Министерство науки и высшего образования Российской Федерации

Владивостокский государственный университет
экономики и сервиса (ВГУЭС)

И. Ф. Анкудинова, С. А. Уткина, А. С. Чернышева

АНГЛИЙСКИЙ ЯЗЫК

ПЕРЕГОВОРЫ НА ВЫСШЕМ УРОВНЕ

ISBN 978-5-9736-0658-9

Владивосток
2022

Хрестоматия написана с целью формирования и развития навыков чтения аутентичных текстов общественно-политической направленности на английском языке; ее можно использовать для развития навыков конспектирования и реферирования. Хрестоматия построена по тематическому принципу и освещает актуальные проблемы международных отношений. Предлагаемые тексты представляют собой как учебные материалы по теории международных отношений на английском языке, так и оригинальные материалы сайтов зарубежных изданий.

Для аудиторной и самостоятельной работы студентов-бакалавров, обучающихся по направлению подготовки 41.03.05 «Международные отношения».

Министерство науки и высшего образования
Российской Федерации

Владивостокский государственный университет
экономики и сервиса (ВГУЭС)

И.Ф. Анкудинова
С.А. Уткина
А.С. Чернышева

АНГЛИЙСКИЙ ЯЗЫК

ПЕРЕГОВОРЫ НА ВЫСШЕМ УРОВНЕ

Электронная хрестоматия

Владивосток
Издательство ВГУЭС
2022

Рецензенты:

О.А. Шурыгина, канд. филол. наук, доцент, доцент кафедры иностранных языков Владивостокского филиала Российской таможенной академии

А.В. Титовская, канд. ист. наук, доцент кафедры межкультурных коммуникаций и переводоведения ФГБОУ ВО «Владивостокский государственный университет экономики и сервиса»

Анкудинова, Ирина Федоровна

Хрестоматия написана с целью формирования и развития навыков чтения аутентичных текстов общественно-политической направленности на английском языке; ее можно использовать для развития навыков конспектирования и реферирования. Хрестоматия построена по тематическому принципу и освещает актуальные проблемы международных отношений. Предлагаемые тексты представляют собой как учебные материалы по теории международных отношений на английском языке, так и оригинальные материалы сайтов зарубежных изданий.

Для аудиторной и самостоятельной работы студентов-бакалавров, обучающихся по направлению подготовки 41.03.05 «Международные отношения».

СОДЕРЖАНИЕ

1. ДИПЛОМАТИЯ И МЕЖДУНАРОДНЫЕ ОТНОШЕНИЯ

Text 1. Is The Foreign Service for You?

A Foreign Service career is more than a job. It involves uncommon commitments and occasional hardships as well as unique rewards and opportunities. A decision to enter this career must involve unusual motivation and a firm dedication to public service. Foreign Service personnel are committed to support their country's policy publicly, whatever their private views. The Foreign Service is a mobile profession. Personnel must agree to serve at any national diplomatic or consular post abroad, or in any domestic position, according to the needs of the Foreign Service.

Personnel spend an average of 60 % of their careers abroad. This imposed mobility presents challenges to family life and raising children not found in more settled careers. Many overseas posts are in small or remote countries where harsh climates, health hazards, and other discomforts exist, and where many social amenities frequently are unavailable. Overseas service may also involve security risks to personnel and their families.

However, careers in the Foreign Service offer special rewards too: the pride and satisfaction of representing your country and protecting your country's interests abroad; the challenge of working in a demanding, competitive, action-oriented profession; opportunities for change and growth; contact with stimulating compatriots and foreign colleagues in government, business, the press and other professions, frequent travel, and the enriching cultural and social experience of living abroad.

Text 2. What Do Foreign Service Officers Do?

For centuries, maintaining relationships between nations through the exchange of representatives has been the task of diplomacy. Foreign Service work is on the front line of the process by which nations establish and maintain official contact with one another in pursuing their respective goals, objectives, interests and policies. It embraces the making, implementation, and support of foreign policy at all levels at home and abroad. It involves the functions of representation, administering our overseas establishments, caring for the interests of one's country's citizens abroad; and reporting, communicating, and negotiating on political, economic, consular and administrative affairs.

The growth in the number and importance of international organizations brings new demands for competence in multilateral diplomacy. Hand-in-hand

with this development is the growing importance of a range of increasingly technical issues which are global rather than primarily bilateral in nature and which require new skills and better insights into the foreign policy implications of such areas as science and technology, narcotics and refugee affairs. And today a significant portion of a Foreign Service officer's career will be served in the country's capital, participating in the complex process by which national policy is made and supported.

Political officers analyze and report on political matters that affect the national interests of their country. They convey their government views on political issues to foreign officials, negotiate agreements and maintain close contact with political leaders, third country diplomats and others o f influence.

Political work requires an ability to report and interpret events and trends in a variety of cultures and political systems. Officers must persevere in a field in which visible results are not always immediately apparent. They must also be able to communicate rapidly and concisely, and be flexible in handling diverse responsibilities, especially at smaller posts.

Some political officers have more specialized duties. Those who qualify may become area specialists, knowledgeable about the language, history, culture and politics of a nation or region such as the USA, or Latin America. Political officers may also serve as science attaches abroad.

A typical week for a political officer overseas might include: reporting on a foreign election or change of government, seeking support for your country's foreign policy initiative, analyzing a border dispute, briefing or suggesting remarks for a visiting senior official, and perhaps, escorting the official, while handling the daily flow of cables and correspondence relating to the visit. Success in the Foreign Service requires a strong command of the mother tongue as well as of a foreign language. All Foreign Service officers must be able to speak and write clearly, concisely and correctly. The success of much of their work depends on their ability to speak and write persuasively and to analyze and defend policies and proposals.

Text 3. The Evolution of Multilateral Diplomacy

Diplomacy is the method by which nation-states, through authorized agents, maintain mutual relations, communicate with each other, and carry out political, economic, and legal transactions.

Although the roots of diplomacy reach back to the beginning of organized human society, the Peace of Westphalia of I MX is generally believed to be the origin of diplomacy as an institution, since it marked the beginning of the European nation-state system (which initially consisted of twelve well-defined sovereign states) and codified the rules of conduct among sovereign and "equal" states. The Westphalian principles of sovereignty and the

territorial state that were established in the seventeenth century are the foundation o f today's multilateral diplomatic system.

The history of diplomacy is commonly divided between the "old diplomacy" that reached its zenith in the nineteenth century and the "new diplomacy" of the twentieth. The "old diplomacy" or "bilateral diplomacy" was dominated for almost three hundred years by the "French system of diplomacy", which established and developed several key features of contemporary diplomacy-resident ambassadors, secret negotiations, ceremonial duties and protocol, honesty, and professionalism. Old diplomacy was predominantly limited to the conduct of relations on a state-to-state basis via resident missions (embassies), with the resident ambassador being the key actor. The "new diplomacy" that emerged in the nineteenth century and found its fullest expression in the twentieth is distinguished from the "old" by two themes: "First, the demand that diplomacy should be more open to public scrutiny and control, and second, the projected establishment o f an international organization which would act both as a forum for the peaceful settlement of disputes and as a deterrent to the waging of aggressive war".

The vestiges of the "old diplomacy" rapidly faded into the background after World War II, when the "standing diplomatic conference" (or, as it is more commonly known, international organization) and multilateral diplomacy blossomed. By the middle of the twentieth century, the international arena had become too big and too complex for traditional bilateral diplomacy to manage, unleashing the unprecedented drive of the past fifty years to build international and regional organizations with defined rules of procedure, permanent secretariats, and permanently accredited diplomatic missions and gradually shifting the emphasis in diplomatic method from traditional bilateralism to multilateralism. This was a particularly important development in international relations.

As a consequence, the "new" diplomacy, especially as it is manifested in the United Nations, broadened the tasks of the profession, subtly changing how diplomats conduct their trade. Today, the tasks of a diplomat include: (1) formal and substantive representation (the former involves presentation of credentials, protocol and participation in the diplomatic circuit of a national capital or an international or regional institution, while the latter includes explanation and defence of national policies and negotiations with other governments); (2) information gathering (acting as a "listening post"); (3) laying the groundwork or preparing the basis for a policy or new initiatives; (4) reducing interstate friction or oiling the wheels of bilateral or multilateral relations; (5) managing order and change; and (6) creating, drafting and amending international normative and regulatory rules.

Multilateral diplomacy emphasizes diplomats' public speaking, debating and language skills since communications are conducted principally by means

of verbal, face-to-face exchanges rather than in the predominantly written style o f bilateral diplomacy. The expansion and intertwining of political, economic, and social issues and concerns on the agenda of multilateral diplomacy have pushed diplomats towards greater specialization, and increased involvement in external affairs of domestic ministries, such as those concerned with agriculture, civil aviation, finance and health. As Sir David Hannay, former permanent representative o f the United Kingdom to the United Nations, points out: "You have to have a reasonable spread of specializations. You now certainly have to have military advice. And on the development side, you have to have people who know something about environment, who know something about population control, who know something about wider development policies".

Also, multilateral diplomacy has overlaid the task of the international system on the diplomats' traditional function of advancing and protecting national interests within the system.

Text 4. What Is Public Diplomacy?

In recent decades, public diplomacy has been widely seen as the transparent means by which a sovereign country communicates with publics in other countries aimed at informing and influencing audiences overseas for the purpose of promoting the national interest and advancing its foreign policy goals. In this traditional view, public diplomacy is seen as an integral part of state-to-state diplomacy, by which is meant the conduct of official relations, typically in private, between official representatives (leaders and diplomats) representing sovereign states. In this sense, public diplomacy includes such activities as educational exchange programs for scholars and students; visitor programs; language training; cultural events and exchanges; and radio and television broadcasting. Such activities usually focused on improving the "sending" country's image or reputation as a way to shape the wider policy environment in the "receiving" country.

As coined in the mid-1960s by former U.S. diplomat Edmund Gullion, public diplomacy was developed partly to distance overseas governmental information activities from the term propaganda, which had acquired pejorative connotations. Over the years, public diplomacy has also developed a different meaning from public affairs, which refers to a government's activities and programs designed to communicate policy messages to its own domestic audiences.

In recent years, and notably since the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks in New York City and Washington DC, public diplomacy has attracted increased attention from both practitioners and scholars from many parts of the world. As distinct from the "narrow" traditional, state-based conception of

public diplomacy described above, recent scholarship has offered a "broader" conception of the field's scope by developing the concept of the new public diplomacy which defines public diplomacy more expansively than as an activity unique to sovereign states. This view aims to capture the emerging trends in international relations where a range of non-state actors with some standing in world politics-supranational organizations, sub-national actors, non-governmental organizations, and (in the view of some) even private companies – communicate and engage meaningfully with foreign publics and thereby develop and promote public diplomacy policies and practices of their own. Advocates of the new public diplomacy point to the democratization of information through new media and communication technology as a new force that has greatly empowered non-state actors and elevated their role and legitimacy in international politics. As a result, a new public diplomacy is seen as taking place in a system of mutually beneficial relations that is no longer state-centric but composed of multiple actors and networks, operating in a fluid global environment of new issues and contexts.

This new diplomacy will not in the short term displace traditional state-to-state diplomacy as practiced by foreign ministries, but it will impact the way those ministries do business. More than ever before, foreign ministries and diplomats will need to go beyond bilateral and multilateral diplomacy and to construct and conduct relations with new global actors.

The increased interest in public diplomacy in recent years has been facilitated by conceptual developments in other fields. Marketing and public relations notions such as branding have been incorporated by public diplomacy scholars to great effect to cover countries, regions, and cities. Similarly, the concept of soft power coined by international relations scholar Joseph Nye has, for many, become a core concept in public diplomacy studies. Nye defines soft power as "the ability to get what you want through attraction rather than coercion or payments." In other words, soft power is the degree to which a political actor's cultural assets, political ideals and policies inspire respect or affinity on the part of others. Thus, soft power has come to be seen as a resource, with public diplomacy a mechanism that seeks to leverage soft power resources.

Text 5. Necessary Qualities for Multilateral Diplomacy

In order for multilateral diplomacy to function properly, diplomats must possess several qualities. Kaufmann cites ten qualities that he believes are most important. He considers truthfulness and honesty to be of prime importance in diplomacy. This does not mean that diplomats need be open and frank about their tactics or that their positions can never be adjusted. It does require that references to historical, legal, and statistical data be correct and that

agreements and pledges made earlier be honored. Although honesty is considered to be an important virtue, its definition has been more than once stretched to the limits. For example, it is not uncommon for apparently solid endorsement of a member state's candidacy for an important position on a UN committee, or for a proposal drawn up in a "non-paper," to suddenly evaporate, sometimes even in the first round of voting. This can lead to only one conclusion – that some of the pledges made were untruthful (or that a delegation "forgot" to inform the sponsors of their withdrawal of support). Because voting procedures in international organizations are never transparent and opinion polls do not exist within the UN (if opinion polls were used, I am certain the number of proposals made and candidacies announced, with all the prestige attached to them, would be reduced significantly), it is of the utmost importance for all participants to have a thorough understanding of the common diplomatic vocabulary in order to be able to make a sound judgment of the actual support one's proposal or candidate can expect. Indeed, the mere show of sympathy for a certain delegation is often misinterpreted as endorsement of proposals or candidates.

A feel for accuracy is therefore a second important quality every diplomat should have, but especially one involved in multilateral diplomacy. Kaufmann states that "ambiguity and vagueness are probably as frequent in conference diplomacy as precision and single-minded clarity". Hence, effective communication in multilateral forums calls for both active and passive precision. This means the ability to get a message across to delegates who do not necessarily share the same cultural background and are not as proficient in commonly used languages like English or French, and the talent to listen to and interpret material, to judge its merits and report them in both letter and spirit. However, delegates sometimes feign ineptitude in languages or in a particular expertise in order to hide their political objectives or to achieve other gains. Moreover, the fact remains that compromise is still diplomacy's middle name, and accuracy thus remains only an ideal. Nonetheless, it should be remembered that meticulously spelled-out texts are often of little practical use to the people who must implement their instructions, since such detail tends to limit maneuverability.

In order to work in an environment that to an outsider might seem frustratingly intricate, a player in multilateral diplomacy needs the right attitude as well. Kaufmann mentions commendable but sometimes-contradictory human qualities like calm, good temper, patience, modesty and zeal. Of course, being overly outspoken will not be an asset to any negotiator, particularly in multilateral diplomacy, but the inability to show any emotion will likewise be a hindrance. Granted, attending meetings of seemingly trivial committees and plenary sessions filled with long, arduous monologues by jaded officials may not be the most appealing activities on a rainy Friday

afternoon, but, as Kaufmann puts it, "exaggerated placidity will provoke its own kind of irritation"; or, in Talleyrand's words, "surtout pas trop de zele". Diplomats need to be able to exercise patience in order to know wTien to introduce a proposal and when to wait. Since multilateral diplomacy involves a larger audience, some actors develop an inclination toward vanity. Sometimes, this is not restricted to individuals alone; entire delegations can become convinced that every UN member state should be made fully aware of the exceptional vision set forth in their proposals. When other delegations do not share this opinion, irritating and shameful spectacles can result.

Given multilateral diplomacy's inherent complexity, a diplomat needs to be adaptable as well. This means that one has to be able to work on several problems and in several locations simultaneously. One of the most distinctive features of multilateral diplomacy is the constant mental leaps one has to make in order to determine the reasons why particular representatives adopt certain views – because of national interests, personal convictions, or the need for bargaining chips for negotiations in other forums. Indeed, conference diplomacy often calls for the ability to play chess on different boards at the same time. Yet Kaufmann states that adaptability is perhaps best demonstrated through psychological flexibility, the ability to listen carefully to other delegates while suppressing the usual urge to constantly place oneself at the center of attention.

Language versatility, as Kaufmann calls it, can be considered an important aspect of adaptability. Although English has ousted French as the predominant means of communication in diplomacy, the latter's use and that of other languages is still very important and useful. The effort to try to address a counterpart in their native tongue can yield instant credit, which might otherwise not be obtained. Moreover, the ability to shift instantly from one language to another gives any person an edge. When colleagues are less capable in this respect, it places them automatically in an intermediary position, which can be subsequently exploited.

The virtues, vices, and qualities outlined above are first and foremost human. The prescribed attitude of diplomats represents the accumulated experience of centuries of civilized conduct between cultured people.

Text 6. What are International Relations?

International relations refers to the collective interactions of the international community, which includes individual nations and states, inter-governmental organizations such as the United Nations, non-governmental organizations like Doctors Without Borders, multinational corporations, and so forth. The term is also used to refer to a branch of political science which

focuses on the study of these interactions. As an academic discipline, international relations encompasses a wide range of academic fields, ranging from history to environmental studies, and there are a number of areas of specific specialty, for academics who are interested in them.

The concept of international relations on some level is probably quite old, given that humans have been establishing governments and communicating with each other for thousands of years. However, many people agree that international relations truly began to emerge around the 15th century, when people started exploring the world and interacting with other governments and cultures. Organizations like the Dutch East India Company were among the first multinational corporations, for example, while representatives of various European governments met with foreign governments to establish trade agreements and to discuss issues of mutual concern.

International relations can get incredibly complex. It is also sometimes known as "foreign relations," and specialists in this field do things like staffing diplomatic agencies abroad, providing consultation to businesses which are considering establishing branches overseas, and assisting charitable non-governmental organizations with their missions. Many specialists pick a particular region of the world to focus on, as the language and etiquette of international relations is incredibly varied, depending on whom one deals with.

In the academic world, the study of international relations encompasses the history of this immensely varied field, along with studies of modern foreign relations. Students often examine specific relationships to learn more about them, and they may look at emerging global issues as an ongoing part of their education. Many people in the field of international relations also spend time abroad, studying foreign relations from a different angle and performing specific regional research.

Whether one works in international relations or studies it, one should expect to examine things like economics, history, sociology, anthropology, law, nationalism, development, human rights issues, psychology, geography, global studies, and even philosophy. Many institutions all over the world offer training for people who wish to specialize in this field, along with cooperative study agreements abroad which help to expand the horizons of students.

Text 7. History of International Relations

The history of international relations is often traced back to the Peace of Westphalia of 1648, where the modern state system was developed. Prior to this, the European medieval organization of political authority was based on a hierarchical religious order. Westphalia instituted the legal concept of

sovereignty, which essentially meant that rulers, or the legitimate sovereigns, would recognize no internal equals within a defined territory and no external superiors as the ultimate authority within the territory's sovereign borders. Classical Greek and Roman authority at times resembled the Westphalian system, but both lacked the notion of sovereignty.

Westphalia encouraged the rise of the independent nation-state, the institutionalization of diplomacy and armies. This particular European system was exported to the Americas, Africa, and Asia via colonialism and the "standards of civilization". The contemporary international system was finally established through decolonization during the Cold War.

What is explicitly recognized as international Relations theory was not developed until after World War I," IR theory, however, has a long tradition of drawing on the work of other social sciences. Many cite Thucydides' "History of the Peloponnesian War" as the inspiration for realist theory, with Hobbes' "Leviathan" and Machiavelli's "The Prince" providing further elaboration. Similarly, liberalism draws upon the work of Kant and Rousseau, with the work of the former often being cited as the first elaboration of Democratic Peace Theory. Francisco de Vitoria, Hugo Grotius and John Focke offered the first accounts of universal entitlement to certain rights on the basis of common humanity. In the twentieth century, in addition to contemporary theories of liberal internationalism, Marxism has-been a foundation of international relations.

