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**Russian concept of the Eurasian Aerospace Defense System. Analysis of the problem**

The goal of this article is to present possibilities of creation of the Eurasian System of Aerospace Defense as a main direction in development of Eurasian integration under Russian Federation leadership and presenting the most important geopolitical role of Eurasia in contemporary international relations. Conclusions and interpretations coming from the works of professor Aleksey Podberezkin, a scientist from the National Institute of International Relationships by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Moscow are a starting point for the analysis. He is an esteemed scientist, adviser to the President of Russian Federation and author of some works on security and international relations (inter alia: Алексей Иванович Подберезкин, Евразийская воздушно-космическая оборона, Москва 2013). In 2017 he issued a two-volume piece on current military politics of the Russian Federation Современная военная политика России: учебно-методический комплекс (Москва 2017).

**Geopolitical importance of Eurasia**

Zbigniew Brzeziński pointed out in his paper of 1990, *Great Chessboard*, the importance of Eurasia. He was stressing military and political phenomenon of that region showed there as a giant chessboard, on which there was a struggle for worldwide hegemony going on. Nevertheless, it was only in 1904 that the great importance of the region was noticed by a British geographer, Halgord John Mackinder. He claimed that the one who rules the so called „World Island”

1 “World Island” embraces continental mass which is comprised of Europe, Asia and Africa. The other areas, South and North America, Australia and Malayan Archipelago are satellites of the “World Island” and play a minor role. See: A. Cianciara, *Klasyczne koncepcje geopolityczne*, in: *Geopolityka*, A. Dybczyński (scientific editor), Warszawa 2013, pp. 59–61.

2 Ibidem.
but it is also meant as an original mental movement that was stressing uniqueness of Russian history and culture treated as a separate civilization. It has become a basis for the statement that Eurasia concept is the key to a secret of Russian soul.\textsuperscript{3} According to the Eurasia concept Russia’s supporters are not Asia nor Europe, and it should be treated as a separate geographical unit, since it is a region development of which was influenced by ethnic specific of Great Russ’ people. It was assumed that the area of Eurasia is the same as the area of Russia. Eurasians were reluctant to the West, and their task was to prove that Russia has the right to civilization and cultural distinctness. Piotr Sawicki kept stressing that Russian civilization was called to play unique role within the Old World (Asia and Europe), in the sense of keeping its unity.\textsuperscript{4} In this sense Russia should continue geopolitical traditions of the Mongol Empire what was explained by the fact that Russia’s pressure on Scandinavia, Poland, Persia and Turkey replaced raids of nomads on the continental and oceanic zone.\textsuperscript{5}

Many scientists recall that after the USSR had collapsed Eurasia concept became the most influential orientation in Russian geopolitics. It was reborn in a doctrinal form of Neoeurasia idea with Aleksandr Dugin as its main representative. In this concept the West (primarily the US) is regarded as enemy, as well as the Atlanticism concept.\textsuperscript{6} A. Dugin recognized cultural and geographical individuality of Eurasia, nevertheless, in his theories Eurasian empire stretches to Central Africa. According to this ideology Russia was to create alliance with China, India and Iran (even Iraq and Tibet are also mentioned) against Anglo-Saxon world. Together they would take actions against mortal enemy, as the West with the USA, because of the belief that American version of liberalism poses a threat to Russia and the whole planet. Europe and pro-Western countries of the Eastern Asia with Japan to lead the way, were to be included finally in the Eurasia alliance.\textsuperscript{7}

It is also worth mentioning that in 1997 Vladimir Hatchaturov presented a very interesting geopolitical concept which was paying attention to the following four determinants of the world order:

1) geographical area occupied by China and India is the geopolitical center of the world,
2) global geopolitical processes are initiated by the geopolitical center of the world,
3) in the course of global geopolitical processes there are two poles emerging: stable, embracing geopolitical center of the world, and unstable,
4) together with any change in the area of even one of the poles the world enters the period of geopolitical instability (global wars and revolutions).


