – Intern. Affairs, MFT - MIT and Department of Commerce, Intelligence – SVR + FSB and CIA.
Source: budgets of these countries for 2017.

It can be seen from the table that the most costly part of the runway is the line of the Ministry of Defense. Let's see the correlation of military forces, in this case, based on SIPRI statistics, which is different from the figures of national budgets. According to the latest data, in 2016 the US defense spending was equal to \$ 611.2 billion, which is 36.2% of all defense spending in the world. Russia is in third place (after the PRC) with the sum of 69.2 billion dollars, which corresponds, according to the share, to 4% of world military expenditures. The lag from the US is almost an order of magnitude.

From the table above, it can be seen that the US FPP outstrips Russia's potential by almost two orders of magnitude. Bearing in mind that the US FPP outperforms the FPP next to it by more than four times, according to the law of the center of force in the field of geostrategy, the United States should be recognized as the only world center of power. FPP of Russia allows to consider it as a "center of power", as in the case of the "pole", only in the space of the former USSR.

And if, thanks to the US FPP, their role is visible anywhere in the world, Russia's role is felt only on the European continent and only because of its exaggerated assessment by European states.

The new weapons, about which Putin announced such propaganda in the message, do not change anything in the systems of world geostrategic relations. For one reason: it, even if thanks to the God, whom the president is praying for now, and will be created, it will never be used in practice. But this weapon works great for the benefit of the rest of the world, mainly the enemies of Russia, as it devours and will devour further financial and economic resources of the country, continuing to turn it into one of the poorest countries in the world. In this regard, the words inscribed in *the National Security Strategy of the Russian Federation* of December 31, 2015 look like a mockery, where it says:

In order to protect national interests, Russia pursues an open, rational and pragmatic foreign policy that excludes costly confrontation (including a new arms race).

In fact, everything happens exactly the opposite. Russia pursues a hidden, irrational and costly policy, where money is thrown to the wind. Those amounts that are thrown out in the Syrian adventure, just flowers. Berries will be ahead. And to predict what kind they will be, it is not difficult. The USSR is a classic example of ignoring the laws of the relationship between FPP and budget and the budget with GDP. It is necessary to know that the inflated FPP of the USSR was the main killer of the Soviet state. The very leaders of the state, who did not know the laws of either foreign policy or world relations, were nurtured this killer. They did not even know such three axioms of world relations:

Axiom one: the dynamics and development of world relations are based on Force.

Axiom two: the system of world capitalist relations develops according to the zero-sum scenario, i.e. if someone wins, another inevitably loses (in the same way as in macro- and micro-economics).

Axiom three: in the world of capitalist relations there is no place for MORAL (only force and once again force).

All theories based on other axioms are false.

Since the system of world relations is currently functioning on the basis of a "market economy" (= capitalism), world laws are also "market" in nature. In other words, the effectiveness of the foreign policy of any state in the world arena can be achieved only if the state-object becomes poorer or weaker. In the form of the law, I define this position as follows:

The ultimate goal of any actor-subject in the world arena is the increase of own well-being, which, if achieved, occurs at the expense of reduced well-being of the actor-object. This is the first law of world relations, operating in the field of geo-economics.

The second law refers to the sphere of security, which is the pivot of the superstructure of world relations, i.e. system of international political relations. I define the security law as follows:

The security of the actor-subject in the system of international political relations is achieved at the expense of decreased security (= or increasing the insecurity) of the actor-object. This is the second law of world relations, functioning in the sphere of geopolitics.

This is not the place to justify these axioms and laws. This is done in many of my scientific works on the theory of foreign policy and world relations. Here I mentioned them only to show how much the message of Mr. Putin and all those who prepared this "masterpiece" for him is far from an objective understanding of the world processes. Only by being a unique illiterate or unique cynical person could one say at the end of his message:

Dear colleagues!

The whole world is now passing through a turning point, and the leader will be one who is ready and capable of change, the one who acts is moving forward. Our country, our people showed such will at all defining historical stages of our development. Over the past almost 30 years, we have achieved such changes, for which other states needed centuries (*italics mine*).

After such a conclusion, after a little thought, I once again became convinced of the special wisdom of the current Russian leader. Indeed, in order to jump from feudalism to socialism through capitalism in 30 years with a religious outlook, it is hardly possible for "other states". They had to creep for centuries even for the transition from feudalism to capitalism.

Over the next 30 years, under the leadership of the reelected president, I am confident that Russia will overcome the distance and in a thousand years ... it does not matter, backward or forward, because, as the hero A. Platonov Dvanov from Chevengur said: Russian is a man of bilateral action: he can live and so and back and in both cases remains intact.

March 9 2018