As far as tools of international relations are concerned, they are as follows:

– **Diplomacy** is the practice of communication and negotiation between representatives of states. To some extent, all other tools of international relations can be considered the failure of diplomacy.

– **Sanctions** are usually a first resort after the failure of diplomacy, and are one of the main tools used to enforce treaties. They can take the form of diplomatic or economic sanctions and involve the cutting of ties and imposition of barriers to communication or trade.

– **War,** the use of force, is often thought of as the ultimate tool of international relations. There is a growing study into 'new wars' involving actors other than states. The study of war in International Relations is covered by the disciplines of 'War Studies' and 'Strategic studies'.

The **mobilization of international shame** can also be thought of as a tool of International Relations. This is attempting to alter states actions through 'naming and shaming' at the international level. A prominent use of this would be one of the UN Commission on Human Rights procedures which publicly exposes states human rights violations.

Text 8. Netanyahu: A Shrewd Leader Who Reshaped Israel

By Yolande Knell
BBC News, Jerusalem

He had been called "the King of Israel" and "the great survivor": for a generation, Benjamin Netanyahu, or "Bibi," as he is popularly known, dominated Israeli politics.

Known for his combative style, the country's longest-serving leader played a key role in its drift to a more right-wing, nationalist outlook.

On the international scene, he has been the face of Israel, speaking in fluent US accented English and ensuring his small country punches above its weight.

For one biographer, a main part of Mr Netanyahu's legacy has been to oversee a change which "totally shifts the paradigm" away from seeing Israel only through the prism of its long-standing conflict with the Palestinians.

"It was seen as the key to solving all the problems of the Middle East," says Anshel Pfeffer, author of Bibi: The Turbulent Life and Times of Benjamin Netanyahu. "That's been turned on its head."

"Despite being further away from than ever from solving the conflict [Mr Netanyahu] has just had four diplomatic agreements with Arab states, Israel has got better relations with the world and, prior to Covid, there was a decade of uninterrupted economic growth."

Youngest leader

It was a quarter of a century ago that Mr Netanyahu became Israel's youngest ever prime minister, with a narrow victory over then Labour leader, Shimon Peres.

The election came just months after the assassination of Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin, who had signed the breakthrough peace deal, the Oslo Accords, with the Palestinians.

Mr Netanyahu had appealed to voters by strongly opposing the peace talks, which he saw as jeopardising Israel's security.

But once in power, he gave in to pressure from Washington to sign further deals with Palestinian leaders, which ultimately led to the collapse of his first right-wing government.

Later, outside the prime minister's office, he remained a popular figure in the Likud party and served as a minister at the time of the 2000-2005 Second Palestinian Intifada or uprising against Israeli occupation.

He burnished his security credentials, criticising concessions to the Palestinians including Israel's withdrawal from the Gaza Strip and several West Bank settlements.

Peace process stalls

Returned to power in 2009, Mr Netanyahu expressed qualified support for an independent Palestinian state, with the condition that it would have to be demilitarised and formally recognise Israel as a Jewish state.

Palestinian leaders rejected those terms and on Mr Netanyahu's watch, Israel's presence continued to grow in the occupied West Bank.

Talks with the Palestinians mostly went onto the back-burner.

Mr Netanyahu preferred to believe the unsolved conflict could be managed as a security issue. His supporters argued there was no partner for peace.

Deadly fighting continued to break out between Israel and militants in Gaza. In 2014, there was international criticism of the high number of Palestinians killed in a large-scale military operation to stop rocket fire into southern Israel.

That raised tensions with the Obama administration which were already building over its Iran policy.

In early 2015, as the US led talks to curb Iran's nuclear ambitions, Mr Netanyahu angered the president by going behind his back to address the US Congress directly.

He told lawmakers a prospective deal posed a "grave threat, not only to Israel but to the peace of the entire world".

Trump partnership

But soon relations with Israel's strongest ally were to change dramatically.

Mr Netanyahu called President Trump his country's "greatest friend" ever in the White House.

The US recognised Jerusalem as Israel's capital, moving its embassy here from Tel Aviv, overturning decades of US policy and international consensus.

Those moves infuriated the Palestinians – who want East Jerusalem as the capital of their own hoped-for state – and caused them to break off ties with Washington.

The Americans also withdrew from the 2015 Iran nuclear pact, in a step hailed by Mr Netanyahu.

When it finally arrived, the long-awaited Trump peace plan for Israel and the Palestinians – much heralded by its proponents as "the deal of the century" – was heavily tilted in Israel's favour. It was never implemented.

Mr Netanyahu took personal credit for the diplomatic developments, along with historic deals, brokered by the US, to normalise Israeli relations with Arab League countries: the United Arab Emirates, Bahrain, Sudan and Morocco.

Corruption trial

Despite his success on the global stage, Mr Netanyahu had growing problems at home.

The prime minister was under police investigation for allegedly accepting lavish gifts from businessmen as bribes and offering favours to try to get more positive press coverage.

He remains on trial, denying the charges against him and calling them a political witch-hunt.

Israel has become increasingly polarised: outside a recent court hearing, two counter-protests were taking place.

"He's doing everything he can to escape justice and he will take 9 million citizens down the drain only to escape justice," said Nurit Gil in the anti-Netanyahu camp.

"They are trying to do a governmental coup," claimed a Netanyahu supporter, Shoshana Idisis. "We believe Netanyahu is the one and only leader. He's not perfect but he didn't do anything that they are saying."

For many Israelis, the protracted legal process has been tied to a long period of political stalemate – which has resulted in four inconclusive general elections in two years.

"It's absolutely crazy," Times of Israel political correspondent Tal Schneider told me after the latest vote. "We've never experienced anything like this since the establishment of the country in 1948."

"It's been really tiresome for people. The problem, of course, is that if you don't have a functioning government, you don't have a budget and full working services."

Opposition unites

It remains to be seen whether the new, fragile unity government will be able to put Israel "back on track" as Mr Netanyahu's replacement, Naftali Bennett has promised.

Parties from across the political spectrum have come together in an effort to cast off Mr Netanyahu's divisive shadow.

However, with their deep, ideological differences there are many sensitive policies they will want to kick into the long grass.

Mr Netanyahu, who is 71, has indicated that he plans to stay on as leader of his Likud party which controls a quarter of parliamentary seats.

A masterful political strategist, in opposition he will look to exploit the weaknesses of the governing coalition.

Already he has tried to discredit Mr Bennett, his one-time chief of staff, accusing him of committing "the fraud of the century" to create a left-wing government which would, he said, imperil Israel.

The former King has not given up hope of regaining his crown.

Text 9. South Korea-Japan Ties Sour A mid Fresh Military Drills Near Disputed Islands

Justin McCurry in Tokyo
Tue 15 Jun 2021 06.43 BST

Meeting of leaders at G7 reportedly cancelled over Seoul's decision to stage exercises around Dokdo islands, which are also claimed by Tokyo.

South Korea has begun annual military drills near a pair of remote islands that are also claimed by Japan, as the long-running territorial dispute threatened to sour preparations for the Tokyo Olympics.

The exercises near the Dokdo islands – referred to as Takeshima in Japan – began days after a meeting between the countries' leaders on the sidelines of the Cornwall G7 summit was reportedly cancelled due to Japanese objections to the exercises.

Earlier this month, South Korea lodged a complaint with the International Olympic Committee (IOC) after Tokyo 2020 organisers identified the islands as Japanese on an online map showing the route of the Olympic torch relay.

The start of annual military drills near Takeshima/Dokdo is expected to strain relations that have already been soured by recent disputes over the countries' bitter wartime history.

Despite their status as key US allies and a shared interest in denuclearising North Korea, Tokyo and Seoul are locked in disagreement over Japan's use of wartime sexual slavery and labourers who were forced to work in its mines and factories before and during the second world war.

Naval, air and coast guard forces will join the drills, which will be staged mostly at sea with minimal contact between troops due to coronavirus concerns, the South Korean defence ministry said.

Yonhap news agency said a rumoured meeting between the South Korean president, Moon Jae-in, and the Japanese prime minister, Yoshihide Suga, last weekend was cancelled after Suga took issue with the drills.

The Yomiuri Shimbun newspaper reported that Moon had been planning to tell Suga of his desire to attend the Olympics opening ceremony on 23 July in a public show of support for the controversial Games. The visit would also be an opportunity for the two men to hold their first talks.

Moon said he was disappointed not to have met Suga during the G7. "My first encounter with prime minister Suga would have been a precious chance [for] a new start in the South Korea-Japan relationship, but I am sorry that it could not develop into a meeting," he said in a Facebook post.

Japanese officials said the meeting had been called off due to scheduling problems.

A foreign ministry official in Seoul would not confirm if the drills were the reason for the cancellation, saying only "the exercises are regularly held every year for the purpose of defending our territory", according to Reuters.

The drills around the South Korean-controlled islets have taken place twice a year since 1986, prompting frequent protests from Japan, which insists they are "inherently" Japanese – a claim it says is supported by international law.

"The drills are unacceptable and extremely regrettable," the chief cabinet secretary in Japan, Katsunobu Kato, said on Tuesday. "We have protested to the South Korean government and called for them to be halted."

Kato added that there was "no truth" in reports that Moon planned to visit Tokyo during the Olympics.

Japan has rejected South Korea's demand to amend the Olympics map, prompting calls from some South Korean MPs to boycott the Games.

The islands – also known as the Liancourt Rocks after a French whaling ship that was almost wrecked there in 1849 – lie 225km (140 miles) off the east coast of South Korea.

The territory is guarded by a small police detachment; its sole resident is 83-year-old Kim Shin-yeol, who lived there with her husband, Kim Sung-do, until his death in 2018.

2. ВИЗИТЫ И ПЕРЕГОВОРЫ

Text 1. Merkel Makes Final Visit to Russia as German Chancellor

German Chancellor Angela Merkel, scheduled to leave office later this year after nearly 16 years, is in Moscow for one final meeting with Russian President Vladimir Putin.

Before the two leaders met for talks in the Kremlin Friday, Merkel took part in a wreath-laying ceremony at Russia's Tomb of the Unknown Soldier in Moscow and viewed a military procession immediately after.

Later, at the Kremlin, Putin presented the German chancellor with a bouquet of flowers as they met for a photo opportunity before their talks. In front of reporters, Merkel told Putin though they have deep differences, she feels it is important they meet for talks.

Merkel said the two leaders had much to discuss, including, among other issues, the situation in Afghanistan and Libya as well as bilateral relations.

Putin and Merkel are likely to broach Russia's Nord Stream 2 natural gas pipeline to Germany, which is nearly complete. The U.S. has raised questions about the deal, as it represents a huge blow to ally Ukraine by bypassing the historic gas transit country.

The two were scheduled to hold a joint news conference soon after their talks.

Merkel is scheduled to visit Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelensky in Kyiv on Sunday.

Text 2. French President Emmanuel Macron to visit Dublin next week

French President Emmanuel Macron will visit Dublin next week, where he is due to meet President Michael D Higgins and Taoiseach Micheál Martin.

Mr Macron will arrive in Ireland next Thursday, 26 August, where he will be welcomed by President Higgins at Áras an Uachtaráin.

A statement from the president's office said that after the welcoming ceremony, they will have a bilateral meeting at the Áras followed by a meeting with a number of prominent writers and thinkers.

Mr Macron will then travel to Government Buildings for talks with the Taoiseach.

The talks will focus on current EU and international issues, Covid-19 and Irish-French relations, a Government statement said.

In the evening, he will be hosted for a working dinner with President Higgins and his wife Sabina.

Accompanying the French President on his trip will be a number of ministers from his government.

Their itinerary will include bilateral meetings with Irish counterparts, including Ministers Simon Coveney, Paschal Donohoe and Thomas Byrne.

Text 3. France's Macron visits Iraq to Show Support and Strengthen Ties

French President Emmanuel Macron is making a two-day visit to Iraq in what officials say is a show of support for the country as it struggles to maintain stability and to rebuild after years of war.

Mr Macron will begin his visit on Saturday by attending the Baghdad Conference for Co-operation and Partnership, a summit that brings together several foreign leaders in an attempt to ease tension in the region and to win much-needed support for Iraq.

France's president will also meet his Iraqi counterpart Barham Salih, Prime Minister Mustafa Al Kadhimi and Parliament Speaker Mohammed Al Halbousi, an official at the French embassy in Baghdad said.

The aim of the visit is to "support Iraq and Iraqi people", the official said. "This period is very important for Iraq as we are approaching the elections in October."

Mr Macron "wants to express his support for Iraq and the political process and democracy".

The parliamentary election on October 10 was brought forward from May next year, one of the key demands of pro-reform protests that engulfed the country in late 2019.

Later on Saturday, Mr Macron will visit the shrine of the eighth-century imam Mousa Al Kadhim in Baghdad, which is revered by Shiites, before heading north to meet officials in the self-ruled Kurdish region.

On Sunday, he will visit the northern Iraqi city of Mosul, the crown jewel in ISIS's self-proclaimed state after the extremist group's onslaught in Syria and Iraq in mid-2014.

The city was recaptured in late 2017 by the US-backed Iraqi security forces, but at heavy cost. ISIS rule and the battle to retake Mosul left large parts of the city and surrounding areas in ruins. A lack of funds, political wrangling and corruption have delayed reconstruction efforts.

Mr Macron will talk to students of Mosul University and visit the Old City as well as Mosul's main landmarks, Al Nuri Mosque and Al Saa'a Church.

By visiting Shiite, Sunni and Christian places of worship, the president wants to send "a strong message that France respects all Iraqi segments", the French embassy official said.

The 12th-century Al Nuri Mosque and its complex, as well as Al Saa'a Church, are being reconstructed through a UAE-Unesco project.

The UAE has pledged $50.4 million to restore the Al Nuri complex and two old churches, Al Saa'a and Al Tahera.

Unesco launched its Revive the Spirit of Mosul initiative in early 2018, a few months after Iraq declared victory over ISIS. It aims to restore the city's landmark buildings and heritage sites, while also strengthening the educational system by repairing schools. With a focus on reforming curriculums and supporting local cultural initiatives, the project aims to revive the city's intellectual life.

Iraq has been going through a difficult time since the 2003 US-led invasion that toppled Saddam Hussein and unleashed insurgency and sectarian warfare.

The country is caught in the middle as its main allies, the US and Iran, spar on its soil. The economy has also been hit by the falling price of oil and the coronavirus pandemic.

France did not play a major role in Iraq after the 2003 invasion but has increased its engagement since 2014, when it joined the US-led International Coalition to fight ISIS. French forces trained Iraqi troops and France offered financial support for humanitarian and stabilisation efforts.

In March, Iraq signed a preliminary agreement with French company Total that includes four projects to develop an oil field, produce gas, build large energy infrastructure and generate solar energy.

Total is expected to invest more than $7 billion in the projects, all of which are located in the oil-rich south of the country.

In February, the French company ADP Ingenierie signed an agreement with Iraqi Civil Aviation for the reconstruction of Mosul airport. Another company is in talks to build an elevated metro system in Baghdad.

Mr Macron's visit is the second in less than a year. Last September he became the first western leader to visit Iraq since Mr Al Kadhimi took office in May after a chaotic period during anti-regime protests that forced the previous government to resign.

"Iraq is a very important partner for France," the embassy official said.

Text 4. Britain's Sharma arrives in China's Tianjin for Climate Talks

Britain's senior climate change official Alok Sharma arrived in Tianjin on Sunday to meet representatives from government and business ahead of the

next round of global climate talks scheduled to take place in Glasgow in November.

Sharma, a government minister and President of the COP 26 climate talks, said via Twitter late on Saturday that he had arrived in China and was meeting top climate envoy Xie Zhenhua to discuss "how we work together" to ensure the November summit is successful.

"I welcome China's commitment to climate neutrality by 2060 and look forward to discussing China's policy proposals towards this goal, its plans for submitting an enhanced 2030 emissions reduction target, as well as how we work towards a successful multilateral outcome at COP26," he said via press release.

China, the world's biggest emitter of climate-warming greenhouse gas, is coming under pressure to announce more ambitious measures on coal production and consumption.

Britain and other G7 nations have also asked China to introduce more near-term policies to help ensure its longer-term targets are achieved.

However, climate watchers expect it to stick to its current trajectory of allowing coal consumption to rise further until 2025 before starting to decline.

Sharma's visit to China comes just three days after John Kerry, the U.S. special envoy on climate, met with Xie and other top Chinese government officials to discuss joint actions on tackling the climate crisis.

Senior Chinese diplomat Wang Yi told Kerry that climate change "cannot be separated" from broader diplomatic disputes between the two sides, But Kerry said resolving the crisis was "not ideological, not partisan, and not a geostrategic weapon."

Text 5. US, Mexico resume high-level trade talks halted during Trump era

The United States and Mexico on Thursday resumed high-level economic talks for the first time in four years since the beginning of the Trump administration.

Vice President Harris and Secretary of State Antony Blinken were included as part of the U.S. team. Mexico's Foreign Secretary Marcelo Ebrard and Economy Secretary Tatiana Clouthier were also involved, representing the border country, according to Reuters.

The negotiations, referred to as the High-Level Economic Dialogue talks, will seek to cover various subjects including climate change, workers' rights and the ongoing immigration issue.

This is the first time the two countries have resumed talks since 2017 when former President Trump, often a harsh critic of Mexico, halted the dialogue.

Harris, according to the wire service, said that much had changed since 2017 when the countries entered into this particular dialogue. She added that coronavirus has thrown a curve ball into the global economy.

The pandemic has prompted the rise of cyberattacks which, in turn, have disrupted supply chains.

The vice president said that for this reason, the U.S. and Mexico should come together to address the problem.

"Mexico is our closest neighbor … and a strategic partner and one of our most important economic relationships. Mexico's economic stability is in the interest of the United States. We talked about this in Mexico City, 18 states in the United States count Mexico as their first or second export destination. One billion dollars crosses our shared border every day," Harris said, according to the news outlet.

"This high level economic dialogue is an opportunity to deepen our ties and advance our collective goals. Together, we will strengthen supply chain resilience. Together, we will modernize our hemispheric infrastructure."

The two countries have planned to discuss major economic issues including building a more resilient supply chain along the border; a more sustainable economy and social development in Mexico and Central American countries; and building on cybersecurity and workforce development, according to Reuters.

A senior administration official told reporters in a conference call Wednesday that both the U.S. and Mexico's goals in the talks is to find a constructive resolution to the issues.

"We made clear that they could raise any issue of concern, and that we would raise issues of concern. And then we would look to find ways to find constructive resolution along with these issues," the senior administration official said.

The senior administration official also said that investing in communities is the "only sustainable way" to address the migration issue long term.

Text 6. Australia Says Trade Deal with Britain Agreed

Reporting by Colin Packham; Editing by Simon Cameron-Moore

CANBERRA – Britain and Australia have agreed a trade deal after talks between their prime ministers ironed out outstanding issues, Australia's Minister for Trade Dan Tehan said on Tuesday. Britain had made securing a trade deal with Australia a priority for its post-Brexit strategy as it seeks to build stronger commercial and diplomatic links in the Indo-Pacific region, but negotiations have dragged on for months.

Australia's Prime Minister Scott Morrison and his British counterpart Boris Johnson overcame sticking points during a bilateral talks after the Group of Seven meeting in Britain over the weekend, which Morrison had attended as a guest.

"Both prime ministers have held a positive meeting in London overnight and have resolved outstanding issues in relation to the [Free Trade Agreement]," Tehan said in a statement.

A formal announcement would be made later on Tuesday, Tehan said.