\textsuperscript{4} J. Potulski, \textit{Współczesne kierunki rosyjskiej myśli geopolitycznej. Między nauką, ideologicznym dyskursem a praktyką}, Gdańsk 2010, p. 113 et seq.

\textsuperscript{5} Ibidem.

\textsuperscript{6} I. Massaka, \textit{Eurazjatyzm. Z dziejów rosyjskiego misjonizmu}, Wrocław 2001, pp. 175–194. Atlanticism is one of the streams in current Russian geopolitics referring to traditions of Russian Westernizer movement, main Assumption of chich was to link Russian prosperity with its cooperation with the West. See: J. Potulski, \textit{Współczesne kierunki rosyjskiej myśli geopolitycznej…}, p. 38.

As one can see, according to these assumptions, Russia is perceived as a part of both stable and unstable pole, and because of that it plays a role of geopolitical axis of the world. According to V. Hatchaturov the aim of the Russian politics should be to enhance the significance of the axis by reintegration of the country and building strong ties and relations with China and India.8

Rennaisance of geopolitical programs caused the significant influence on the whole international community in the second half of the 20th century what is associated with reorientation of forces in the present system as a follow up to changes in American foreign politics. It regards foremost political situation in Central and South-Eastern Asia. We cannot deny that there is much increase in instabilities in some countries and regions of the world, particularly in the area of Eurasia, where ca. 90% of military conflicts during the last few decades took place. This is a reason why it is so important to take complex actions towards a complex defense in this region, along with the Heartland paradigm which seems exceptionally influential in current strategic relations, especially with regard to current politics of the Russian Federation. According to Russian analysts:

Post Soviet Central Asia in Washington’s foreign policy has gone from a third-rate attention in Russia to one of the most important points of American interests worldwide. Predicted complication of Afghan problems will entail an increase of the US, Russia and China interest in this region. In this respect, conflict of interest in the region is possible.9

In this area, it is worth noting that military and political attributes of Eurasia have become an underlying cause for the aggravation of confrontation in the region in the second half of the 21st century. These attributes are reflected primarily in the following:

- special geopolitical, economic and historic role of Eurasia worldwide, which is to grow rapidly in the coming decade. And not only because of a rapid pace of China’s, India’s or other countries development but also because of numerous civilization and geopolitical contradictions cumulated for the past decades;
- growing role of Russia in Eurasia, which can be the main player on the continent and influences of which are totally inadequate to the role it wished to play, especially in the regions east of the Ural mountains with a huge potential and transportation routes of global importance;
- concentration of reserves, (...) not only energy but also agriculture, water, forest.

A tremendous human potential in Eurasia, which quality indicator has been

---

growing very fast, will start unavoidably play a key role in a global development. It is only in China during reforms time that over 300 million of people got higher education;• some independence from „maritime countries”- former world leaders – which can be taken away only with strategic offence and defense potentials development.11

Programmed grounds for the Eurasian System of Aerospace Defense

Research done by A. Podberezkin, when there still remains an up-to-date conflict between Moscow and Washington, Moscow and the European Union, allow to see another perspective in activities within international security area and to define the role of Russia on this „Asian chessboard”. Indeed, the process of NATO enlargement to the east after the Cold War ended, transformed the alliance from the regional organization into a global organization, including whole Eurasia region in its scope of responsibility area. The course of events in Iraq, Afghanistan, its approach to Syria and Iran proved that NATO as military and political coalition is the one and only real international power to ensure security to Eurasia. Nevertheless, the alternative for its potential can be the Shanghai Cooperation Organization12 and the Collective Security Treaty Organization within the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS), which is a tool of post Soviet area integration in a military and defense sense.