The deal will be keenly scrutinized by British farmers, who fear they could be forced out of business if the deal eliminates tariffs on lamb and beef imports from Australia.

Though details have still to emerge, official estimates say the agreement could add 500 million pounds ($705.7 million) to British economic output over the long term.

For Australia, however, analysts questioned the importance for an economy already focused on Asia.

"This free trade agreement is more about symbolism than immediately tangible material benefits," said Ben Wellings, senior lecturer in politics and international relations at Monash University.

3. ДОКУМЕНТЫ, ЗАКЛЮЧАЕМЫЕ ПО ИТОГАМ ПЕРЕГОВОРОВ

Text 1. Final instruments of intergovernmental negotiations and visits: communiqués and (joint) statements

Meetings between heads of government or state, as well as between ministers for foreign affairs, to discuss policies or problems of mutual interest to their countries have become common practice in intergovernmental relations. The results of such meetings are usually, for lack of time, not set out in formal treaties or agreements signed in the traditional manner. Very often, the participants confine themselves to the drawing up of a joint statement, declaration or communiqué, handed out during a press conference and usually published in newspapers. Such instruments, however important or binding upon the participating governments, have none of the classic character of international agreements.

The final documents of intergovernmental negotiations or visits – joint statements, communiqués or declarations (whether signed or unsigned) come to life only if there is prior agreement between the participants on each paragraph, phrase or word in the text.

A communiqué is an official report on the course of international negotiations, and on the agreement achieved. It may be brief and contain an announcement of some fact or facts in general terms. Sometimes, however, it may be long and elaborate, and then it will include a detailed description of the course of negotiations, a declaration of the decisions adopted by the participants and the terms of the agreement achieved.

Prior to World War II a shorter variety was predominant.

Today the idea has undergone substantial change. Final documents of negotiations or visits now embrace a wide range of important international issues and are becoming more meaningful. Communiqués as well as joint statements and declarations have become increasingly widespread, playing a far more important role in international relations than they used to play in the past.

The nature, content and tone of a final document are determined primarily by the nature of the states adopting the document – states with similar or different social systems, allied states or states members of the opposing military groupings, and so forth.

Text 2. Communiqué

COMMUNIQUÉ

At the invitation of President of..., President... of... paid an official working visit to (name of country) from April 26 to 28, 20__.

During the visit, talks were held between President of ... and President of...

The meetings and talks were held in the atmosphere of cordiality and mutual respect, which is a traditional feature of relations between peoples of our countries.

During the talks, priority was given to examining the most topical problems of our time from the standpoint of further steps aimed at consolidating the policy of detente in Europe and all over the world, eliminating the seats of tension, strengthening international security and confidence between states. Mutual understanding was reached on the issues discussed.

A detailed exchange of views was also held on the further development of the basic areas of bilateral cooperation in various fields. […]

The Sides agreed to continue efforts to deepen economic relations on a stable and long-term basis. The activity of the permanent commission will be of major significance in the realization of this aim. [...]

Determined to contribute to the development of their economic relations, the Sides agreed to take all necessary measures to ensure a further considerable growth of trade turnover.

The Sides noted with satisfaction the successful development of cultural exchanges and cooperation between the two countries. [...]

As a result of the talks President of... and President of... signed a Programme for the Further Development of Cooperation between (name of country) and (name of country).

President of... and President of... are convinced that this summit has been useful and will serve the cause of peace and security in Europe and all over the world.

President... invited President... to pay an official visit to (name of country). The invitation was accepted with satisfaction.

Text 3. Joint Communiqué

JOINT COMMUNIQUÉ

The Republic of Venezuela and the Kingdom of Nepal, desirous of strengthening the ties of friendship and with the purpose of bringing together effectively their respective peoples, have agreed to establish diplomatic relations as of this date.

The Governments of both countries are convinced that the establishment of diplomatic relations will further enhance cooperation between the two countries based on the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

New York, April 27th, 20____

For the Government of Venezuela (*Signed*) Anders Aquilar M. Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary Permanent Representative of Venezuela to the United Nations	For His Majesty's Government of Nepal (*Signed*) Jai Pratap Rana Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary Permanent Representative of Nepal to the United Nations

Text 4. Joint Statement

JOINT STATEMENT
ENVIRONMENT OF DURABLE PEACE AND SECURITY

The prime ministers of India and Pakistan held a bilateral meeting on the sidelines of the UN general assembly in New York on 23 September 20__.

Their discussions covered the whole range of bilateral relations. The two prime ministers also carried out a detailed review of new developments in the region during the past few months.

They reaffirmed their common belief that an environment of durable peace and security was in the supreme interests of both India and Pakistan, and of the region as a whole.

They expressed their determination to renew and reinvigorate efforts to secure such an environment. They agreed that the peaceful settlement of all outstanding issues was essential for this purpose.

The two leaders reiterated their commitment to create conditions which would enable both countries to fully devote their resources, both human and material, to improving the lives of their people, particularly the poorest among them.

The two prime ministers noted with satisfaction the agreement reached between the foreign secretaries on operating the mechanism to address all items on the agreed agenda of 23rd June, 20___ in a purposeful and composite manner. They directed the foreign secretaries, accordingly, to resume the dialogue on the agreed dates.

New York, N.Y.
23 September 20___

Prime Minister Prime Minister of India	Prime Minister Prime Minister of Pakistan
……………………………… (signed)	…………………………… (signed)

Text 5. Resolution adopted by the UN General Assembly

Publisher	UN General Assembly
Author	UN General Assembly (45th sess. : 1990–1991)
Publication Date	21 December 1990
Citation / Document Symbol	A/RES/45/212
Reference	45
Cite as	UN General Assembly, Protection of global climate for present and future generations of mankind : resolution / adopted by the General Assembly, 21 December 1990, A/RES/45/212, available at: https://www.refworld.org/docid/3b00f221f.html [accessed 5 September 2021]

Recalling its resolutions 43/53 of 6 December 1988 and 44/207 of 22 December 1989, in which it recognized that climate change is a common concern of mankind, and urging Governments and, as appropriate, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations and scientific institutions, to collaborate in a concerted effort with the aim of preparing, as a matter of urgency, a framework convention on climate change, and other related instruments, containing appropriate commitments for action to combat climate change and its adverse effects, taking into account the most up-to-date, sound scientific knowledge and any existing uncertainties, as well as the particular needs and development priorities of developing countries,

Recalling also its resolution 44/206 of 22 December 1989 on the possible adverse effects of sea-level rise on islands and coastal areas, particularly low-lying coastal areas,

Recalling further its resolution 44/228 of 22 December 1989 on the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development,

Taking note of the relevant resolutions and decisions of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme and of the Executive Council of the World Meteorological Organization,

Taking note also of the recommendations and decisions of the Preparatory Committee for the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, adopted at its organizational session and at its first session,

Noting the important work accomplished by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, which has completed its first assessment report,

Noting also the relevant conclusions and recommendations on climate change adopted at various intergovernmental meetings during 1990,

Noting further the fact that the largest part of the current emission of pollutants into the environment originates in developed countries, and recognizing therefore that those countries have the main responsibility for combating such pollution,

Welcoming the fact that several countries and a regional economic integration organization have already taken measures or made specific commitments to address the problem of climate change and its effects through the stabilization and/or reduction of environmentally harmful emissions of greenhouse gases, and that other countries are contemplating doing so,

Noting that, pursuant to paragraph 10 of General Assembly resolution 44/207, resolution 4 (EC-XLII) of 22 June 1990 of the Executive Council of the World Meteorological Organization and decision SS.II/3 of 3 August 1990, adopted by the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme at its second special session, an Ad Hoc Working Group of Government Representatives to prepare for negotiations on a framework convention on climate change met at Geneva from 24 to 26 September 1990 and adopted a number of recommendations,

Recognizing the continuing need for scientific research into the sources and effects of climate change and its possible adverse impact, including the socio-economic consequences, and the effectiveness of possible response strategies, and recognizing also the importance of the active participation of developing countries and the need to assist and cooperate with them in climate-related research and action.

1. Decides to establish a single intergovernmental negotiating process under the auspices of the General Assembly, supported by the United Nations Environment Programme and the World Meteorological Organization, for the preparation by an Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee of an effective framework convention on climate change, containing appropriate commitments, and any related instruments as might be agreed upon, taking into account proposals that may be submitted by States participating in the negotiating process, the work of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate

Change and the results achieved at international meetings on the subject, including the Second World Climate Conference;

2. Decides that the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee should be open to all States Members of the United Nations or members of the specialized agencies, with the participation of observers in accordance with the established practice of the General Assembly;

3. Welcomes the organization of a broad-based preparatory process at the national level involving, as appropriate, the scientific community, industry, trade unions, non-governmental organizations and other interested groups;

4. Decides that the first negotiating session should be held in Washington, D.C., in February 1991 and that, subject to review of the timetable at the end of each negotiating session and taking into account the schedule of other intergovernmental meetings on environment and development matters, in particular the sessions of the Preparatory Committee for the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, further meetings should be held at Geneva and at Nairobi, in May/June, September and November/December 1991 and, as appropriate, between January and June 1992;

5. Authorizes the Secretary-General of the United Nations, with the assistance of the Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme and the Secretary-General of the World Meteorological Organization, pending the establishment of an ad hoc secretariat for the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee, to convene, exceptionally, the first session of the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee, to be held in Washington, D.C., in February 1991; the subsequent sessions of the Committee shall be convened by the ad hoc secretariat;

6. Decides that the maximum duration of each of the negotiating sessions should be two weeks;

7. Considers that the negotiations for the preparation of an effective framework convention on climate change, containing appropriate commitments, and any related legal instruments as might be agreed upon, should be completed prior to the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development in June 1992 and opened for signature during the Conference;

8. Reaffirms the principles embodied in its resolutions 44/207 and 44/228, which take into account the concerns of all States and the specific needs of developing countries;

9. Takes account of the Ministerial Declaration adopted at the Second World Climate Conference, held at Geneva from 29 October to 7 November 1990;

10. Decides to establish a special voluntary fund, administered by the head of the ad hoc secretariat under the authority of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, to ensure that developing countries, in particular the least

developed among them, as well as small island developing countries, are able to participate fully and effectively in the negotiating process, and invites Governments, regional economic integration organizations and other interested organizations to contribute generously to the fund;

11. *Recommends* that, at the first session of the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee, to be held in Washington, D.C., a Bureau consisting of a Chairman, three Vice-Chairmen and a Rapporteur shall be elected, each of the five regional groups being represented by one member;

12. *Requests* the Secretary-General of the United Nations, in consultation with the Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme and the Secretary-General of the World Meteorological Organization, as well as with the executive heads of United Nations bodies with expertise in the field of development, to establish as soon as possible at Geneva an ad hoc secretariat of appropriate size and quality, consisting mainly of Professional staff of the United Nations Environment Programme and the World Meteorological Organization, taking into account the need to ensure that the work programmes of those two organizations are not negatively affected, to be coordinated by those two organizations in consultation and co-operation with the head of the ad hoc secretariat and supplemented by staff from other bodies of the United Nations system, as appropriate, in order to ensure that the ad hoc secretariat embodies the requisite technical expertise;

13. *Decides* that the Secretary-General of the United Nations shall appoint as head of the ad hoc secretariat a senior official of an appropriate level, who shall act under the guidance of the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee;

14. *Requests* the head of the ad hoc secretariat to co-operate closely with the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change to ensure that the Panel can respond to the needs and requests for objective scientific and technical advice made during the negotiating process;

15. *Also requests* the head of the ad hoc secretariat to make available, at the first session of the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee, the first assessment report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, including its paper on legal measures, as well as the background documentation prepared for the Panel, as inputs for the negotiations, together with the Ministerial Declaration of the Second World Climate Conference and other relevant documents;

16. *Requests* the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee, through the ad hoc secretariat and taking into account the relevance of the negotiations to the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, to keep the Preparatory Committee for the Conference and the Secretary-General of the Conference, as well as the Secretary-General of the United Nations, regularly informed in a timely manner, through regular progress reports, of the progress of the negotiations;

17. Also requests the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee to take into account, as appropriate, any relevant developments in the preparations for the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development that the Preparatory Committee may bring to its attention;

18. Requests the Chairman of the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee, on behalf of the Committee, to submit a report to the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development in 1992 on the outcome of the negotiations, as well as on possible future steps in the field of climate change;

19. Invites relevant non-governmental organizations to make contributions to the negotiating process, as appropriate on the understanding that these organizations shall not have any negotiating role during the process, and taking into account decision 1/1 concerning the participation of non-governmental organizations adopted by the Preparatory Committee for the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development at its first session;

20. Decides that the negotiating process shall be funded through existing United Nations budgetary resources, without negatively affecting its programmed activities, and through voluntary contributions to a trust fund established specifically for that purpose for the duration of the negotiations and administered by the head of the ad hoc secretariat under the authority of the Secretary-General of the United Nations;

21. Invites the World Meteorological Organization and the United Nations Environment Programme and other relevant bodies of the United Nations system, including those in the field of development, to make appropriate contributions to the negotiating process, including its funding;

22. Invites Governments, regional economic integration organizations and other interested organizations to contribute generously to the trust fund;

23. Requests the head of the ad hoc secretariat to prepare draft rules of procedure for consideration by the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee at its first session;

24. Requests the Secretary-General of the United Nations to submit to the General Assembly at its forty-sixth session a report on the progress of the negotiations;

25. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its forty-sixth session the item entitled "Protection of global climate for present and future generations of mankind".

4. КУЛЬТУРНЫЕ ОСОБЕННОСТИ ВЕДЕНИЯ ПЕРЕГОВОРОВ

Text 1. The Art of Negotiating

The art of negotiating involves finding a balance between achieving the best possible result, while at the same time establishing a *mutually beneficial* working relationship with your *counterparts*. Much negotiation literature, including the best-seller book *Getting to Yes*, emphasizes inventing *options for mutual gain* rather than negotiating on a win-lose basis. The former tries to expand the pie by discovering new options, while the latter sees negotiations as a fixed pie where the more one side wins, the more the other side loses. The idea behind the "Getting to Yes" *approach* is that it is unproductive to lock yourself into a fixed position because that will prevent you from finding *alternatives* that will be mutually beneficial. One example is when a major American soft drink producer was attempting a *market penetration* in the former Soviet Union. One of the *major* problems was the means of payment. The soft drink producer wanted payment in dollars, but the Soviets did not want to exhaust their limited dollar reserves. The whole deal could have fallen apart if both sides had locked themselves into their *predetermined* positions and simply repeated the importance of the other side accepting it. What they did instead was to seek out alternative solutions to satisfy *mutual* needs. You will be asked to analyze this case and find a solution in the exercise at the end of this chapter.

Another problem with fixed positions and a win-lose orientation is that most business relations involve long-term cooperation. Naturally, you want to achieve the best possible result for your company, but at the same time you do not want to poison the ongoing business relationship on which your future success depends. Negotiations are a case of give and take, and good negotiators are sensitive to the *priorities* and musts of the other side. Beating the other side into submission, even though it may give you a sense of victory, is certainly not the way to establish the *atmosphere* of mutual understanding necessary for an ongoing business relationship.

Thus, in negotiating you should consider the following.

Establish Interests and Not Positions
As suggested, emphasizing interests allows negotiators to arrive at mutually satisfying solutions that will become the basis for a positive ongoing business relationship. Establishing interests is a two-part process. First, you must clearly establish your interests; second, you must *strive* to understand

your counterparts' interests. You should try to put yourself in the others' shoes and let them know that you have tried to understand their position. For example, in the case "Tourism Comes to Zanir," the Abenteuer Urlaub team could establish an understanding of the interests involved by stating first that they see Zanir as an attractive tourist destination because of its unspoiled nature and beautiful beaches, which would be highly attractive to the German tourists and thus profitable for both parties. They could go on by saying that they understand the Zanirian authorities' *concerns* about economic development and the protection of their cultural traditions. So as not to sound as if they are *presupposing* the Zanirian position, they could preface their statements by "as we understand it" or "correct us if we are wrong."

Do Not Underestimate the Importance of Socializing and Protocol

Almost every case will begin with some socializing before sitting down at the negotiating table. This can involve the exchange of business cards and "gifts" and conversation with compliments, expectations for a mutually beneficial relationship, and sharing of interests and hobbies – for example, your golf handicap and favorite courses – anything to create a relationship. You will also want to establish a sense of mutual respect and, when important to the culture of your counterparts, respect for senior members. The socializing will be followed by the host team's leader seating the delegations and officially presenting the members of his or her team, including their titles. The visiting delegation's leader will then present his or her team in the same way. All members will have name cards with their titles in front of them.

Breaks in the negotiations will also provide an opportunity for socializing and for *sounding out* individual members concerning their feelings about issues. Each team must carefully determine how much *leeway* its individual members have in discussing positions outside the negotiation room.

Take the Other Side's Position Seriously

As an extension of focusing on interests and not positions, do not just look at the other side's position as something to be *brushed aside* on your way to victory. Put yourself in their shoes and try to understand why they want what they want.

This will help you understand interests and not focus on positions, which in turn will help you arrive at creative alternative solutions. For example, in the Zanir case, the German team must be sensitive not only to African history but to present needs. In order to understand Zanirians' skepticism to tourist development, they must understand what centuries of colonialism have done to Zanirian *perception* of Europeans' intentions. The Zanirians could easily view their German counterparts as there to *exploit* Zanir's natural resources as has historically been the case in European-African relations. Thus, the Germans

must emphasize that they understand the Zanirians' need for economic development and create a sense that this project can result in mutual gain. Naturally, this may weaken the German position, but failing to understand the Zanirians' needs may spoil the entire deal.

Depersonalize and Focus on Substance
Establishing *good chemistry* among negotiators is important since you will be involved in a long-term relationship where problems will arise. Thus, you have to establish a good working relationship in order to have a basis for dealing with the *eventual* problems. However, at the same time, you must avoid taking disagreements personally. You must focus on the problem and not conclude that your counterpart is unfair, unreasonable, or unreliable. It is easy to resort to such attacks when negotiations become *deadlocked* or problems arise, but emotional responses and personal attacks will destroy a working relationship faster than anything. Attack the problem and not your counterpart. Remember, both sides have their perception of the problem, their interests, and usually a mutual interest in solving the problem.

Listen and Observe Actively
Entering negotiations with a *preconceived* notion of the "only right outcome" and a fixed position will prevent you from listening to and observing your counterparts. They will be sending you verbal and non-verbal signals constantly, and you must perceive them and acknowledge them if you are to arrive at a mutually satisfying agreement. Thus, expressions such as, "As I understand your position," or "If I understand you correctly" help you to ensure that you have understood your counterparts' position as well as sending them a message that you are honestly trying to understand their position and take it into consideration. This helps establish a sense of mutuality which is the basis of negotiations geared at reaching a satisfying agreement.

Furthermore, listening can help you pick up signals as to how far your counterparts are willing to go to meet you. A classic case is that of a soft drink producer who wanted to break into a restaurant chain dominated by the "number 1" producer. The negotiating team went in trying to be accepted along with the existing supplier and couldn't understand why they were getting nowhere until one of the team members picked up a hint that the restaurant chain was dissatisfied with the present supplier and was willing to give the entire contract to the new supplier. Naturally, this is an extreme case, but awareness of your counterparts' communication, both verbal and non-verbal, is an important part of negotiations. This is extremely important in international negotiations, where verbal and non-verbal signs differ. You must not only be aware of these signs, but capable of interpreting them in their context. For example, if an American says, "that might be difficult," it means that

something still might be worked out. However, if a Japanese negotiator says the same thing, it is most likely a polite way of saving face while *rejecting* a proposal. With non-verbal communication, otherwise known as body language, there are further problems. In-high context cultures (cultures where words' meanings have to be interpreted from the social context in which they are spoken and verbal communication is imprecise), body language, pauses, even grunts can be more communicative than words. This subject will be taken up in the next chapter along with the importance of understanding the culture of those with whom you are negotiating.