In the Shanghai Cooperation Organization it is China and Russia that play predominant role, although China is the leader in economy and Russia offers foremost political and military cooperation to other members of the organization.13 What is more, Russians and Chinese are ready to support financially independence of other members of the organization from the West. Russia is very interested in enhancing this organization as a tool in its global competition with the US so that the Shanghai Cooperation Organization was a political counterbalance to Western countries.14 These activities are supported by research done by scientists from the National Institute of International Relations in Moscow (Московский государственный институт международных отношений, MGIMO), including A. Podberezkin, who

10 А.И. Подберезкин, Евразийская воздушно-космическая оборона, Москва 2013, p. 25.
11 Ibidem. This problem refers to a geopolitical theory, according to which the most important significance to the Word history does not have Heartland but a broad strip of peninsulas (Rimland) surrounding Heartland. It has an important role in geopolitical theories by Nicholas John Spykman, according to him Rimland is the centre of the world’s power. Within the boundaries of Rimland there are continental Europe, the Middle East, India, China and Indo-Chinese Peninsula, Malay Peninsula and Korean peninsula. See: N.J. Spykman, The geography of the peace, New York 1944, pp. 36–40.
14 Ł. Firman, Szanghajska Organizacja Współpracy…, pp. 236–237.
is one of numerous supporters of more active politics based on Eurasian ideas with Russia playing the main role. The actions taken are strategic and were expressed by establishing in December 2011 Russian Aerospace Defense Forces as a new armed force to defense aerial and space security of Russia\(^{15}\). During the summit of the Commonwealth of Independent States in December 2012 in Ashgabat not only economic projects were discussed but establishing the joint air defense system. For this purpose a special coordination committee was established. Russian proposal to integrate Russian units with sub-units of Russian Aerospace Defense Forces Branch (from 2015 Russian Aerospace Forces) in the frame of the above initiative was supported. It can be called the first step to create Eurasian Aerospace Defense Forces.

Establishing a few military forces centers in Eurasia is to gain potentials of strategic offensive weapon, and foremost aerial and space precision-guided component of different purpose.\(^{16}\) Works on Eurasian Aerospace Defense Forces are Russia’s assertive step to assume responsibility for Eurasia security in a concern of NATO and the USA domination in this region. Main thoughts of A. Podberezkin’s paper establish a paradigm of common security, what is particularly interesting in view of the growing threats in modern world, to be – at the same time – an answer for anti-Russian (according to Russian analysts) plans and aims of NATO.

At present, the problem of North Korea seems to be particularly dangerous, because of nuclear tests done by the country, what raises the risk of pushing the Peninsula into a war. And this would definitively cause American intervention in the area. Possible results of any conflict with the superpower are even hard to predict. According to some research by Russian analysts one can be concluded: Russia is afraid of American domination in Eurasia. According to A. Podberezkin it is obvious that the US continues to seek obstruction to renewal of Russia’s strategic presence in the region and political alliance between Moscow, Beijing and Tehran. It is also not insignificant that Central Asia is for the US geopolitically important bridgehead in the region in case of an eventual confrontation with China and Russia. These ideas go along with a maritime doctrine of the Russian Federation of 2015. Basic thought of the new doctrine was given in point 52 of the document: *the main unacceptable for the Russian Federation element in relations with NATO are its plans to move military infrastructure and facilities towards its borders and attempts to grant the alliance global functions.*\(^{17}\) The doctrine has got two dimensions, global – addressed mainly to the US and European – addressed to NATO. This thought can be perceived as a message for military decision-makers in the US and NATO that Russian Federation will not allow American dominance on a global scale.\(^{18}\) It is worth noting that other

---


\(^{16}\) A.И. Подберезкин, *Евразийская воздушно-космическая...*, pp. 50–51 et seq.


\(^{18}\) Ibidem.
strategic documents of the Russian Federation are of the same meaning, for example updated Strategy of Security or Defense Doctrine of 2010. Basic priorities concerning security, i.e. political and economic internal threats were substituted by external threats, i.e. interference by other entity into a zone of influence.

Also large scale military conflicts were listed as a vital threat. At the same time the role of the Russian Federation was highlighted as a power which was to guarantee its own influences in regional and global dimension. It was also stressed that NATO and the US were trying to interfere unlawfully into Russian interest zone and keeping unipolar order with American hegemony leads to disturbances and conflicts on a global scale.\(^{19}\)

In this context demonstrations by A. Podberezkin raise no astonishment and demonstrate that Russia pretends to be the main actor of Eurasian integration and promotes its own system of values not only in culture and economy but also in the international security area. To achieve this Russia will have to promote and emphasize to an even greater extent its foreign and military politics as far as the south and the east are concerned. Areas east of the Ural mountains have become of its most political interest. At the same time Russian state is afraid of western aspirations, what A. Podberezkin expressed in the following words:

Hoping that territorial unity, sovereignty and security of Eurasia will be kept only by international law and international institutions – it is naivety. Similarly naive was to count by M. Gorbachev on general values. There are quite many comments that Russia cannot govern itself by wealth hidden in the middle of deep Siberia or constantly make use of vast areas with huge supplies of natural resources (M. Albright, M. Thatcher, Z. Brzeziński), which openly interfere with international norms. Also open attempts to use force pressure and soft power against Russia. This injustice can be fixed, according to many politicians, only by revision of the Russian Federation state borders what seems not so impossible in the eyes of Western politicians. To gain such aims there can be a whole range of scenarios realized, among which the most secure and proper from the political point of view, would be making Russia to refrain from the control over transportation corridors, resources and then over territorial unity. At present, such calculations really exist. What is more, history proves that similar course of events is more often a norm than exception. And it is not only in the past but also in the newest history, with the USSR and Yugoslavia as examples\(^{20}\) (interpretation by the author).

These thoughts show that Russia should take some counteractions against any possible revisionist actions against this country.

\(^{19}\) М. Депczyński, *Rosyjskie Siły Zbrojne*..., pp. 29–30.

Vladimir Putin doctrine follow-up

According to A. Podberezkin’s idea, that there is no grounds to think that the reduction of tension in Eurasia will take place or that the US will resign from counteracting integration processes in the continent. Strategic interests of the US in Central Asia were clearly defined for the first time in April 1997 in a special report of the State Department to Congress. In the report it was pointed out that the USA, as the biggest energy consumers in the world, is interested in “widening and diversification” of the world’s energy resources. What is more, because of their nature, American interests in that region are not only economic but also strategic, because (...) the problem applies directly to ensuring security of the West. On the other hand, in a doctrinal approach of Russians there are ideas that Russian policy’s aim in Eurasia region is to create common peaceful security and stabilization area based on the rule of integrity of common security, cooperation and mutual trust.21

It is no wonder that these points of strategic priorities to existence in international environment are immutable exponent of foreign policy led by president Vladimir Putin since 2000. It is worth mentioning that they were firmly emphasized during his speech at the security conference in Munich on February 10, 2007, during which he gave the so called Munich speech, further known as Putin’s Doctrine. It is the interpretation of principles of modern Russia’s foreign policy based on the total criticism of the unipolar idea, i.e. such world order where the power belongs to only one hegemonic entity (the US). According to Putin, the unipolar idea is the cause of new wars and tensions in international relations, leads to unstoppable hyper use of military power in international relations. And that, in turn, makes the world facing permanent conflict, further arms race and lack of security in view of new threats, like terrorism.22 What is more, Putin presented Russian counter proposal to American strategy, which is creation of a new architecture of global security23 to make the world multipolar with influences of one country balanced by interaction of regional centers of power: the EU, Japan, Russia, China, India and Brazil.24

Putin’s doctrine was assessed as the critique of the Western approach to Russia. The West, trying to ensure geopolitical prevalence in Europe and Central Asia, had underestimated Russian Federation’s aspirations after the Cold War time. Meantime, Russia felt threatened by American unilateral approach which was reflected in ringing the country by NATO forces starting with former Baltic republics to American bases in Central Asia. In view of numerous commentators, Russia presented itself as “a beleaguered

22 D. Gibas-Krzak, Świat w polityce zagranicznej Federacji Rosyjskiej, „Kwartalnik Bellona” 2010, No 4, pp. 32–42.
24 Ibidem.
castle”, accused the US of a new arms race, failing to uphold the international law and interference in politics of the CIS. And, what is most important – it did not accept the unipolar order and wanted its political situation to be improved internationally.