Periodically Summarize Agreement As You Are Going Along

In order to avoid misunderstandings that lead to two different interpretations of the final agreement, summarize what has been decided. Use sentences such as, "So far we have decided ...," or "Now let us move on to the question of..." So as not to seem to dictate the summary of what has been decided, you can add, "As we understand it, we have arrived at the following agreement. / We have decided ..."

Establish a Feeling of Fairness by Using Objective Criteria

When resolving disputes, resort to established criteria rather than ones that simply favor your position. One means is to look at similar cases and see what criteria were used and what agreement was arrived at. Another means is to subject the case to a neutral party – an independent consultant. A third approach is to carefully examine how both sides arrived at their figures. Often this will lead to compromise, especially if one or both sides cannot *document* how they arrived at their figures. When making your proposals, present your statements in a positive way by using expressions such as: "Don't you think a fair compromise would be ...", "To reach a fair solution, we propose ...," or "We are willing to approach your position/meet you half way and propose ..." These expressions are also tactical since they suggest that your counterparts are unreasonable if they reject your position.

Document Your Position and Present It Logically

Your position will be more convincing if you have the facts to support it. Thus, use statistics, figures, and examples from similar negotiations. A position presentations worksheet is provided in Appendix 4 and should be filled out in advance of your negotiation. An example drawn from the Zanirian team's presentation in the case "Tourism Comes to Zanir" would look like this.

POSITION: We require 51 percent ownership of the project, including the cost of the hotel stay. Thus, we require that you break down the cost of the package sold in your country and transfer 51 percent of the cost of the hotel

stay to us in German marks (Deutsche Marks).The calculation of the hotel stay will be determined by agreement between your accountant and ours.

DOCUMENTATION: Our neighboring country developed a similar resort project to that which you propose based on 100 percent ownership of the resort by the foreign company. Their experience shows that 90 percent of the money spent by tourists was either spent in buying the package in the company's country or spent at the hotel. Thus, the profits for the country, DM 1,000,000 per year, were not sufficient to cover the costs of the improvements in the infrastructure necessary for the project. Here are the figures furnished by the Sendalian Ministry of Commerce for your review. (Then you present the figures.)

CONSEQUENCES: Based on these figures, the project would result in negative cash flow for our country. You must admit that for a project to be attractive, there has to be a profit potential in it for both sides. (Note the appeal to fairness and commonly accepted good business practices.)

Establish a Positive Mind Set Before Entering the Negotiations

Do not look at your counterpart as someone who is out to cheat you or someone whom you are going to manipulate to your own advantage. Enter negotiations with a positive attitude that an agreement can be reached which will be mutually beneficial. Establish this feeling at the beginning of the negotiations by being friendly toward your counterparts. The protocol of introductions, exchanging business cards, complimenting your counterparts and their company, showing due respect for senior members, and being pleasant are all part of establishing the right tone. Do not overlook the importance of the social aspects of negotiations.

Emphasizing the mutual benefits that can be achieved early in the negotiations is also a means of expressing a positive *attitude* toward the result of the negotiations.

Emphasize the Positive

As a follow-up to the tone established in the beginning, emphasize the progress made as you move through the negotiations and the benefits to be gained by further progress. Use phrases such as, "Good, we have made good progress on items one and two, so let's see what we can do with item three" or "Good, I think we both feel encouraged about our progress so far and we are on our way to a mutually satisfying agreement."

Know Your Limits

Before the negotiations, set your opening offer and your resistance point – the point you would resist going beyond. Factor into your resistance point the concessions you would require to move beyond that point. Finally, set your

bottom line – the limit you are willing to go to before breaking off negotiations. When approaching that point, in a last attempt to save the negotiations, you might add: "It looks as if further negotiations seem pointless". In an attempt to save the negotiations, you can mention the advantages of achieving an agreement, but that any agreement must be based on mutual gain. You can emphasize your desire to achieve a satisfying agreement by saying, "We had hoped to achieve a mutually satisfying agreement and still do, but you will have to be willing to meet us half way," or something similar.

Be Prepared

Assess the balance of power and get as clear a picture as possible of how much you need what the team can offer you and what your alternatives are and how much they need you and what their alternatives are. This will require filling out the negotiations worksheet in Appendix 3- Furthermore, gain an understanding of your counterparts' culture and its impact on their approach to negotiations, which is discussed in the next chapter.

Be Aware of Tactics and Tricks

In spite of everything that has been said about the importance of achieving a mutually satisfying agreement, both sides wish to achieve the best possible agreement for themselves. Negotiating is a tightrope act between mutuality and individual gain. Thus, tactics and even tricks will be involved. If your counterparts feel that you are vulnerable to their tactics or tricks, they will naturally be tempted to use them. What you must do is to be aware of the kinds of tactics and tricks they may use. You can even confront them with, "You're not using the "good cop, bad cop" on us, are you?" I thought we were going to try to reach a mutually satisfying agreement "You appeal to fairness, while at the same time showing them that you know what tactic they are trying. In doing this at the outset, your counterparts will be less tempted to try to manipulate you, and negotiations can move on to the next level where mutually satisfying solutions can be achieved. The following section discusses some important considerations and some tricks to be aware of.

HOME FIELD ADVANTAGE: There are definite advantages with playing on your home field. You have your own support network, both social and business, while your visitors are far from friends, family, and business support. Staying in hotels and dealing with foreign cultures can wear them out to the point that they will more readily accept a deal just to get back to the comforts of their environment.

STALLING: If your counterparts know that you have a return flight or a deadline, they can wait you out, forcing you to accept their terms due to the

deadline. Make it quite clear that you have all the time in the world, even if you do not.

WEARING You OUT: Pretending to be social, the host team can provide many social activities to wear you out and dull your senses. Negotiating is a demanding activity requiring complete alertness. You need to be rested and alert, so do not let yourself be exhausted to the point where you are on the defensive. Simply decline those invitations that prevent you from staying rested and alert.

UNFAVORABLE POSITIONING: Positioning around the negotiating table may sound like a simple matter, but it can be part of psychological warfare. For example, if your hosts know that the sun will shine in your faces at 3:00 PM just about the time that you are reaching an important decision, they may place you on a certain side of the table. You must either be aware of this possibility and mention it in the beginning or politely ask to be moved when the sun starts shining in your face.

MISREPRESENTING FACTS: "How to lie with statistics" is a well-known phrase. If you doubt the accuracy of your counterparts' facts or figures, you may ask them to document them – that is show how they arrived at them, including the source of their information. If they have obviously invented the facts or figures, your questioning may be enough to have them revise them. If necessary, you can have an independent consultant/assessor go over figures, especially in assessing the value of something. Another approach is to hire your own assessor and use those figures as a point of departure in negotiating the true value of the thing in question.

TWO BITES OF THE APPLE: This is a question of the authority of your counterparts to conclude a deal. You must establish early that the people with whom you are dealing have final authority to sign an eventual contract. Otherwise they might use the "two bites of the apple" approach, which means that after you have reached an agreement and exposed your position, they say that they have to submit the proposal to their boss for final approval. The boss then accepts those parts of the contract that are favorable for him or her and subjects the remainder to further negotiation.

GOOD COP, BAD COP: A negotiating team is divided into two groups – the good cop and bad cop. In this approach, taken from police interrogation, the bad cop players take a very hard-line approach and try to wear you down. After hammering at you, a break is taken where the "good cops" talk to you, try to flatter your ego, and suggest a slightly moderated position, but one that you would not normally accept if you had not been so badly battered by the "bad cops." The "good cops" seem friendly, considerate, and reasonable in comparison to the "bad cops," and they get you to go along with an unfavorable compromise. The best way to avoid this is simply not to allow

yourself to judge the situation relative to the "bad cop," but to maintain your original goals.

These are just a few examples of important considerations and standard tricks used in negotiations. Your job is not to be tricked, and the best way is simply to confront the opposing side. While showing that you understand the tactic, you also establish yourself as being both professional and ethical and can then demand that you move on to "real" negotiations based on mutuality, honesty, and fairness.

MAKING THREATS: Typical threats are "Accept this or I'll buy from company X" or "We'll take you to court." When confronted by such threats, one has to determine the likelihood of them being carried out. Ways of assessing this likelihood are (1) the seniority of the person making the threat – the higher up in the organization, the more power he or she has and the greater the likelihood, (2) past performance – has this person carried out threats before, and (3) what this person and company stand to lose if the threat is carried out and the question of who needs whom more.

FISHING: Overstating a demand to discover a counterpart's reaction. If the reaction is strong, including body language (crossing of arms, angry expression), then the resistance on that point will be strong. This is a way of determining where your counterparts will be less flexible (their high-priority items) and where they are likely to make concessions and you can push for an optimal result. If someone tries this tactic on you, here are various possible responses:

Confrontational "You can't be serious." (Followed by silence. Often used to attack what is considered to be a bluff.)

Polite rejection. "I'm afraid we cannot consider that a reasonable offer." (followed by silence.)

Treating it as a misunderstanding. "Perhaps there is a misunderstanding here. Could you explain your position?" (This forces your counterparts to expose their position.)

STANDARD CONTRACT: Your counterpart presents the proposal as "This is a standard contract for the industry." You can counter by saying that the contract, if it is unfavorable, is unlike the contracts you have dealt with in all your other negotiations.

PLEASE REPEAT THAT, AS I AM NOT SURE I UNDERSTAND: A tactic used when a person wants to get a counterpart to reveal inconsistencies which can be used against her or him. The more a person speaks, the more likely he will reveal the real motives, thus exposing and weakening that bargaining position. This also gives you more time to consider a response.

NO INITIAL COMPROMISE: Typical for Western negotiators is to agree on areas where agreement can be reached with limited concessions and then negotiate questions where the gap in the two positions is wider. However,

some negotiating styles are based on no initial compromise on any point, even when taking an extreme position. The point is to wear down one's counterparts and make them compromise more than they normally would.

Text 2. Cultural Awareness in International Negotiations

Negotiation is not just a matter of arriving at a contract – the deal. It is a complicated process that involves a number of factors, many of which are culturally determined. You must never assume that your counterparts from another culture think like you do. Doing so can lead to misunderstanding, frustration, and distrust, which may sour the climate of the negotiations and even lead to failure to arrive at an agreement. Classic examples are (1) the question of time, (2) disagreement on the importance of protocol, and (3) conflicts arising from a deal orientation versus a relationship-establishing orientation in negotiation meetings. The question of time can create frustration and misunderstanding between a culture emphasizing punctuality, such as Germany, and one where punctuality is of less importance, such as in Latin cultures. German negotiators can easily interpret "Latin time" as being disrespectful if they are kept waiting. On the other hand, representatives from Latin cultures can feel that the German emphasis on punctuality is "pushy." These conflicting reactions can create an underlying tension, which could sour the atmosphere surrounding the negotiations. Disagreement on the importance of protocol between formal cultures, such as Japan, and informal cultures, such as the United States, can be equally disruptive. The Japanese culture is characterized by rituals such as bowing and the formalistic exchanging of business cards (with two hands), which shows the status of the individuals and others' acceptance of this status. The American emphasis on informality and the attempt to be on a personal first-name basis may be interpreted as disrespectful, particularly among the older and more traditional members of a Japanese delegation. This can lead to a loss of face, which is serious in Japanese culture and in most cases is irreversible. Finally, the goal of the negotiation process may be totally different for the two teams. U.S. negotiators are traditionally deal-oriented, and the purpose of their negotiations is to arrive at a written, binding contract. Saudi negotiators, on the other hand, are more relationship-oriented, and their goal is to form a friendship which will be the basis of a long-lasting business relationship. The standard saying is, "establish friendship and business will follow". Thus, a Saudi might regard an American push for the signed contract as a sign of distrust. Furthermore, the establishing of a relationship takes more time than many American negotiators have "budgeted." With a return ticket on a specific flight purchased, the American may push for the conclusion of negotiations, where the Saudi would like to take the extra time necessary to get to know his counterpart(s).

The purpose of this chapter, and the resulting exercise at the end of it, is to create an awareness of the possible differences in values underlying approaches to negotiations, which can lead to misunderstandings, frustration, conflicts, and failed deals. It will contain certain generalizations about the way representatives from different cultures negotiate – the culture of negotiations – which, like all generalizations, will not hold true in all cases. However, they will form a framework with which to deal with members of another culture. The applicability of the generalizations will vary from culture to culture. They will hold true to a greater degree with formalistic cultures, such as Japan, where there are rigid rules of behavior. They will be less accurate in individualistic cultures, such as that of the United States, where there is more individual freedom of action. Nevertheless, they should be learned so that (1) you avoid the mistake of assuming that everyone thinks and negotiates like you, and (2) you develop a sensitivity to different meanings attached to different gestures, means of expression (direct versus indirect communication), concepts of time, and so forth. Negotiation is a dialogue, and a dialogue requires an understanding of the differences associated with acts, statements, and body language. Understanding these differences will help you avoid misinterpretation, mistakes in communication, and even insults, all of which can result in failed deals.

The American culture of negotiation is used in this chapter as an example and compared with contrasting cultures on each point.

TIME: Negotiations should begin on time. "Time is money," and thus negotiations should not take more time than necessary. This means that American negotiators are sometimes frustrated by what they see as "Latin time" where meetings don't start promptly or the Arab tendency to want to establish friendship before negotiations can really begin. Americans are very goal-oriented, set up time schedules, and hope to conclude negotiations within those time frames. They can appear to be impatient or "pushy" (pressuring the opposite side to come to an agreement). Whereas a Chinese negotiator must convince his superior that he has fully explored the limits of his counterpart's position, an American negotiator may want to prove his efficiency by making a quick deal.

Another conflict may arise due to differing perceptions of time. Some cultures such as North American, British, and Germanic function under Monochrome time, which is linear and has segments which can be compartmentalized allowing people to concentrate on one thing at a time. Thus, negotiations should proceed from A to Z and not be interrupted. This is typical of American thinking. Other cultures, notably Arab, function under Polychrome time, where many things can occur at the same time. This can be a source of conflict between American and Arab negotiators because the latter allows many things to occur at the same time. For example, a telephone call or

a secretary's interruption are perfectly acceptable in a Polychrome time culture, whereas they would be considered impolite and frustrating for a member of a Monochrome time culture.

CONTRACT: American look at negotiations as a means of reaching a contract and stress legality and the binding nature of a written document, which sets out rights and duties that can be upheld in a court of law. Other cultures look at negotiations as a means of establishing a relationship that will be the basis of future business. For Americans, a contract is the sign of closing a deal, while for some other cultures it begins a relationship. The emphasis on a binding legal document may be interpreted by other cultures as a sign of a lack of trust. They often see a contract as a general outline of the present situation, which can be altered if a new situation arises. Thus, for legalistic cultures, such as Western European and North American, the Oriental tendency to look at a contract as a point of departure is very frustrating. The legalist interprets changes in a contract as breach of contract, which can be brought to court. Many Oriental negotiators feel that if a situation changes, the agreement should change, and that the original agreement was a statement of principles that can be worked out over time if the relationship between the two sides is good.

DEAL VERSUS RELATIONSHIP: A basic source of misunderstanding is an emphasis on making a deal versus establishing a relationship. Making a deal is typical of legalistic cultures such as Western Europe and North America, whereas establishing a relationship is typical of Oriental, Latin American, and Arab cultures. Legalistic cultures try to establish an "airtight" contract that takes into consideration all contingencies. Members of a relationship-oriented culture realize that the world is not static and unanticipated changes will occur that will require the reinterpretation of the original agreement. Thus, when a Japanese businessman seeks to modify a contract, the American will likely feel that he is being cheated. Whereas the Japanese will likely feel that the American is being unreasonably rigid and distrustful. The difference in emphasis on deal versus relationship may even affect the emphasis of the negotiations. A Japanese or Chinese negotiator will likely begin with an agreement on general principles, while an American will begin with specific details.

Naturally, the emphasis on building a relationship results in a more prolonged negotiation period. The American impatience to close the deal might not consider the importance of establishing a sound relationship, which is disconcerting for representatives of relationship-oriented cultures. Failure to recognize the importance of personal relationships can undermine the basic foundation of a working relationship. It is almost contradictory that Americans, who are extremely social, often place so little emphasis on relationship-building in international negotiations.

PROTOCOL: Protocol concerns the importance of the formal aspects of negotiations. It includes aspects such as how to address people (first or last names), use of titles, dress, gift giving, exchange of business cards, the respect for age, the shape of the negotiating table, the placement of negotiators, etiquette of conducting business over a meal, and so forth. Americans are informal and have a tendency to overlook the importance of protocol, which can be interpreted as impoliteness. Protocol functions to establish a relationship, and those who overlook the importance of relationship may overlook the importance of protocol. It helps to establish respect through gift giving and business card exchange, and respect for culturally determined rules of the game. Failure to consider protocol can be interpreted as both a personal affront and an affront to the culture of one's counterparts. Griffin and Daggatt cite Americans' tendency to address the member of the other negotiating team who speaks English best, thus overlooking a senior member of the other team, an act which ignores seniority and implicitly shows disrespect to the point of causing loss of face. As protocol establishes recognition of seniority among counterparts, failure to observe it can be equal to an unintentional insult. In analyzing one's counterparts, one has to decide both how important protocol is and what aspects of protocol are important.

DECISION MAKING: Approaches to decision making can be divided into individual and consensus. While in American teams the decision-making power often lies in the hands of individuals, other cultures emphasize group agreement by consensus, which naturally takes longer to achieve. Several negotiation experts have characterized the American approach as a "John Wayne" style where an individual arrives on the scene, conducts the negotiations as quickly as possible, and hopes to leave with a signed contract. This individualistic approach has several drawbacks. First, it is Monochrome, second, it overlooks the importance of establishing relationships, and third it can lead to excessive ego involvement. Believing that success or failure is individual, the John Wayne negotiator may take his counterparts' maneuvers personally and emotionally and lose his calm objectivity. This may lead to overreaction, which may decrease his effectiveness as a negotiator as well as poison the personal relationship between himself and his counterparts. Another problem can arise through misinterpreting the decision making process. Members of a team from an individualistic culture may conclude that the members of the negotiating team have the power to make the final decision. They will then be frustrated to find out that an agreement which they thought was final will be submitted to a larger group for approval. By then, they have stated their position, which makes them vulnerable, and the senior official of the other team can keep what is acceptable and demand that the rest be renegotiated.

An individual versus consensus approach will also impact on the concession process. An individual approach will allow for more flexibility in concession making. American teams tend to begin with an ideal contract and then make concessions until a compromise is reached. However, consensus-oriented teams have very little leeway in making concessions due to the difficulty they have in reaching consensus in their group. The consensus approach makes concessions difficult for the Japanese. The Russians often adopt an even more inflexible position, since they view compromise as a sign of weakness. Thus, whereas the Americans are generally willing to make concessions to reach an agreement, this approach may conflict with other cultures' negotiating styles.

In negotiating with other cultures, you must understand their negotiating approach, their attitude toward compromise, and who has the final say in accepting an agreement. Otherwise, you will be ineffective and frustrated.