Present politics of the Russian Federation after the end of the Cold War proposes a new collective security pact which was presented by Dmitry Medvedev in 2008. The first stage of this new plan was to convene the summit of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) and all security structures, including NATO, EU, CIS and the Collective Security Treaty Organization (CSTO). The proposal was a follow up to ideas and programs in Russian foreign policy after the Cold War, because it was already in 1994 when Russia proposed transformation of the Conference for Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE) into a kind of regional United Nations Organization with Security Council (Executive Committee). CSCE-OSCE was supposed to be a political superstructure for the European security system and provide Russia with equal influence on Euro-Atlantic zone management (it was mostly about the possibility of co-decision as far as NATO enlargement was concerned). On October 8, 2008 during a conference in Evian, France, president Medvedev posited the UN enhancement and presented some rules, called later Medvedev’s Plan, on which the new architecture of European security was to be based. The rules were as follow:

• respect of territorial integrity, of sovereignty and political independence,
• avoiding to use force or the threat to use force,
• opposition to attempts to ensure one’s own security at the expense of the security of others,
• disagreement on activities weakening unity of the common security area,
• disagreement on development of other military alliances to the disadvantage of security of other treaty participants.

The most important for the increase of Russia’s position as a power was the idea of indivisibility of security for all, thanks to which Russia would be given influence on NATO enlargement processes and decisions on the placement of anti-missile shield elements in Central Europe. It is worth stressing that these ideas became basic to political elites of the Russian Federation and strategic programs in the field of defense have been based on the same assumptions which had been formulated after the end of inter-block confrontation. Nevertheless, in the assessment of many analysts, Russia’s goal is not creation of a multipolar order but taking over the role of a hegemonic entity, what is, in reality, a step back to the Cold War competition between the USSR and the US.

28 A. Bryc, Rosja w XXI wieku. Grać światowy czy koniec gry?, Warszawa 2008, p. 120.
The future of A. Podberezkin’s concept

It should be assumed that the idea of the Eurasian Aerospace Defense Forces is the extension of previous ideological and program concepts of Russia connected to international order transformation. This time, though, it is based on the military component and refers to Eurasia region. Under the name of the Eurasian System of Aerospace Defense there are means and measures developed to defend the Russian Federation and its allies on land and at sea, in the air and space, linked by functional contacts from aerial and space assault. Its tasks include:

- warning before rocket and space assault and recognizing space and informing military forces about it;
- destroying battle blocks of intercontinental ballistic missiles and ballistic missiles of submarines; destroying space equipment of the adversary;
- warning before aerial assault, recognizing air situation and control over airspace; defense of the most important state management and military facilities from airspace measures, defense of the economy and infrastructure, massive troops and military facilities;
- establishment of radio electronic situation, securing radio electronic defense of Aerospace Defense targets.\(^\text{30}\)

Further development and integration of military systems is required so that the system worked properly. It is to equip military forces of the Russian Federation in modern means and systems of Aerospace Defense and to compete with the main producers of Aerospace Defense systems on an equal footing. At present, the most powerful political and military potential have NATO members, that are main suppliers of both aero-cosmic strikes means and aero-cosmic defense measures worldwide. What is more, military and industry complex and arms market of the People’s Republic of China tends to intensify. NATO members and its allies as well as China are interested in development of their own aero and cosmic defense measures.\(^\text{31}\)

The importance of Aerospace Defense program is that currently there is no common Eurasian security system and it is only NATO at the moment that continues to pretend to this role and tends to widen its influences across the whole continent.

According to A. Podberezkin there are a few scenarios of shaping a new system possible, which come down to:

1) creation of an Eurasian security system (modeled on OSCE), in which there would all countries from Ireland to the Philippines be included. It would have political obligations together with implementation mechanisms;

2) creation of coalition systems of international security which would include the most important countries and alliances on the continent:


\(^\text{31}\) Ibidem.
3) developments of already existing military and political alliances (coalitions) and creation new ones.\textsuperscript{32}

Russian analysts, afraid of NATO prevalence, claim that integration initiatives in Eurasia under Russian leadership will be regarded by the US as unnecessary because they pose a threat to American hegemony.\textsuperscript{33} That is the reason why NATO will, by all means, counteract any attempts of launching any coalition. Because the alliance has got many instruments to prevent such situation that bilateral or multilateral cooperation in specific areas could transform into a military and political coalition in Eurasia, also with participation of members of the European Union. In the West, in turn, analysts criticize Putin’s politics and point out that because of current Russian actions on the international stage it is possible only to take “the strategy of force”, what should be done together by the US and the EU.\textsuperscript{34}

\textbf{China and India towards the Eurasian Aerospace Defense}

It is a Russian idea that common Eurasian Aerospace Defense should become a part of a broader political agreement, similar to the OSCE Helsinki Final Act from 1975, in which a sovereign right to ensure military security of national territories would be guaranteed. Particularly that many Eurasian countries, primarily China and India, very quickly move in that direction in their independent way and their strategic documents and activities on the international stage clearly indicate that they want to be important, if not key, players on the “Eurasian chessboard.”\textsuperscript{35} Increasing potentials of China or India are unquestionable and it is definite that it is going to influence heavily the balance of power in the region.

According to Indian foreign policy concepts in the post Cold War era the aim of the country has become a strive for power status in the 21st century\textsuperscript{36}. It is mainly

\begin{itemize}
\item USA,
\item EU,
\item China,
\item India,
\item Russia;
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{32} Ibidem, pp. 32–33.
\textsuperscript{33} Ibidem, p. 33.
\textsuperscript{34} An example of such rhetoric are statements of Theresa May, the UK Prime Minister, who pointed out that Putin had to choose another strategy than annexation of Crimea, conflict in Ukraine and cyber attacks on European governments and parliaments. At the same time, the British Prime Minister did not refer in a negative way to the partnership with Russia but under conditio that the country would obey the rule of a democratic country. See: May do Rosjan: Wiemy co robicie. Nie odniesicie sukcesu, TVN24 of 14 XI 2017, https://www.tvn24.pl/wiadomosci-ze-swiat,2/theresa-may-krytykuje-rosje-putina,789946.html [access: 3 I 2018]; Die Welt: Reset z Rosją niemożliwy. Jedyną opcją strategia siły, Defence24 of 27 XII 201., http://www.defence24.pl/719274,die-welt-reset-z-rosja-niemozliwy-jedyna-opcja-strategia-sily [access: 3 I 2018].
\textsuperscript{35} А.И. Подберезкин, Евразийская воздушно-космическая..., pp. 459–460.
\textsuperscript{36} J. Zajączkowski, Polityka zagraniczna Indii po zakończeniu zimnej wojny, in: Polityka
about recognition by other powers of India’s global aspirations. According to Indian analysts, in the world based on hierarchy India should stand in the same line with such powers as the EU, the US, China, Japan and Russia and also belong together with them to the club of world powers. It is true that in the beginning of the 21st century India has chosen a bandwagoning strategy, i.e. alliance with a stronger power (in this particular case – the US). Nevertheless, it does not mean that the country intends to submit to the hegemonic entity. India inspire more to the role of an equal partner in international relations, especially that the symbol of the country strength are still nuclear weapon and army. It is mainly a significant military potential, including nuclear power, that decides about the country’s power status. In this context, it is worth noting that Shakti – Indian goddess of strength – more and more often reflects Indian perception of international order.\textsuperscript{37} Furthermore, it should be mentioned that Indian nuclear doctrine is based on the \textit{minimal reliable deterrence} notion and on the \textit{no first use} rule, also to countries which also possess nuclear weapon. It means, inter alia, that the basic thing is the ability to survive enemy strike (it regards both to means of transfer as well as command structures) and to launch an effective counter-strike. The strength of such strike should be so much significant to discourage a potential aggressor from application of its own nuclear forces. In this context, it is understandable that all used and developed ballistic systems are mobile systems (wheeled or rail).\textsuperscript{38} It is also worth pointing out that the outline of Indian nuclear doctrine disclosed in 1999 included the term \textit{nuclear triad} (missiles with nuclear warheads placed on land, on submarines and on bombers).