CONFLICT: Conflict is not seen as necessarily negative by American negotiators and is often seen as part of the negotiating process. Emotions perhaps are more accepted than in some Asian cultures. Thus, American negotiators can appear more confrontational than some of their Asian counterparts, the Koreans being a notable exception. Certain aspects of conflict are (1) stating that you disagree, (2) making threats in terms of "if you do not accept this, we will", including threats of breaking off negotiations, (3) using the word "no", and (4) interrupting. This is one of the classic differences between Western European and Japanese negotiators. Japanese learn at an early age to avoid social conflict and save face. The Japanese generally do not like negotiating across a table. They sound out their counterparts in advance and hope to use formal meetings to present areas of agreement. The Japanese will question their counterparts in detail, not because they do not understand what is being said, but because they are looking for areas of agreement on which to build a consensus. Often adjustments in positions will be worked out outside of the negotiating room during breaks, where the Japanese negotiator will fish for possible agreement. The negotiator must be constantly aware of statements made outside of the negotiating room, since a suggestion may be subtly raised so as to be as easily withdrawn if not met by approval. This allows the all-important face saving. Thus, subtlety is the key. As Thayer and Weiss state, "Japanese negotiating style has been described as *awase* (to combine and adjust one thing to another). Instead of directly addressing issues, openly stating proposals and counterproposals, and generally relying on exact concepts and standardized meanings – features of an *erabi* (to select) culture such as the United States – awase style entails inferring the positions of the parties, assuming approximate meanings and adjusting to the situation. This style emphasizes proper form and process, even over the substance of decisions, and explains the Japanese preference for informal explorations and

agreement behind-the-scenes prior to formal sessions." Thus, those from cultures where conflict is acceptable must be extremely sensitive to subtle forms of communication by members of cultures where conflict is unacceptable. This leads us to a discussion of direct versus indirect communication.

DIRECT VERSUS INDIRECT COMMUNICATION: Direct communication involves stating exactly what you mean and expecting straight answers from others. It also involves asking questions and expecting direct answers. This is referred to as low-context communication, where facts and not the situation are important. In high-context communication, cultural constraints prevent a direct answer, and thus one has to interpret responses. For example, "no" is rarely used and can be replaced by "a bit difficult." "Yes" may not mean agreement, but simply that a request has been understood. "I'll think about it," for an American, will mean that a possibility of acceptance exists, whereas for a Japanese it might be a polite form of "no."

Eye contact is another area of difference. Americans look each other directly in the eyes, which may be considered impolite in some other countries. However, an American can interpret not looking one in the eyes, as a reason for distrust. Silence is another source of misunderstanding. Silence is perfectly acceptable in certain cultures, whereas it can be a source of embarrassment in others. It can even be used to gain concessions, where the members of one culture simply outwait the members of another who find silence unbearable, break down, and make a comment that leads to a concession. Often body language or grunts express more than words, and negotiators from low-context cultures must be careful about their own body language so as not to send false messages. They must also be aware of high-context culture representatives' body language to infer meaning where verbal communication does not exist.

WIN-WIN VERSUS WIN-LOSE: Win-win is when both sides win, while win-lose is where one side benefits at the other side's expense. The emphasis in the United States on winning may tend to push American negotiators toward win-lose strategies. Another factor is American emphasis on the individual rather than the group, which can lead to considering selfish interests higher than collective interests. Cultures that emphasize the importance of relationships will most likely emphasize win-win relationships, the idea being that a good business relationship will allow the partners to weather eventual conflicts and establish a mutually beneficial partnership. The win-win approach emphasizes finding interests that both sides have in common and developing them. The win-lose approach emphasizes making gains at the other party's expense, which creates a competitive and not a cooperative atmosphere. The win-lose approach is based on the idea of a fixed pie where one's gains result in another's losses. Win-win suggests that the pie can be expanded by looking for common interests and synergy. Needless to say,

negotiations will be difficult if the two sides approach the table with conflicting strategies. Win-win negotiators must be careful that their counterparts share this approach or they will be easily exploited. It is wise to set down the win-win ground rules at the beginning if negotiations are to be profitable for both sides.

Text 3. How to Master the Art of Negotiation

Many people believe that negotiations are "all or nothing," and that there has to be one winner and one loser. Nothing could be further from the truth. While the goal of negotiation is most certainly getting what you want, the fact is that the best deals (the ones that stick) incorporate terms and ideas from both parties.

In this article, we'll provide some tactics and tips that good negotiators use to get what they want. These suggestions may be used in virtually any negotiation process.

Before the Negotiation

Before entering any formal negotiation, it is important for an individual to think about what they want to achieve from the process. To that end, it makes sense to put on paper specific goals or desirable outcomes. Be optimistic. Ask yourself what would be a "home run" in your deal? This could be as simple as the other party conceding entirely to your wishes.

Next, individuals should identify several fall-back positions that they'd be comfortable with that would still get the deal done. The idea is to have thought out as many scenarios as possible.

The next task should be to identify (or try to identify) any potential weaknesses in the opposing party's position. For example, if in a real estate transaction, one party knows that the other party has to sell a certain property or face a liquidity crisis, this is valuable information that can be used in negotiation. Identification of weaknesses is important. That's because it might allow the party that has done its homework to capitalize on the other party's weaknesses and turn negotiations in its favor. At the very least, help both parties to identify an area of middle ground better.

Another pre-negotiation exercise – and it is something that most people don't do but should – is to come up with a list of reasons why their proposal would also be beneficial to the opposing party. The logic is to bring up the key points of this list in the actual negotiation with the counterparty in the hope that the points will advance the cause and/or help to identify some common ground.

Again, using real estate as an example, perhaps one party (in this case a company) could argue that its bid for a particular property is more favorable than others (even though it's lower in terms of dollars) because it is an all-cash

offer, as opposed to a riskier financing or a stock swap. By explicitly pointing out the advantages to both parties, the negotiator increases the odds of getting the deal done.

The Negotiation
In-Person

Ideally, each party should identify its goals and objectives at the outset. This allows each participant in the negotiation to know where the other stands. It also establishes a basis for a give-and-take conversation. At this point, each party may offer its fall-back proposals and counter-proposals to hammer out a deal.

That said, beyond the initial back-and-forth of proposals, there are also other things that negotiators can do to enhance their chances of turning the deal in their favor.

Let's use body language analysis as an example.

Was your proposal well received? Positive signs include nodding of the head and direct eye contact. Negative signs include folding of the arms (across the chest), aversion of eye contact, or a subtle head shake as if to say "no." Pay attention next time you ask someone a question. You'll see that more often than not, a person's body language can yield a lot of information regarding their underlying feelings.

By Phone

If negotiation is done over the phone, body language can't be determined. This means that the negotiator must do his best to analyze his counterpart's voice. As a general rule, extended pauses usually mean that the opposing party is hesitant or is pondering the offer. However, sudden exclamations or an unusually quick response (in a pleasant voice) may indicate that the opposing party is quite favorable to the proposal and needs a little nudge to seal the deal.

By E-Mail or Mail

Negotiations done through e-mail or the mail (such as residential real estate transactions) are a different animal altogether.

Here are some tips:

Words or phrases that leave ambiguity may signal that a party is open to a given proposal. Look specifically for words such as "can," "possibly," "perhaps," "maybe," or "acceptable." Also, if the party uses a phrase such as "anxiously awaiting your reply" or "looking forward to it," this may be a signal that the party is enthusiastic and/or optimistic that an agreement may soon be reached.

When the opposing party makes an initial offer or a counter-proposal, see if you can incorporate some of those ideas with your own and then seal the deal

on the spot. If compromise on a particular issue is not possible, propose other alternatives that you think would be favorable to both parties.

Finally, a more formal contract reflecting the terms agreed upon during the negotiation is a must. To that end, have an attorney draft a formal contract soon after the negotiation process is completed and make certain that all parties sign it on time.

No Agreement? No Worries

If an agreement cannot be reached in one sitting or one phone call, leave the door open to future negotiations. If possible, schedule further meetings. Don't worry, if worded your request appropriately won't appear overly anxious. To the contrary, it will come across as though you sincerely believe that a deal can be worked out and that you are willing to work to make that happen.

In between negotiations, try to review what took place during the initial meeting mentally. Did the opposing party reveal any weaknesses? Did they imply that other factors may have an impact on the deal? Pondering these questions before the next meeting can give the negotiator a leg up on their counterpart.

The Bottom Line

Not every negotiation can reach a deal that all sides are happy with. Whatever happens, f an agreement can't be reached, agree to part as friends. Never, under any circumstances, burn your bridges. You never know when you might have to cross those rivers again.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- Negotiating a deal is an essential part of doing business, and relies just as much on personality and soft skills as it does on quantitative analysis and valuation.
- The very first step before sitting at the negotiating table is to prepare. Learn about who you'll be dealing with, do your due diligence, and prepare psychologically.
- When negotiations begin, optimize your strategy based on how the deal will be done: in person; over the phone; or through email.
- Don't accept a bad deal. If your negotiations fail, keep calm and walk away, being careful not to burn any bridges.

5. МЕЖДУНАРОДНЫЕ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ
INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Text 1. International organizations

International Organizations (IOs) have become a central part of international relations. As Hurd (2014) writes: "As interdependence increases, the importance of international organizations increases with it. We find international organizations in one form or another at the heart of all of the political and economic challenges of the twenty-first century".

While their existence in the international system is relatively new, the presence of these IOs have shaped the way that international relations between different actors are carried out. International Organizations, while often a vessel of state actions, have also themselves become actors. International organizations are organizations, comprised of states, in order to pursue some sort of common purpose or objective. Often, these organizations set the rules for behavior and activity among state and non-state actors in the international system.

As Ian Hurd (2014) explains, international organizations "… are constituted by international law as independent entities, separate from states that make them up as their founders and their members. The practical expression of this independence varies greatly across organizations, but in a formal sense they are corporate "persons" much like firms are "persons" in domestic commercial law. This means that they have legal standing, with certain rights and obligations, and can sue and be sued". This is an interesting point, and one that will continue to be discussed with regards to different international organizations. On the one hand, they are their own entity, and are often treated as such. On the other hand, they are often made up of states, of which the leaders of those said states have their own domestic and international political interests. The balance between their interests and the charters and objectives of an international organization are critical in the international relations discourse. In fact, Hurd says as much, saying that "The dilemma of international organization as a practice in world politics is of course that these actors are composed of units which are themselves independent actors, and so formal international organizations are always collective rather than unitary actors. When they operate as "agents" they are unitary actors in the same way that national governments, also composed of many individuals and factions, are recognized as unitary actors in world politics". And often times, we have seen just this; international organizations have clearly failed to live up to what its

charter has specifically called for, the reason why the international organization exists to begin with.

This distinction in how to understand what an international organization is not unique; many, have asked "what is an international organization, saying that "[t]he history of international organizations as a field of study suggests no clear answer to the question…". Historically, the early international organizations were comprised of state actors. However, much of this is because, for much of the history of international relations, particularly since the Peace of Westphalia in 1648, the international system has primarily been a state-centric one. However, we have started to see a much greater role for non-state actors in international organizations. As we shall see in cases such as the United Nations, there are specific roles for NGOs which include shadow reports, involvement on committees as consultants on global issues, etc… This page will cover the overview of international organizations in the international system, how international organizations relate to international relations, what roles these different IOs serve, as well as how they are related to state and non-state actions. Then, sub-pages under the International Organizations category will cover specific international organizations such as the United Nations, the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the World Health Organization, and regional organizations such as the European Union, The Arab League, along with other regional international organizations.

Text 2. History of International Organizations

As we alluded to earlier, international organizations are gaining prevalence in terms of influence. There was arguably a lack of attention on international organizations by academics (Keohane, 1998), although this has changed, particularly since the foundation of the United Nations (Keohane, 1998).

But this in no way suggests that IOs are a new phenomena in international relations. In fact, as long as there have leaders, there have attempts at working with one another on various issues. But while this is the case, it wasn't until the early 1800s (1815–1822) with the Council of Vienna that states came together to cooperate on international relations following the Napoleonic Wars. About a century after the Council of Vienna, following World War I, the world saw the birth of the League of Nations, an international organization set up to cooperate against any entity that was destabilizing international peace. However, despite its importance in the history of international relations and international organizations, it did not last long, dissolved in 1939 with the onset of World War II. However, the League of Nations has been seen as a precursor to arguably the most influential international organization today: The United Nations. The United Nations was set up in 1945, following the Second World War, to also address insecurity in the international relations system. The UN

has expanded. Early on there were questions on just how great of a role the United Nations had (and would have) in international affairs. However, decolonization, the Cold War, oil politics, among other issues put the United Nations at the forefront of international politics.

Following the United Nations have been several other international organizations. Some of these international organizations are the International Labour Organization, the World Trade Organization, World Bank, the International Monetary Fund (IMF), and regional organizations such as the African Union, the European Union, and the Organization of American States.

Text 3. International Organizations Theory

The different international relations theories approach international organizations from their own set assumptions about how the international system works, and the role of international organizations within their respective positions. Based on how they view the world, international organizations serve a specific role in international affairs. So, for example, for a theory that advocates power and security, international organizations may be seen as functioning a particular way given this behavioral characteristic, whereas someone else who views the international relations theory as something different, could also in turn have a different perception on international organizations. Thus, it depends on who you ask as to how what role international organizations serve, as well as their level of effectiveness in the international political system.

An international organization is an organization with an international membership, scope or presence. International organizations are classified into two main categories:

· Non-governmental organizations (NGOs). These may be:

– international non-profit organizations, for example: the World Wide Fund for Nature, the International Committee of the Red Cross, MBAs without borders, the World Youth Alliance;

– international corporations, referred to as multinational corporations, for example: The Coca-Cola Company, Toyota, Microsoft, Adidas, Siemens.

11. Intergovernmental organizations (IGOs). These are organizations that are made up primarily of sovereign states (or member states). Examples include: the European Union (EU), the World Trade Organization, NATO, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), Interpol, the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the Group of Eight (G-8).

The formation of international organization was a 20-th century phenomenon. Nowadays there are more than 2,500 international organizations. Among them there are more than 130 intergovernmental unions. The United Nations Organization is the most notable. Other important organizations are the

European Economic Community, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Interpol, Greenpeace and UNESCO. The creation of international organization on a world-wide scale in the 20-th century was the result of the progress in the technology of communication, transportation, warfare, and the spread of industrialization. These processes gave rise to a sense of independence among the nations of the world, and made people recognize the importance of international cooperation to avoid danger, solve problems, and use the opportunities which face the society of nations on a world-wide scale. Some organizations are concerned only with single and relatively narrow problems while others such as the UN and UNESCO (the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization), deal with a great variety of matters.

Let's take, for example, the United Nations. It's an organization to which nearly all the countries of the world belong. Its headquarters are situated in New York. Its central aim is to maintain peace and security in the world and to develop friendly relations among nations.

Greenpeace is an international organization, which deals with ecological and environmental problems. It was formed in 1971. Now it is a powerful organization, which works all over the world. There are many serious actions in the list of Greenpeace activities. The national offices exist in 27 countries of the world. In Russia Greenpeace was formed in 1992. It works here in three directions: Wood Campaign, Anti-nuclear Campaign and Campaign for preservation of Lake Baikal. Greenpeace tries to attract public attention to different problems in the world and to find the way out. It is financed by personal voluntarily donations of its supporters.

The results of activity of international organizations are significant. The UN General Assembly passed a number of resolutions and declarations. They are the Nuremberg Principles dealing with crimes against peace, war crimes, and crimes against humanity, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; the right of people and nations to self-determination; denuclearization, and non-intervention. The most important of them is the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. This general agreement, which stresses that all human beings are titled to some basic liberties, marked the birth of the international and universal recognition of human rights.

Text 4. History of the ICRC

Since its creation in 1863, the ICRC's sole objective has been to ensure protection and assistance for victims of armed conflict and strife. It does so through its direct action around the world, as well as by encouraging the development of international humanitarian law (IHL) and promoting respect for it by governments and all weapon bearers. Its story is about the

development of humanitarian action, the Geneva Conventions and the Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement.

The founding

What was to become the International Committee of the Red Cross met for the first time in February 1863 in Geneva, Switzerland. Among its five members was a local man named Henry Dunant who, the year before, had published a book (A Souvenir of Solferino) calling for improved care for wounded soldiers in wartime.

By the end of the year the committee had brought together government representatives to agree on Dunant's proposal for national relief societies, to help military medical services. And in August 1864 it persuaded governments to adopt the first Geneva Convention. This treaty obliged armies to care for wounded soldiers, whatever side they were on, and introduced a unified emblem for the medical services: a red cross on a white background.

The ICRC's primary role was a coordinating one. But it gradually became more involved in field operations, as the need for a neutral intermediary between belligerents became apparent. Over the following 50 years, the ICRC expanded its work while national societies were established (the first in the German State of Württemberg in November 1863) and the Geneva Convention was adapted to include warfare at sea.

First World War, 1914–1918

At the outbreak of the First World War, based on experience in other conflicts, the ICRC opened a Central Prisoners of War Agency in Geneva, to restore links between captured soldiers and their families.

It continued to innovate: its visits to prisoners of war grew during this period and it intervened over the use of arms that caused extreme suffering – in 1918 it called on belligerents to renounce the use of mustard gas. That same year it visited political prisoners for the first time, in Hungary.

The national societies themselves undertook an unprecedented mobilization that saw volunteers running ambulance services on the battlefield and caring for the wounded in hospitals. For the Red Cross in many countries, it was their finest hour.

1918–1939

After the war, many national societies felt that, with the coming of peace and hopes for a new world order, the role of the Red Cross had to change. In 1919, they founded the League of Red Cross Societies, intended as the future coordinating and support body for the Movement. But conflicts during the 1920s and 1930s emphasized the need for a neutral intermediary, and the ICRC

remained active – increasingly outside Europe (Ethiopia, South America, the Far East) and in civil wars (notably in Spain).

The ICRC persuaded governments to adopt a new Geneva Convention in 1929 to provide greater protection for prisoners of war. But despite the obvious broader threats posed by modern warfare, it was unable to have them agree on new laws to protect civilians in time to prevent the atrocities of World War II.

Second World War, 1939–1945

The Second World War saw a huge expansion of activities as the organisation tried to work to assist and protect victims on all sides. The ICRC and the League worked together to ship relief supplies across the globe, reaching both prisoners of war and civilians. ICRC delegates visited POWs around the world and helped exchange millions of Red Cross Messages between family members. For years after the war, the ICRC dealt with requests for news about missing loved ones.

However, this period also saw the ICRC's greatest failure: its lack of action on behalf of victims of the Holocaust and other persecuted groups. Lacking a specific legal basis, bound by its traditional procedures and hindered in its ability to act by its ties with the Swiss establishment, it was unable to take decisive action or to speak out. It was left to individual ICRC delegates to do what they could to save groups of Jews.

Since 1945

Since 1945 the ICRC has continued to urge governments to strengthen international humanitarian law – and to respect it. It has sought to deal with the humanitarian consequences of the conflicts that have marked the second half of the 20th century – starting with Israel and Palestine in 1948.

In 1949, at the ICRC's initiative, states agreed on the revision of the existing three Geneva Conventions (covering wounded and sick on the battlefield, victims of war at sea, prisoners of war) and the addition of a fourth: to protect civilians living under enemy control. The Conventions provide the ICRC's main mandate in situations of armed conflict.

And in 1977, two Protocols to the Conventions were adopted, the first applicable to international armed conflicts, the second to internal ones – a major breakthrough. The Protocols also laid down rules concerning the conduct of hostilities.

UNITED NATIONS (UN)

Text 1. How the UN Works

The United Nations was established on 24 October 1945 by 51countries committed to preserving peace through international cooperation and collective security. Today, nearly every nation in the world belongs to the UN: membership now totals nearly 200 countries.

When states become members of the United Nations, they agree to accept the obligations of the UN Charter, an international treaty which sets out basic principles of international relations. According to the Charter, the UN has four purposes: to maintain international peace and security, to develop friendly relations among nations, to cooperate in solving international problems and in promoting respect for human rights, and to be a center for harmonizing the actions of nations.

UN members are sovereign countries. The United Nations is not a world government, and it does not make laws. It does, however, provide the means to help resolve international conflicts and formulate policies on matters affecting all of us.

The United Nations is much more than a peacekeeper and forum for conflict resolution. Often without attracting attention, the United Nations is engaged in a vast array of work that touches every aspect of people's lives around the world.

Child survival and development. Environmental protection. Human rights. Health and medical research. Alleviation of poverty and economic development. Agricultural development and fisheries. Education. Family planning. Emergency and disaster relief. Air and sea travel. Peaceful uses of atomic energy. Labour and worker's rights. The list goes on and on.

The United Nations has six main organs. Five of them – the General Assembly, the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council, the Trusteeship Council and the Secretariat – are based at UN Headquarters in New York. The sixth, the International Court of Justice, is located at the Hague, the Netherlands.

The General Assembly

All UN member states are represented in the General Assembly – a kind of parliament of nations which meets to consider the world's most pressing problems. Each member state has one vote. Decisions on important matters," such as international peace and security, admitting new members, the UN budget are decided by two-thirds majority. Other matters are decided by simple majority. In recent years, a special effort has been made to reach decisions through consensus, rather than by formal vote.

The Assembly holds its annual regular session from September to December. When necessary, it may resume its session, or hold a special or emergency session on subjects of particular concern.

The Security Council

The UN Charter gives the Security Council primary responsibilities for maintaining international peace and security. The Council may convene at any time, day or night, whenever peace is threatened.

There are 15 Council members. Five of these – China, France, the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom and the United States – are permanent members. The other 10 are elected by the General Assembly for a two-year term. Decisions of the Council require nine yes votes.

What the UN does for peace

Preserving world peace is a central purpose of the United Nations under the Charter, member states agree to settle disputes by peaceful means and refrain from threatening or using force against other states.

UN efforts have produced dramatic results. The UN helped defuse the Cuban missile crisis in 1962 and the Middle East crisis in 1973. In 1988 a UN-sponsored peace settlement ended the Iran-Iraq war. In the 1990s, the UN was instrumental in restoring sovereignty to Kuwait and played a major role in ending civil wars in Cambodia, El Salvador, Guatemala and Mozambique.

UN peacemaking brings hostile parties to agreement through diplomatic means. The Security Council may recommend ways to avoid conflict or restore or secure peace – through negotiation, for example or undertake mediation, or recourse to the International Court of Justice. In the event of fighting the UN tries to secure a ceasefire. It may send a peacekeeping mission to help the parties maintain the truce and to keep opposing forces apart. Peacekeeping operations may last for a few months or continue for many years.

Text 2. United Nations Reform

SUMMARY At the 72nd United Nations (UN) General Assembly on 18 September 2017, 120 countries expressed their commitment to the reforms proposed by UN Secretary-General António Guterres. Since 1946, the UN has undergone a number of reforms either in whole or in part. The term 'reform' has proved troublesome for UN member states on account of its lack of clarity and the lack of consensus as to execution. This is particularly apparent in the skepticism expressed by the United States (US) in 2018 regarding the need for global governance, the importance of UN Security Council decisions such as the Iran nuclear deal, and the efficiency of the United Nations. This briefing explains how the current reform differs from previous ones, in as much as it

focuses on management and addresses the criticisms of a lack of accountability and transparency, ineffectiveness, and the deficit in trust between the organization and its member states in the current system.

The United Nations reform agenda centers on three key areas: development, management, and peace and security. First, development reform will bring a bold change to the UN development system in order to achieve the goals of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. This will be centered on the creation of a new generation of country teams led by an independent team of UN country experts ('resident coordinators').

Second, the simplification of processes, increased transparency and improved delivery of mandates will form the basis of a new management paradigm for the secretariat. Third, peace and security reform will be underpinned by placing priority on conflict prevention and peacekeeping, increasing the effectiveness and coherence of peacekeeping operations and political missions. Two years after its launch, the reform process is starting to bear fruit, with implementation set to begin in 2019 and a focus on streamlining, accountability, transparency and efficiency. However, the reform process does not make explicit mention of bolstering human rights. This briefing also explores the possibility of capitalizing on the current reforms so as to boost the indivisibility of human rights, while taking stock of stakeholders' reactions to the UN reforms under way.

Text 3. United Nations Security Council

The United Nations Security Council is the premier forum in international politics. Through its decisions, mandated operations and enforcement actions the Council directly influences the present and future state of international peace and security. This article is the first in a series aimed at providing readers with an understanding of this most important institution. It is merely an introduction.

On 26 June 1945, at the San Francisco War Memorial and Performing Arts Center, representatives of fifty countries signed the Charter of the United Nations. By inscribing their humble signatures to this document they would create the United Nations – an international organization imbued with humanity's most generous impulses: charity, hope and faith. At the centre of this organization would reside arguably the most powerful institution of international relations ever conceived – the United Nations Security Council.

Under the Charter of the United Nations, the Security Council is designated as the custodian of international peace and security. It has 15 members, each with one vote. The Council has the power to define threats to the peace and act on those threats by using a range of measures including peacemaking, sanctions and even the use of force.

Origins

The origins of the United Nations are found in the philosophical musings of Franklin D. Roosevelt and Winston Churchill. Roosevelt's vision for post-war order was clear: "might be placed at the disposal of right". For him and the other leaders this equation could only be answered by the institutionalization of the 'Four Policemen' concept. The idea being that in the post-war era – the Republic of China, the United States, the United Kingdom and the United Soviet Socialist Republics – should be enabled to act as the providers of security (or the 'policemen'), while the other members of the international community would be the consumers of security.

The actual blueprints for the new organization were developed by the United States State Department and the United Kingdom Commonwealth Office, and debated at 'the Washington conversations on the creation of an international peace and security organization' held at Dumbarton Oaks in Washington DC in the spring of 1944. At Dumbarton Oaks, discussion focused on the creation of a Council that would have the power and authority necessary to maintain international peace and security.

It was envisaged that the 'Four Policemen', later five (with France added at a later date), would act in concert through a Council and an international armed force would carry out the enforcement of decisions, with air power providing the backbone of such a force. Command and control of these forces would be managed by a Military Staff Committee, as an extension of the Combined Chiefs of Staff system that had operated in Europe during the Second World War. The committee would consist of military representatives of the Permanent Five plus other major states, to be included on the basis of contribution.

Force, however, was to be used only as a last resort. The Council possessed options and could first resort to the use of other instruments, notably sanctions. Chapter VII of the Charter sets out a very clear logical progression or escalation in a possible Council response. The first step in this progression of response is article 40, which refers to 'provisional measures' that can be taken in order not to inflame the situation. If compliance was not forthcoming, however, article 41 could be "employed to give effect" to the decisions of the Council. Article 41 contains a detailed list of possible sanctions that could be imposed in order to elicit compliance. If sanctions proved inadequate, step three – the final stage along the line of escalation – was the use of force; the basis for which is provided in Article 42.

The veto

The most contentious issue discussed at Dumbarton Oaks, and later at San Francisco, was the issue of the veto. In technical terms the veto is found in article 27 of the Charter:

"Decisions of the Security Council on all other matters shall be made by an affirmative vote of nine members including the concurring votes of the permanent members…"

In simple terms, the veto power allows any permanent member to cast a negative veto to block a resolution of the Council.

The veto was designed to act as an effective safeguard on the interests of the Permanent Five (P-5). This is because the permanent members could exercise the veto to protect their own interests or the interests of an ally or proxy; they could do this whenever they felt that the Council is encroaching on their 'space'. Although, the veto can elicit paralysis, it also serves a useful function. This function is known as the concert function. By instituting the veto the UN was virtually insuring the participation of all the Great Powers. And so the world was presented with a stark choice at San Francisco in 1945, between "an organization with great power privilege" and "no organization at all".

The veto allows the permanent members to manage their interactions in regard to their interests. When they all agree, action can be taken. When they disagree, action can be blocked. Areas of contention are therefore avoided and the Great Powers are separated, effectively averting direct confrontation.

Council activities

The envisaged processes of response of the Council were done away with, out of sheer practicality, and the Council began to work very differently from what was imagined at the outset. In its early years, the Council dealt with the 'questions' of Spain, Greece, Free Trieste, Iran, Indonesia, and India-Pakistan, before taking on the now immovable Palestinian question, the Suez Crisis, the Congo, Cyprus and later South-Western Africa. In addressing these questions the Council employed the use of military observers and later interposition peacekeepers, as well as commissions of investigation; the Council even went as far as to establish an international protectorate known as the Free Territory of Trieste and deployed a UN force in the Congo.

Since the end of the cold war, the previously underutilized Council became hyperactive – dealing with multiple situations across four continents. During the 1990s, the Council began to intervene in a particularly traumatic and complex series of internal conflicts.

The Council launched effective assistance missions in El Salvador, Namibia, Mozambique and a more ambitious transitional administration mission in Cambodia (which was relatively effective). Emboldened by the positive outcomes, member states carrying heightened expectations grew ever more ambitious. They soon deployed large numbers of peacekeepers to Somalia and the former Yugoslavia to assist in the delivery of humanitarian aid. The conceptual ground on which missions were based was flawed and both operations were ultimately ineffective. The sudden retrenchment (a reduction

in number of missions authorized) in UN peacekeeping following the hasty withdrawal of the UN Mission from Somalia (UNOSOM II) resulted, in part, in the collapse of the UN Assistance Mission for Rwanda (UNAMIR). The failure of the Security Council to halt the genocide in Rwanda is surely its supreme failure.

Today, the Council generally responds to three types of situations: (1) chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear weapons proliferation; (2) international conflict; and (3) intra-state conflict. More recently, the Council has also developed a (4) crosscutting and (5) quasi-legislative agenda.

Over the past 70 years, the Council has developed a set of instruments (table 2) that it has used to respond to these situations. In an increasingly complex environment, the Council has proven itself remarkably innovative. At the same time, the Council has also made significant blunders in the use of these instruments and has at times failed to learn from past mistakes. In Rwanda, Bosnia, and Somalia, the Council adopted responses that were later proven to be wholly inadequate. These abject failures damaged the credibility of the Council and tarnished the UN brand.

With the crisis in Syria entering its third year, the Council is again accused of being unable to suppress the various threats to international peace and security, which beset the world. This has led many critics to label the Council ineffective. At the heart of this criticism is the notion that the Council has "failed to act swiftly and effectively to contain international crises". These criticisms are all valid. The Council certainly is hyperactive, reactive, selective and imperfect. But it still remains the go-to forum in a time of crisis, and is likely to remain so well into the future.

Text 4. What the UN Security Council Is Not

"The UN is not just a product of do-gooders. It is harshly real. The day will come when men will see the UN and what it means clearly. Everything will be alright – you know when? When people, just people, stop thinking of the United Nations as a weird Picasso abstraction, and see it as a drawing they made themselves."

With that candid 1955 statement, former UN Secretary-General (1953–1961) Dag Hammarskjöld encapsulates the nature of the UN as a member state organization – created by states to serve states and limited by state cooperation. Conveying an understanding of these limitations is the aim of this article.

When people criticize the United Nations Security Council, they do so based on an incorrect conception of what the Council is. They expect the Council to be something that it is not.

The Council is not:
The embodiment of collective security

An apolitical institution
An independent entity in international politics
A receptacle of universal ideals

Collective security

The Council is not the embodiment of the idea of collective security. In what is considered the classic definition of the term, Inis Claude defines collective security as follows:

"An international system in which the danger of aggressive warfare by any state is to be met by the avowed determination of virtually all other states to exert pressure of every necessary variety – moral, diplomatic, economic, and military – to frustrate attack upon any state."

If one were to hold the Council up to the above definition, one could only conclude that the Council cannot be judged to be a collective security institution. The Council cannot claim that an attack on one member state is an attack on all member states (the mantra of collective security) and that such an attack would automatically precipitate a Council response. By less rigorous definitions the Council might be judged to be a collective security institution.

These vague definitions of collective security, however, are largely unhelpful as they dilute and confuse what is, in essence, an unequivocal concept. The term is suggestive of a guaranteed automaticity and the continued use of the term around the UN and its Security Council is potentially damaging to the UN brand – a brand that should be founded on the basis of realistic expectations.

Instead, the Council should be seen as the embodiment of selective security – a fitting term used to describe the Council, coined by Adam Roberts and Dominik Zaum in their 2007 book Selective Security: War and the UN Security Council Since 1945. If one consults the Council's long record since 1945, it becomes very clear it has decided to intervene in certain situations and decided against intervening in other situations. This is the Council's prerogative. The Council holds the discretionary power to interpret and decide on what constitutes a threat to international peace and security and what does not. This inherent selectivity is symptomatic of the relative level of political will and the interests and/or disinterests of the member states, above all those of the veto-wielding Permanent Five (P-5). Therefore, in sum, the Council is not obligated to act in response to any and every circumstance and should not be expected to do so.

A political institution

Secondly, the Council is not a disinterested and apolitical institution. The Council is, first and foremost, a political body, beholden to the political processes of collective decision-making. The relative levels of political will

and the various interests of the member states are channeled into a process of political negotiation and bargaining, and the resulting outcome is a collective decision of the Council – a resolution or presidential statement. Each decision is, therefore, reflective of the overlapping interests of the membership and also the level and quality of agreement that could be reached among them.

Cooperation, for this reason, is possible insofar as there is a reasonable alignment of the interests of the members. So while certain states share similar perspectives and are to a degree culturally aligned, in strategic terms, other states are not. This discord among the members also plays out in a normative setting and leads to a contestation over values and around the Council's goals, role and agenda. This contestation could be viewed as an important game within the Council, which constructs the Council as a place in which its members argue about what the world order should look like.

A Council of states, for states

Thirdly, the Council is a council of states, for states. The Council is essentially an intergovernmental institution. Although, the Council is often called 'the UN Security Council' as if it were an independent entity separate from its constituent parts (its members), it is not necessarily an actor in its own right. As Roberts and Zaum rightly suggest, the Council is not "a homogeneous corporate entity, but rather a focal point for state cooperation, especially great-power cooperation".

The Council is a member state forum, designed for member states, and works on the basis of cooperation between member states. The Council does not possess the ability to act unless member states decide collectively to act and then subsequently furnish the necessary resources to give effect to that decision. Thomas Weiss also supports this notion of the UN, when he concludes that "the UN is primarily an institutional framework through which member states may pursue or channel their foreign policy".

Transnational values?

Fourthly, the Council is not under any obligation to operationalize universal values, or conform to any vis-à-vis democracy, or uphold the Responsibility to Protect. As has been established, the Council is an inherently selective political state-driven body and with every member intent on preserving its own interests, these interest-based concerns will almost always override any deference to altruism or universal values.

The cases of Libya and Syria provide a perfect example of Council inconsistency in regards to the operationalization of the third pillar of the Responsibility to Protect. In the case of Libya, the Council acted under the rubric of Responsibility to Protect, adopting a sweeping resolution, which authorized the use of force (a No-Fly Zone) for the purpose of protecting

civilians from violence or the threat of violence. A not dissimilar case was presented soon after in Syria. The Council, however, could not agree (largely because of Chinese and Russian concerns) on application of the Responsibility to Protect, and so the Council did not act.

On the evidence of Council action over the past 70 years, it is unreasonable to expect the consistent application of the Responsibility to Protect into the future. Unfortunately, lofty expectations unrealized may contribute to the erosion of the concept in the eyes of many; and moreover may reduce the concept to the status of a tool of moral leverage or advocacy.

The reality

In sum, the Council cannot be expected to be impartial, apolitical, and democratic, to do everything, to be everything, to function appropriately in every context, provide collective security or faithfully implement the Responsibility to Protect. This is not to say that these expectations are not 'good' or worthy, but they are based on an idea of the Council that does not exist in reality. The Council is an ardently pragmatic and selective body, limited yet powerful. These contradictions hold the enterprise together and an appreciation of them is required before any criticism can be leveled.

Text 5. United Nations Security Council Reform

The argument of many critics of the United Nations Security Council is that it isn't effective and that it needs to be fundamentally reformed. The loudest calls for reform come from those who believe that the inclusion of a host of new permanent members is the answer to the effectiveness deficit. Others argue that it is folly to suggest that the addition of new permanent members would amount to meaningful reform.

Since the end of the cold war, these reform debates, contorted by politics, have circled endlessly without any prospect of conclusion. With the creation of the 'Open-ended Working Group on the Question of the Equitable Representation on and Increase in the Membership of the Security Council and Other Matters Related to the Security Council' (the UN committee with the longest title), the debate became formalized and plans for reform subsequently proliferated (table 1).

Table 1

The Blocks

Plans	Description
G4 (Japan, Germany, India and Brazil)	The G4 plans envisage a Council with a total membership of 25, including six new permanent members (Brazil, Japan, Germany, India and two African countries) and an additional three elected seats.

Plans	Description
United for Consensus (UfC)	UfC called for a 25-member Council, which would be achieved by adding 'no permanent members to the Council, but would rather create new permanent seats in each region, leaving it to the members of each regional group to decide which Member States should sit in those seats, and for how long'
Ezulwini Consensus	The Ezulwini Consensus represents the Africa bloc and proposes two permanent seats and two additional elected seats for Africa. Under the proposal, the permanent members would be granted 'all the prerogatives and privileges of permanent membership including the right to veto'.

What is reform?

In general terms, reform is aimed at improving performance, and altering something for the better; it is concerned with repairing defects and overcoming limitations in order to realize some higher state of performance or effectiveness. Working from the premise that the Council is defective, reforms should repair defects and thereby improve the Council's effectiveness.

In simple terms, the arguments for reform through enlargement and new permanency are as follows:

A Council that is more reflective of the contemporary geopolitical realities of the world = A more effective Council

A more representative Council = A more effective Council

A more democratic Council (incorporating inclusive and participatory decision-making) = A more effective Council

A Council with a membership that includes regional powers will be more capable = A more effective Council

Text 6. More reflective, representative and legitimate

Perhaps, the most well recited argument for an expanded Council (with up to six new permanent seats) is the argument that the Council does not reflect contemporary power realities and should therefore be reformed to reflect the so-called new realities of the 21st Century.

The overarching narrative of legitimacy through representativeness and the dilution of power is argued as a given. Yet, as Ian Hurd has suggested, there exists little evidence to suggest that the addition of new permanent members to the Council would automatically enhance its legitimacy.

It is clear that aspirant countries understand the value of permanent membership, each has an interest in their own election and each uses the rhetoric of representativeness in support of their claims. Adding India, Brazil, Germany, Japan, South Africa and Nigeria (see table 2) is not an exercise in representativeness, nor is it an act of dispersing power. Permanency concentrates power in the hands of five or five + six, in the case of a reformed Council. Including the powerful on the Council is representativeness, insofar as it is representative of the distribution of power in the world, as decided at that particular moment in history.

In terms of other forms of representation, the argument has been made that many of the BRICS (namely Brazil, South Africa, and India) aspirants are representative of their region or of the Global South. The weakness of this argument is that in the end countries are representative of themselves – the nameplate in front of each new permanent member would not read 'Global South' or 'Latin America' or 'South Asia.' This might be fatuous, but it underlines an undeniable fact.