Following strategic assumptions made India has noted progress in developing the national two-tier air defense system, which components are AAD anti-ballistic missiles which are designed to take out targets transferring nuclear warheads. Indian rocket forces are equipped currently with three types of ballistic missiles and two more are to be developed. At present, as it is assessed, their air defense system is capable to intercept missiles launched at the range of 2000 km. In 2016 the new Indian missile was capable of destroying ballistic missiles at the range of 5000 km. Ten years earlier a construction of the first Indian strategic nuclear submarine (called boomer) had been started. Available information speak about three to five boomers, but it seems hardly likely that the target system for them is a short range missile, which would highly limit their strategic role.\textsuperscript{39} It is no doubt that there are new modifications of Indian anti-missiles on the table and the end of works on the plan of the air defense system placement. The open question is still whether any cooperation with Americans is planned. All the more so, since Indians, as a rule, do not reject any foreign cooperation in the field of air defense construction – Israel takes part in their program and provides assistance by early warning radar networks.

China, concentrated on political stability, pay the most attention to economic expansion. One should be remembered, though, without the so-called Central State modern world could not exist – this is a result of a significant development of Chinese economy. Solving important global problems is obtained by pragmatic politics and it makes China not to miss any possibility to widen its presence on foreign markets also via Chinese minority settled in many countries. So, one can speak not only about expansionism but also about sinocentrism. China, by its centripetal force, becomes an attractive centre and creates a separate civilization, which desirability decides about the scale of influence. A very important aspect of national strategy is the fact that in China information and communication prevalence is regarded as the biggest threat to national security. In fact, it is not possible that social nets are used for coordination of anti-governmental groups activities or demonstrations of subversive nature, which is a result of Facebook and Twitter prohibition. And Chinese social websites are under control of Chinese government. These kind of activities are to oppose American domination, especially when it comes to influencing Chinese information policy and the way Chinese Internet resources are used in stimulating different kinds of dissenting activities. Although, a new geopolitical reality becomes formation of two military and political centers of military power – China and the US – which can compete against each other in the next decade but cooperation cannot be excluded as well. Analysts very often indicate that establishing the Chinese superpower could mean return to a bipolar order, in which two power centers, one in Washington, and the second in Beijing, could represent different patterns of globalization and political systems, what would resemble the Cold War order. The scale of cooperation and competition is hard to predict but there is a threat that such processes can be at the expense of other countries.

What role could Russia play in the new power structure? In Russian commentators’ assessment hampering Russia’s aerial and cosmic defense development would cause inevitably that in the medium term the US gains the potential capable of not only overpowering strikes but also potential able to neutralize extant forces planned to be used in a counter-strike. Such action can lead to a destabilization of global situation and make military potential again a global instrument of the US and NATO foreign policy. This is the reason why A. Podberezkin postulates Russia and Europe to unite in order to control Eurasian space. It is worth noting that for the last few years Russia has been perceived in China as a main stabilization actor in Eurasia able to weaken American politics. In view of this China seeks to loser cooperation with Russians on the military stage, starting from common tactical training flights to cooperation in scope of anti-aircraft and logistic tasks.

---

41 А.И. Подбerezkin, Евразийская воздушно-космическая..., p. 373.
43 А.И. Подбезрзкин, Евразийская воздушно-космическая..., p. 452.
44 Ibidem.
The headline in the area is military potential building which can play an important role on a global scale. Undoubtedly, Pentagon observes such activities with great concern. There are numerous articles in the American press on the subject, particularly on anti-missiles defense component and air defense cooperation between the two countries which leads to common air defense in Eurasian space. Development of this potential may diminish existing unique capabilities of the US of leading air operations in Asia and Pacific area and on the European action theatre, what slows down the American expansion and shows changing international order.\footnote{Sky\textquotesingle s the limit for joint Russian-Chinese Eurasian Air Defense Zone, 1 VIII 2017, https://sputniknews.com/military/201708011056086886-russian-chinese-common-airspace-defense/ [access: 18 I 2018].}