More capable and more democratic

At the recent reform debate the Indian representative argued that an enlarged Council would address the "democratic deficit, which prevents effective multilateralism, a multilateralism that is based on a democratically-evolved global consensus". There is an instant attraction to the idea of democratization, but it remains to be seen whether adding more permanent members to the Council constitutes an act of democratization. Yes, adding additional members from the Global South is a valid proposition, but giving these additional members permanency captures a very anti-democratic sentiment.

Another argument, aside from the inequality argument, is the argument founded on the notion that if you get the regional powers, the so-called 'heavy lifters' (the largest countries in terms of economy, population and military power) in the room, Council outcomes will be improved. This was the original rationale for the institutionalized privilege afforded the five veto wielding permanent members. The expectation was that permanent members would contribute more to the maintenance of international peace and security.

So what about the argument for creativity? In the Council, a brand of creativity is required to ensure more contextually sensitive resolutions are crafted. Herein lies the counter-argument: if you allow the so-called heavy lifters in the room they will throw their weight around, for the sake of it, rather than acting in a more creative and constructive manner.

In the past many of the smaller countries have been the real innovators, because (1) they understand their limitations, (2) they're not trying to run the world, (3) they tend to carve out a niche in the Council's agenda, and (4) often

contribute through the power of the better argument. The Arria Formula (Diego Arria of Venezuela), the refinement of the Panel of Experts (Robert Fowler of Canada), and even the concept of peacekeeping (Lester B. Pearson of Canada) were all suggestions of smaller powers. India, Brazil, Japan, and Germany are all global economic heavyweights, but that does not necessarily mean they are the creative heavyweights that the Council needs to function more effectively.

The old adage "whether elephants make love or make war, the grass gets trampled" is an expression that applies to the concern held by many smaller countries. Their fear is that if six new permanent seats are created, they will be cut out of decision-making and their creativity will be lost to the Council.

Permanent is a long time
Power in international politics is not a constant. The rise and fall of empires throughout history is testament to this fact. The once powerful are no longer powerful and the once weak are now strong. A reformed Council will not represent the end of history. In 20–30–40 years time, new emerging countries such as Indonesia, Mexico, South Korea and Turkey will ask the question: why aren't we on the Council? And so the reform debate will begin again.

So what are the alternatives? Model B proposed by the Secretary-General in 2005, although unattractive to the membership, is more inclined to provide for a more effective membership formula. Four-year renewable members are more accountable; as the wider membership of the UN has the opportunity to assess each elected Council member's performance – favourably or unfavourably.

Another alternative route to reform is by way of reform of the Council's processes and meeting formats, known as working methods. Although, frequently overlooked, working methods reform does have its supporters within the ranks of the UN membership and they are currently organized under the banner – Accountability, Transparency and Coherence (ACT). In the next article in the series, an alternative vision of the Council will be articulated based on a new set of working methods.

Text 7. United Nations Headquarters in New York

The United Nations Headquarters in New York was built in between 1949 and 1950 near the East River, on 17 acres of land bought in New York to the principal builder of the time, William Zeckendorf, the purchase was ordered by Nelson Rockefeller, after the initial offer placed on the property of the Rockefeller family of Kykuit, rejected the view that it was too far from Manhattan. The eight and a half million dollars to purchase the land was financed by his father, John D. Rockefeller, Jr., who donated to the city. The

principal architect of the complex was Wallace Harrison, the architect-consultant of the family.

The selection of the architect Though normal for buildings of this size is convening an international competition this was not the case with the United Nations Headquarters. The United Nations is an international organization as a unifying rather than entrusting the project to a single architect of a single country decided to form a committee comprising members of architects from different countries. This projection was more collaborative spirit of the institution.

American architect Wallace Harrison was named director of planning and the various government appointed advisory board members in design. The council was finally formed by N.A. Bassov of the Soviet Union, Gaston Brunfaut (Belgium), Ernest Cormier (Canada), Le Corbusier (France), Liang Ssu-cheng (China), Sven Markelius (Sweden), Oscar Niemeyer (Brazil), Howard Robertson (United Kingdom), GA Soilleux (Australia) and Julio Villamajo (Uruguay). Each architect presented at least one proposal on which then work together to complete the outline. The committee reviewed more than 50 proposals before choosing the winner.

The idea of forming an international team of architects was more idyllic than realistic and more than a collaborative project was transformed into a great competition between the most renowned architects of the group. Le Corbusier and Jeanneret in the lead from the beginning wanted to impose its design to the others. His international reputation will certainly gave them an advantage over other competitors. Niemeyer was a disciple of Le Corbusier, who planted the French side presenting a project that was delighted to all members of the committee. Le Corbusier could not accept that it was his own disciple who snatch the project.

There appeared the left hand of Wallace Harrison, Le Corbusier convinced that the draft Niemeyer was merely an interpretation of its own project and that the result was neither more nor less than emulating the student's teacher even years after being professionally independent. This idea seemed to calm the situation but the French continued to promote his project during the collaborative creation leading to finally say that the final draft is the "Scheme 23A, which was nothing but the project of Le Corbusier, but with the "modifications" of Niemeyer. A matter of vocabulary.

Situation It is located in the vicinity of Turtle Bay in the eastern part of Midtown Manhattan. While in New York City, the territory occupied by the United Nations headquarters, is considered international territory, and its borders are the first avenue to the west, the Forty-Second Street to the south, the forty-eighth in the North and the East New York River to the east. His exact address is the number 46, 1st Avenue.

Where could be The UN headquarters in Manhattan was the decision after being subjected to a vote by members of the organization. San Francisco, Chicago, Philadelphia, Flushing Meadows-Corona Park in Queens, and even the Black Hills of South Dakota were all proposed as possible locations for the headquarters of the United Nations before it was finally chosen Manhattan.

Complex The complex includes a number of important buildings. While the Tower of the Secretariat is the predominant view of it, including the headquarters building of the dome of the General Assembly, the Dag Hammarskjöld Library and the Conference and Visitors Center, which sits between the Assembly building General and the skyscrapers of the Secretariat, and can only be seen from the road or the East River FDR. Just inside the perimeter fence of the complex stands a line of poles with flags of all 192 member states of the United Nations over the United Nations flag.

In addition to the 39 floors above ground level devoted to house the offices of various countries the complex has three underground floors of the tower reported that the secretary to the Conference building. In these underground floors are also some shops, a fire-fighting equipment, platforms for receiving merchandise, security offices, warehouses, a three-level parking, a petrol station and the machine room that houses the air conditioning equipment.

Tower of the Secretariat The Secretariat building with 39 floors 168 meters tall is the tallest building in the whole. Its east and west walls are entirely of aluminum and glass, while the North and South are of Vermont marble.

The interior spaces are not very developed and is intended to take up space. There is not a wide area and offices are rather small receiving sunlight for most of them large glass facades. Aiming to continue building up the space even when the needs of occupation change offices were divided using mobile panels anchored to the structure that can easily be moved. The equipment and communications are under a floating floor with hatches every few meters.

General Assembly Building The General Assembly building is a structure with sloping sides concave 115 x 49 m topped with a cupola that provides natural lighting inside the building. The building opens to the north on a plaza leading to the main entrance of the complex to the public. Once in the great hall with large openings welcome glass translucent marble walls and positioned to give the impression of illumination of the cathedrals.

East and west walls are covered with limestone English, with some details in the marble covering the walls of the north and south tower of the secretary. Finally the south facade is a large glass of 17 meters high that a glimpse through the square of his secretary. Crossing the lobby to the right is a small meditation room with a large piece of metal ore in the center illuminated from above.

Hanging from the ceiling above the stairs and reaching the street level of a huge pendulum Foacault spatially connects the lobby to the second floor at the same time visually test the rotation of the earth. The pendulum was a gift from the Dutch government.

The lobby of the assembly hall decorated with shades of blue, green and gold took the second, third and fourth floor. Accessed from the main hall where representatives of different countries take place after the officers toward the center where a podium is high. The podium is occupied by the President of the General Assembly along with the secretary general of the United Nations and the secretary.

The assembly hall can accommodate 192 delegations with six seats per delegation. These seats are the 1321 floor of the room as well as three levels higher.

A balcony also houses 53 seats and 280 media to the public. In two basement levels of the building is a large conference room with 623 seats in the area of the delegates, 44 to 166 for the press and the public. These are also found in basements four smaller conference rooms, studios for radio and television as well as the communications center of the complex. For the public there is a library area with the UN official, Souvenirs shop and a cafeteria.

Building Conference The conference building that connects the building with the general secretary of the tower measuring 120 meters long in an elongated. The fourth level houses the dining room of delegates, private dining rooms, a cafeteria and kitchen workers. In the second and third floor are placed three of the council chambers.

Materials The walls are characteristic of the east-west tower of the secretariat were completely covered with insulating glass designed to absorb heat from sunlight. The north-south exterior walls were covered with marble from Vermont.

EUROPEAN UNION (EU)

Text 1. What is European Union?

The European Union (EU) is a politico-economic union of 28 member states that are located primarily in Europe. It covers an area of 4,324,782 km^2, with an estimated population of over 508 million. The EU operates through a system of supranational institutions and intergovernmental-negotiated decisions by the member states. The institutions are: the European Parliament, the European Council, the Council of the European Union, the European Commission, the Court of Justice of the European Union, the European Central Bank, and the Court of Auditors. The European Parliament is elected every five years by EU citizens.

The EU traces its origins from the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) and the European Economic Community (EEC), formed by the Inner Six countries in 1951 and 1958, respectively. In the intervening years, the community and its successors have grown in size by the accession of new member states and in power by the addition of policy areas to its remit. The Maastricht Treaty established the European Union under its current name in 1993 and introduced the European Citizenship. The latest major amendment to the constitutional basis of the EU, the Treaty of Lisbon, came into force in 2009.

The EU has developed a single market through a standardised system of laws that apply in all member states. Within the Schengen Area, passport controls have been abolished. EU policies aim to ensure the free movement of people, goods, services, and capital, enact legislation in justice and home affairs, and maintain common policies on trade, agriculture, fisheries, and regional development.

The monetary union was established in 1999 and came into full force in 2002. It is currently composed of 19 member states that use the euro as their legal tender. Through the Common Foreign and Security Policy, the EU has developed a role in external relations and defence. The union maintains permanent diplomatic missions throughout the world and represents itself at the United Nations, the WTO, the G8, and the G-20.

Covering 7,3% of the world population, the EU in 2014 generated a nominal gross domestic product (GDP) of 18.495 trillion US dollars, constituting approximately 24% of global nominal GDP and 17% when measured in terms of purchasing power parity. Additionally, 26 out of 28 EU countries have a very high Human Development Index, according to the UNDP. In 2012, the EU was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize. Because of its global influence, the European Union has been described as a current or as a potential superpower.

European integration – a timeline

1950   French Foreign Minister Robert Schuman puts forward proposal to operate Western Europe's coal and steel industries under common management.

1951   Signing of the Treaty of Paris by the six founding Members States establishing the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) (the Treaty of Paris expired on 23 July 2002).

1957   Signing of the Treaties of Rome establishing the European Economic Community (EEC) and the European Atomic Energy Community (Euratom).

1967   Merger of the three European Communities (ECSC, EEC, Euratom).

1973   Denmark, Ireland and the United Kingdom join the European Communities.

1979   First elections to the European Parliament by direct universal suffrage.

1981   Greece joins the European Communities.

1986   Signing of the Single European Act.

Spain and Portugal join the European Communities.

1992   Signing of the Treaty on European Union (Maastricht Treaty).

1993   the Single European Market enters into force (free movement of people, goods, services and capital).

1995   Austria, Finland and Sweden join the European Union.

1997   Signing of the Treaty of Amsterdam.

2001   Signing of the Treaty of Nice.

2002   Introduction of euro notes and coins.

2002–2003 The European Convention draws up a draft Constitution for Europe.

2004   The European Union expands to take in 10 new Member States: Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Slovakia and Slovenia.

Signing in Rome of the Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe.

2005   About 10 member States successfully complete the ratification process, thereby showing their acceptance of the European Constitution.

The rejection of the Constitutional Treaty by French and Dutch voters gives substance to the concerns shared by many citizens. European institutions take due note of this and decide on a period of reflection involving broad discussions in all Members States bringing together citizens, civil society, the social partners, national parliaments and political parties.

Accession negotiations with Croatia and Turkey open in October.

The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia is given the status of 'candidate country' in December.

2006   The ratification process for the European Constitution continues in the Members States.

1 January 2007   Bulgaria and Romania join the European Union.
Slovenia adopts the euro.

13 December 2007 In Lisbon, the leaders of the 27 Member States sign the new treaty for the European Union.

12 June 2008 The Irish referendum leads to the rejection of the treaty by European voters. Nevertheless, 20 countries have already ratified the treaty and the ratification process must continue in the other countries. The leaders of the 27 Member States agree to meet in October to review the issue.

December 2008 During the summit in Brussels, European Union ministers discuss a new timeline for the Lisbon Treaty. It is agreed that once the treaty comes into force, a decision will be taken to enable each Member State to appoint a member of the European Commission. In addition, the Irish government commits to organising a new referendum before November 2009 in return for certain guarantees from its partners.

2 October 2009   Irish voters approve the Lisbon Treaty in a second referendum.

3 November 2009 The process of ratifying the Lisbon Treaty is concluded in the Czech Republic, paving the way for its entry into force on 1 December 2009.

1 December 2009 The Lisbon Treaty comes into effect, modifying but not replacing the treaties currently in force. It comprises two main parts: the first consists of adapting the present Treaty on European Union; the second modifies the Treaty establishing the European Community. In the new Treaty, the latter is renamed the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union.

June 2010 The European summit has given the go-ahead for negotiations start on Iceland joining the European Union. Iceland is now the fourth candidate country, alongside Turkey, Croatia and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

1 July 2010 12th Belgian Presidency of the Council of the European Union.

December 2010 The European Summit grants the status of candidate country to Montenegro.

2012 In 2012, the Nobel Peace Price 2012 has been awarded to the European Union.

1 July 2013 Croatia joins the European Union, counting now 28 Member States.

June 2014 The European Summit grants the status of candidate country to Albania.

Text 2. Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union (Part 1)

The European Parliament, the Council and the Commission solemnly proclaim the following text as the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union.

CHARTER OF FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS OF THE EUROPEAN UNION

The peoples of Europe, in creating an ever closer union among them, are resolved to share a peaceful future based on common values.

Conscious of its spiritual and moral heritage, the Union is founded on the indivisible, universal values of human dignity, freedom, equality and solidarity; it is based on the principles of democracy and the rule of law. It places the individual at the heart of its activities, by establishing the citizenship of the Union and by creating an area of freedom, security and justice.

The Union contributes to the preservation and to the development of these common values while respecting the diversity of the cultures and traditions of the peoples of Europe as well as the national identities of the Member States and the organisation of their public authorities at national, regional and local levels; it seeks to promote balanced and sustainable development and ensures free movement of persons, services, goods and capital, and the freedom of establishment.

To this end, it is necessary to strengthen the protection of fundamental rights in the light of changes in society, social progress and scientific and technological developments by making those rights more visible in a Charter.

This Charter reaffirms, with due regard for the powers and tasks of the Union and for the principle of subsidiarity, the rights as they result, in particular, from the constitutional traditions and international obligations common to the Member States, the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, the Social Charters adopted by the Union and by the Council of Europe and the case-law of the Court of Justice of the European Union and of the European Court of Human Rights. In this context the Charter will be interpreted by the courts of the Union and the Member States with due regard to the explanations prepared under the authority of the Praesidium of the Convention which drafted the Charter and updated under the responsibility of the Praesidium of the European Convention.

Enjoyment of these rights entails responsibilities and duties with regard to other persons, to the human community and to future generations.

The Union therefore recognises the rights, freedoms and principles set out hereafter.

TITLE I DIGNITY

Article 1 Human dignity.

Human dignity is inviolable. It must be respected and protected.

Article 2 Right to life

1.   Everyone has the right to life.

2.   No one shall be condemned to the death penalty, or executed.

Article 3 Right to the integrity of the person

1.   Everyone has the right to respect for his or her physical and mental integrity.

2.   In the fields of medicine and biology, the following must be respected in particular:

(a)   the free and informed consent of the person concerned, according to the procedures laid down by law;

(b)   the prohibition of eugenic practices, in particular those aiming at the selection of persons;

(c)   the prohibition on making the human body and its parts as such a source of financial gain;

(d)   the prohibition of the reproductive cloning of human beings.

Article 4 Prohibition of torture and inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment

No one shall be subjected to torture or to inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.

Article 5 Prohibition of slavery and forced labour

1.   No one shall be held in slavery or servitude.

2.   No one shall be required to perform forced or compulsory labour.

3.   Traffickinq in human beings is prohibited.

Text 3. Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union (Part 2)

TITLE II FREEDOMS

Article 6 Right to liberty and security

Everyone has the right to liberty and security of person.

Article 7 Respect for private and family life

Everyone has the right to respect for his or her private and family life, home and communications.

Article 8 Protection of personal data

1.   Everyone has the right to the protection of personal data concerning him or her.

2.   Such data must be processed fairly for specified purposes and on the basis of the consent of the person concerned or some other legitimate basis laid

down by law. Everyone has the right of access to data which has been collected concerning him or her, and the right to have it rectified.

3. Compliance with these rules shall be subject to control by an independent authority.

Article 9 Right to marry and right to found a family

The right to marry and the right to found a family shall be guaranteed in accordance with the national laws governing the exercise of these rights.

Article 10 Freedom of thought, conscience and religion

1. Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion. This right includes freedom to change religion or belief and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or in private, to manifest religion or belief, in worship, teaching, practice and observance.

2. The right to conscientious objection is recognised, in accordance with the national laws governing the exercise of this right.

Article 11 Freedom of expression and information

1. Everyone has the right to freedom of expression. This right shall include freedom to hold opinions and to receive and impart information and ideas without interference by public authority and regardless of frontiers.

2. The freedom and pluralism of the media shall be respected.

Article 12 Freedom of assembly and of association

1. Everyone has the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and to freedom of association at all levels, in particular in political, trade union and civic matters, which implies the right of everyone to form and to join trade unions for the protection of his or her interests.

2. Political parties at Union level contribute to expressing the political will of the citizens of the Union.

Article 13 Freedom of the arts and sciences

The arts and scientific research shall be free of constraint. Academic freedom shall be respected.

Article 14 Right to education

1. Everyone has the right to education and to have access to vocational and continuing training.

2. This right includes the possibility to receive free compulsory education.

3. The freedom to found educational establishments with due respect for democratic principles and the right of parents to ensure the education and teaching of their children in conformity with their religious, philosophical and pedagogical convictions shall be respected, in accordance with the national laws governing the exercise of such freedom and right.

Article 15 Freedom to choose an occupation and right to engage in work

1. Everyone has the right to engage in work and to pursue a freely chosen or accepted occupation.

2. Every citizen of the Union has the freedom to seek employment, to work, to exercise the right of establishment and to provide services in any Member State.

3. Nationals of third countries who are authorised to work in the territories of the Member States are entitled to working conditions equivalent to those of citizens of the Union.

Article 16 Freedom to conduct a business

The freedom to conduct a business in accordance with Union law and national laws and practices is recognised.