**Conclusions**

In the second decade of the 21st century there has been going on a pursuit of air space and information space transformation into one battlefield, on which there will be no strict boundaries as far as altitude, space, or even information influence is concerned. It is a new global theatre of fighting which becomes decisive and tends to relegate traditional areas of military potential application, i.e. land and marine space. Russians expect that in the medium term perspective – 2018-2020, preliminary stage will be finished. During that time basically new weapon systems will be created and new concepts of their application will be elaborated and tested. Together with the devaluation of nuclear deterrence idea and increase of contradictions between new power centers it means that countries with significant military potential can move an active phase of its application. As a consequence, means of engagement in a such aero and information space become decisive for the victory. Such kind of integration will inevitably cause harmonizing state management and military command of strategic offensive weapon (nuclear and conventional) and defensive weapon (strategic offensive weapon and aerospace defense) as well as means of information influence. It seems appropriate to hypothesize that it is going to be *sui generis* „the battle for Eurasia“ and solution to this task will be a challenge for international cooperation supported by political efforts. Final outcome will depend on military and technical potential, strategic offensive and defensive armament and development of industry in terms of their components production\footnote{Ibidem.}

It should also be stressed that according to Russians the battle for Eurasia is a run-in with American hegemony which calls into question Russian strengthening on the outskirts of the former USSR and building counterbalance to the US\footnote{The American document list also Iran and North Korea and accuses those countries of destabilizing their neighborhood. At the same time it stresses that North Korea has become a global threat because of advanced nuclear program. See: M.A. Piotrowski, B. Wiśniewski, *Strategia bezpieczeństwa narodowego USA: podejście administracji Trumpa*, „Biuletyn PISM” of 21 XII 2017, http://www.pism.pl/publikacje/biuletyn/nr-128-1570 [access: 3 I 2018].}. It is worth
noting that in the latest National Security Strategy of December 19, 2017 China and Russia are those countries that actively affect security weakening and diminishing role of the US. What is more, those countries have propaganda, asymmetric, conventional and nuclear potentials which can be used to revise the existing international order. It is sort of admitting by Americans that Russia and China are their rivals on a global scale. In this context the battle for Eurasia can be regarded as a clash to control Heartland, that is struggle for supremacy of the world which brings back two-block competition from the Cold War times. There is the US (NATO) and Russia on opposite sides and the unknown shall remain what strategy will India and China adopt. One can predict with high probability that international order will definitely be revisioned. It is not known, at the same time, whether tendencies of expansionist nature from the world’s major actors would strengthen.

Abstract

The author of the article describes the most important theses of A. Podberezkin plan against the geopolitical Russia background which form a paradigm of a common security in Russian terms on a strategic area of Eurasia. It is of a particular significance in view of the growing threats to modern world. Especially of hazardous nature is current problem of North Korea in connection with nuclear testing carried out by unpredictable regime of Kim Jong-un which creates the risk that sudden conflict can drag the whole Peninsula into a war. This, in turn, would lead to the US intervention there. Effects of the possible conflict involving superpower are hard to predict. Another current problem is Moscow-Washington conflict and Moscow-European Union conflict. Indeed, NATO enlargement to the east transformed the block from regional to global and included the whole Eurasia into their scope of responsibility. Meanwhile, Russia being in opposition to such strategy, has been trying to build counterbalance to American politics. Research done by scientists, including A. Podberezkin, serve this purpose. He is one of the numerous supporters of more active politics based on Eurasiac ideas with the supreme role of Russia. During the Collective Security Treaty Organization summit in Ashgabat Russia’s proposal concerning przepisać ze strony wcześniej was accepted. This way the Eurasian Aerospace Defense was initiated. Few military centers in Eurasia together with growing importance of India and China and their economic and military capabilities is to obtain potentials of strategic offensive weapons, and most of all, aerial and cosmic precision-guided component of various purpose. Russians predict finishing preliminary stage in the years 2018-2020, during which new weapon systems are to be created and new concepts of their applications are to be developed and tested. It was stressed in the article that it would be a sui generis the battle for Eurasia and solution to this task was going to be a challenge to the international cooperation
supported by political efforts. The final result will depend on technical and military potential, strategic offensive and defensive weapon and development of industry in scope of its components production.
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