Article 17 Right to property

1. Everyone has the right to own, use, dispose of and bequeath his or her lawfully acquired possessions. No one may be deprived of his or her possessions, except in the public interest and in the cases and under the conditions provided for by law, subject to fair compensation being paid in good time for their loss. The use of property may be regulated by law in so far as is necessary for the general interest.

2. Intellectual property shall be protected.

Article 18 Right to asylum

The right to asylum shall be guaranteed with due respect for the rules of the Geneva Convention of 28 July 1951 and the Protocol of 31 January 1967 relating to the status of refugees and in accordance with the Treaty on European Union and the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (hereinafter referred to as 'the Treaties').

Article 19 Protection in the event of removal, expulsion or extradition

1. Collective expulsions are prohibited.

2. No one may be removed, expelled or extradited to a State where there is a serious risk that he or she would be subjected to the death penalty, torture or other inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.

TITLE III EQUALITY

Article 20 Equality before the law

Everyone is equal before the law.

Article 21 Non-discrimination

1. Any discrimination based on any ground such as sex, race, colour, ethnic or social origin, genetic features, language, religion or belief, political or any other opinion, membership of a national minority, property, birth, disability, age or sexual orientation shall be prohibited.

2. Within the scope of application of the Treaties and without prejudice to any of their specific provisions, any discrimination on grounds of nationality shall be prohibited.

Article 22 Cultural, religious and linguistic diversity

The Union shall respect cultural, religious and linguistic diversity.

Article 23 Equality between women and men

Equality between women and men must be ensured in all areas, including employment, work and pay.

The principle of equality shall not prevent the maintenance or adoption of measures providing for specific advantages in favour of the under-represented sex.

Article 24 The rights of the child

1. Children shall have the right to such protection and care as is necessary for their well-being. They may express their views freely. Such views shall be taken into consideration on matters which concern them in accordance with their age and maturity.

2. In all actions relating to children, whether taken by public authorities or private institutions, the child's best interests must be a primary consideration.

3. Every child shall have the right to maintain on a regular basis a personal relationship and direct contact with both his or her parents, unless that is contrary to his or her interests.

Article 25 The rights of the elderly

The Union recognises and respects the rights of the elderly to lead a life of dignity and independence and to participate in social and cultural life.

Article 26 Integration of persons with disabilities

The Union recognises and respects the right of persons with disabilities to benefit from measures designed to ensure their independence, social and occupational integration and participation in the life of the community.

Text 4. Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union (Part 3)

TITLE IV SOLIDARITY

Article 27 Workers' right to information and consultation within the undertaking

Workers or their representatives must, at the appropriate levels, be guaranteed information and consultation in good time in the cases and under the conditions provided for by Union law and national laws and practices.

Article 28 Right of collective bargaining and action

Workers and employers, or their respective organisations, have, in accordance with Union law and national laws and practices, the right to negotiate and conclude collective agreements at the appropriate levels and, in cases of conflicts of interest, to take collective action to defend their interests, including strike action.

Article 29 Right of access to placement services

Everyone has the right of access to a free placement service.

Article 30 Protection in the event of unjustified dismissal

Every worker has the right to protection against unjustified dismissal, in accordance with Union law and national laws and practices.

Article 31 Fair and just working conditions

1. Every worker has the right to working conditions which respect his or her health, safety and dignity.

2. Every worker has the right to limitation of maximum working hours, to daily and weekly rest periods and to an annual period of paid leave.

Article 32 Prohibition of child labour and protection of young people at work

The employment of children is prohibited. The minimum age of admission to employment may not be lower than the minimum school-leaving age, without prejudice to such rules as may be more favourable to young people and except for limited derogations.

Young people admitted to work must have working conditions appropriate to their age and be protected against economic exploitation and any work likely to harm their safety, health or physical, mental, moral or social development or to interfere with their education.

Article 33 Family and professional life

1. The family shall enjoy legal, economic and social protection.

2. To reconcile family and professional life, everyone shall have the right to protection from dismissal for a reason connected with maternity and the right to paid maternity leave and to parental leave following the birth or adoption of a child.

Article 34 Social security and social assistance

1. The Union recognises and respects the entitlement to social security benefits and social services providing protection in cases such as maternity, illness, industrial accidents, dependency or old age, and in the case of loss of employment, in accordance with the rules laid down by Union law and national laws and practices.

2. Everyone residing and moving legally within the European Union is entitled to social security benefits and social advantages in accordance with Union law and national laws and practices.

3. In order to combat social exclusion and poverty, the Union recognises and respects the right to social and housing assistance so as to ensure a decent existence for all those who lack sufficient resources, in accordance with the rules laid down by Union law and national laws and practices.

Article 35 Health care

Everyone has the right of access to preventive health care and the right to benefit from medical treatment under the conditions established by national laws and practices. A high level of human health protection shall be ensured in the definition and implementation of all the Union's policies and activities.

Article 36 Access to services of general economic interest

The Union recognises and respects access to services of general economic interest as provided for in national laws and practices, in accordance with the Treaties, in order to promote the social and territorial cohesion of the Union.

Article 37 Environmental protection

A high level of environmental protection and the improvement of the quality of the environment must be integrated into the policies of the Union and ensured in accordance with the principle of sustainable development.

Article 38 Consumer protection

Union policies shall ensure a high level of consumer protection.

Text 5. Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union (Part 4)

TITLE V CITIZENS' RIGHTS

Article 39 Right to vote and to stand as a candidate at elections to the European Parliament

1. Every citizen of the Union has the right to vote and to stand as a candidate at elections to the European Parliament in the Member State in which he or she resides, under the same conditions as nationals of that State.

2. Members of the European Parliament shall be elected by direct universal suffrage in a free and secret ballot.

Article 40 Right to vote and to stand as a candidate at municipal elections

Every citizen of the Union has the right to vote and to stand as a candidate at municipal elections in the Member State in which he or she resides under the same conditions as nationals of that State.

Article 41 Right to good administration

1. Every person has the right to have his or her affairs handled impartially, fairly and within a reasonable time by the institutions, bodies, offices and agencies of the Union.

2. This right includes:

(a)   the right of every person to be heard, before any individual measure which would affect him or her adversely is taken;

(b)   the right of every person to have access to his or her file, while respecting the legitimate interests of confidentiality and of professional and business secrecy;

(c)   the obligation of the administration to give reasons for its decisions.

3. Every person has the right to have the Union make good any damage caused by its institutions or by its servants in the performance of their duties, in accordance with the general principles common to the laws of the Member States.

4. Every person may write to the institutions of the Union in one of the languages of the Treaties and must have an answer in the same language.

Article 42 Right of access to documents

Any citizen of the Union, and any natural or legal person residing or having its registered office in a Member State, has a right of access to documents of the institutions, bodies, offices and agencies of the Union, whatever their medium.

Article 43 European Ombudsman

Any citizen of the Union and any natural or legal person residing or having its registered office in a Member State has the right to refer to the European Ombudsman cases of maladministration in the activities of the institutions, bodies, offices or agencies of the Union, with the exception of the Court of Justice of the European Union acting in its judicial role.

Article 44 Right to petition

Any citizen of the Union and any natural or legal person residing or having its registered office in a Member State has the right to petition the European Parliament.

Article 45 Freedom of movement and of residence

1. Every citizen of the Union has the right to move and reside freely within the territory of the Member States.

2. Freedom of movement and residence may be granted, in accordance with the Treaties, to nationals of third countries legally resident in the territory of a Member State.

Article 46 Diplomatic and consular protection

Every citizen of the Union shall, in the territory of a third country in which the Member State of which he or she is a national is not represented, be entitled to protection by the diplomatic or consular authorities of any Member State, on the same conditions as the nationals of that Member State.

Text 6. Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union (Part 5)

TITLE VI JUSTICE

Article 47 Right to an effective remedy and to a fair trial

Everyone whose rights and freedoms guaranteed by the law of the Union are violated has the right to an effective remedy before a tribunal in compliance with the conditions laid down in this Article.

Everyone is entitled to a fair and public hearing within a reasonable time by an independent and impartial tribunal previously established by law. Everyone shall have the possibility of being advised, defended and represented.

Legal aid shall be made available to those who lack sufficient resources in so far as such aid is necessary to ensure effective access to justice.

Article 48 Presumption of innocence and right of defence

1. Everyone who has been charged shall be presumed innocent until proved guilty according to law.

2. Respect for the rights of the defence of anyone who has been charged shall be guaranteed.

Article 49 Principles of legality and proportionality of criminal offences and penalties

1. No one shall be held guilty of any criminal offence on account of any act or omission which did not constitute a criminal offence under national law or international law at the time when it was committed. Nor shall a heavier penalty be imposed than the one that was applicable at the time the criminal offence was committed. If, subsequent to the commission of a criminal offence, the law provides for a lighter penalty, that penalty shall be applicable.

2. This Article shall not prejudice the trial and punishment of any person for any act or omission which, at the time when it was committed, was criminal according to the general principles recognised by the community of nations.

3. The severity of penalties must not be disproportionate to the criminal offence.

Article 50 Right not to be tried or punished twice in criminal proceedings for the same criminal offence

No one shall be liable to be tried or punished again in criminal proceedings for an offence for which he or she has already been finally acquitted or convicted within the Union in accordance with the law.

TITLE VII GENERAL PROVISIONS GOVERNING THE INTERPRETATION AND APPLICATION OF THE CHARTER

Article 51 Field of application

1. The provisions of this Charter are addressed to the institutions, bodies, offices and agencies of the Union with due regard for the principle of subsidiarity and to the Member States only when they are implementing Union law. They shall therefore respect the rights, observe the principles and promote the application thereof in accordance with their respective powers and respecting the limits of the powers of the Union as conferred on it in the Treaties.

2. The Charter does not extend the field of application of Union law beyond the powers of the Union or establish any new power or task for the Union, or modify powers and tasks as defined in the Treaties.

Article 52 Scope and interpretation of rights and principles

1. Any limitation on the exercise of the rights and freedoms recognised by this Charter must be provided for by law and respect the essence of those rights and freedoms. Subject to the principle of proportionality, limitations may be made only if they are necessary and genuinely meet objectives of general

interest recognised by the Union or the need to protect the rights and freedoms of others.

2. Rights recognised by this Charter for which provision is made in the Treaties shall be exercised under the conditions and within the limits defined by those Treaties.

3. In so far as this Charter contains rights which correspond to rights guaranteed by the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, the meaning and scope of those rights shall be the same as those laid down by the said Convention. This provision shall not prevent Union law providing more extensive protection.

4. In so far as this Charter recognises fundamental rights as they result from the constitutional traditions common to the Member States, those rights shall be interpreted in harmony with those traditions.

5. The provisions of this Charter which contain principles may be implemented by legislative and executive acts taken by institutions, bodies, offices and agencies of the Union, and by acts of Member States when they are implementing Union law, in the exercise of their respective powers. They shall be judicially cognisable only in the interpretation of such acts and in the ruling on their legality.

6. Full account shall be taken of national laws and practices as specified in this Charter.

7. The explanations drawn up as a way of providing guidance in the interpretation of this Charter shall be given due regard by the courts of the Union and of the Member States.

Article 53 Level of protection

Nothing in this Charter shall be interpreted as restricting or adversely affecting human rights and fundamental freedoms as recognised, in their respective fields of application, by Union law and international law and by international agreements to which the Union or all the Member States are party, including the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and by the Member States' constitutions.

Article 54 Prohibition of abuse of rights

Nothing in this Charter shall be interpreted as implying any right to engage in any activity or to perform any act aimed at the destruction of any of the rights and freedoms recognised in this Charter or at their limitation to a greater extent than is provided for herein.

The above text adapts the wording of the Charter proclaimed on 7 December 2000, and will replace it as from the date of entry into force of the Treaty of Lisbon.

Text 7. Schengen Area

The border-free Schengen Area guarantees free movement to more than 400 million EU citizens, along with non-EU nationals living in the EU or visiting the EU as tourists, exchange students or for business purposes (anyone legally present in the EU). **Free movement** of persons enables every EU citizen to travel, work and live in an EU country without special formalities. Schengen underpins this freedom by enabling citizens to move around the Schengen Area without being subject to border checks.

Today, the Schengen Area encompasses most EU countries, except for Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Ireland and Romania. However, Bulgaria, Croatia and Romania are currently in the process of joining the Schengen Area and already applying the Schengen acquis to a large extent. Additionally, also the non-EU States Iceland, Norway, Switzerland and Liechtenstein have joined the Schengen Area.

Freedom and security for travelers The Schengen provisions abolish checks at EU's internal borders, while providing a single set of rules for controls at the external borders applicable to those who enter the Schengen area for a short period of time (up to 90 days).

The Schengen area relies on common rules covering in particular the following areas:

- crossing the EU external borders, including the types of visa needed,
- harmonisation of the conditions of entry and of the rules on short stay visas (up to 90 days),
- cross-border police cooperation (including rights of cross-border surveillance and hot pursuit),
- stronger judicial cooperation through a faster extradition system and the transfer of enforcement of criminal judgments,
- the Schengen Information System (SIS) and
- documents needed for travelling in Europe.

Police checks and temporary border controls Any person, irrespective of their nationality, may cross the internal borders without being subjected to border checks. However, the competent national authorities can carry out **police checks** at internal borders and in border areas, provided that such checks are not equivalent to border checks. The non exhaustive list of criteria allowing to assess if police checks is equivalent to border controls is set out in the **Schengen Borders Code**. The Code is complemented by relevant case-law of the Court of Justice. It includes the following elements:

- the police checks do not have border control as an objective,
- are based on general police information and experience,
- are carried out in a manner clearly distinct from systematic border checks on persons at the external borders,

- are carried out on the basis of spot-checks.

The police carries out checks under the national law of the Schengen country. Depending on the exact purpose, they can, for example, include identity checks.

Temporary reintroduction of border controls If there is a serious threat to public policy or internal security, a Schengen country may exceptionally **temporarily reintroduce border control** at its internal borders.

If such controls are reintroduced, the Member State concerned has to inform the Council (and thus, other Schengen countries), the European Parliament and the European Commission as well as the public. The Commission is provides information on the current situation at the internal borders at its website: Temporary reintroduction of border controls.

Criteria for countries to join the Schengen Area Joining the Schengen Area is not merely a political decision of the joining State. Countries must fulfil a list of preconditions:

- apply the common set of Schengen rules (the so-called "**Schengen acquis**"), e.g. regarding controls of land, sea and air borders (airports), issuing of visas, police cooperation and protection of personal data,
- take responsibility for controlling the external borders on behalf of other Schengen countries and for issuing uniform Schengen visas,
- efficiently cooperate with law enforcement agencies in other Schengen countries, to maintain a high level of security, once border controls between Schengen countries are abolished,
- connect to and use the Schengen Information System (SIS).

Applicant countries undergo a "**Schengen evaluation**" before joining the Schengen Area and periodically thereafter to ensure the correct application of the legislation.

Background: Free movement in Europe Originally, the concept of free movement was to enable the European working population to freely travel and settle in any EU State, but it fell short of abolishing border controls within the Union.

A break-through was reached in 1985 in Schengen (a small village in Luxembourg), with the signing of the Agreement on the gradual abolition of checks at common borders, followed by the signing of the Convention implementing that Agreement in 1990. The implementation of the Schengen Agreements started in 1995, initially involving seven EU countries.

Born as an intergovernmental initiative, the developments brought about by the Schengen Agreements have now been incorporated into the body of rules governing the EU.

Text 8. Schengen Information System

The Schengen Information System (SIS) is the most widely used and largest information sharing system for security and border management in Europe.

The main purpose of SIS is to make Europe safer. The system assists the competent authorities in Europe to preserve internal security in the absence of internal border checks through three different areas of cooperation:

- **Border control cooperation** SIS enables border guards, as well as visa issuing and migration authorities, to enter and consult alerts on third-country nationals for the purpose of refusing their entry into or stay in the Schengen area.
- **Law enforcement cooperation** SIS supports police and judicial cooperation by allowing competent authorities to create and consult alerts on missing persons and on persons or objects related to criminal offences.
- **Cooperation on vehicle registration** Vehicle registration services may consult SIS in order to check the legal status of the vehicles presented to them for registration. They only have access to SIS alerts on vehicles, registration certificates and number plates.

SIS enables competent national authorities, such as the police and border guards, to enter and consult alerts on persons or objects.

A **SIS alert** does not only contain information about a particular person or object but also instructions for the authorities on what to do when the person or object has been found. The specialised national SIRENE Bureaus located in each Member State serve as single points of contact for the exchange of supplementary information and coordination of activities related to SIS alerts. At the end of 2019, SIS contained approximately 91 million records, it was accessed 6.7 billion times and secured 283 713 hits (when a search leads to an alert and the authorities confirm it).

The Schengen Information System in the future

In November 2018, the co-legislators approved the Regulation (UE) 2018/1860, Regulation (UE) 2018/1861 and Regulation (UE) 2018/1862. These Regulations entered into force on 28th December 2019 and they will be fully operational as from December 2021.

New functionalities in SIS are being implemented in different stages, with a requirement for the work to be completed by 2021. The details on the current state of the implementation are included in the annual report to the Parliament and Council, published by the Commission in February 2020.

- **Sharing of information:** New categories of alerts and more data will be shared through SIS, ensuring that complete and more reliable information is available to the authorities of the Member States.

- **Biometrics:** SIS will contain palm prints, fingerprints, facial images and DNA concerning, for example, missing persons to confirm their identity.
- **Counter-terrorism:** More information will be shared on persons and objects involved in terrorism-related activities, allowing the authorities of the Member States to better pursue and prevent serious crimes and terrorism.
- **Vulnerable persons:** Competent authorities will have the possibility of entering preventive alerts in the system to protect certain categories of vulnerable persons (missing persons, children at risk of abduction or potential victims of trafficking in human beings or gender-based violence).
- **Irregular migration:** Return decisions and entry bans will be part of the information shared in the system to enhance their effective enforcement.
- **Enhanced access for EU Agencies:** Europol will now have access to all alert categories in the SIS while the European Border and Coast Guard Agency operational teams will be able to access SIS for the purpose of carrying out their tasks in the hotspots.

Moreover, the introduction since March 2018 of an AFIS (Automated Fingerprint Identification System) in SIS, and the resulting possibility of making searches using fingerprints, makes it even more difficult for criminals to move unnoticed across Europe. Since 28 December 2020, all Member States must be able to carry out searches on the basis of fingerprints in SIS. Member States are now gradually rolling out the fingerprint search functionality to their police officers and border guards.

On 9 December 2020, the Commission adopted a proposal to enable Europol to issue alerts in the Schengen Information System (SIS) on the basis of third country sourced information, in particular, to detect foreign terrorist fighters.

Countries using the Schengen Information System

The Schengen Information System is operational in 30 European countries, including 26 EU Member States (only Cyprus is not yet connected to SIS) and four Schengen Associated Countries (Switzerland, Norway, Liechtenstein and Iceland).

EU Member States with special arrangements:
- **Bulgaria**, **Romania** and **Croatia** are not yet part of the area without internal border checks (the 'Schengen area'). However, since August 2018, Bulgaria and Romania started using fully SIS. A Council Decision is still required for the lifting of checks at the internal borders of these two Member States. In the case of Croatia, there are still some restrictions regarding its use of Schengen-wide SIS alerts for the purposes of refusing entry into or stay in the Schengen area. Those restrictions will be lifted as

soon as Croatia has become a part of the area without internal border checks.
- **Ireland** operates SIS, but as it has chosen not to join the Schengen area, it cannot issue or access Schengen-wide alerts for refusing entry and stay into the Schengen area.
- **Cyprus** is not yet connected to SIS as it has a temporary derogation from joining the Schengen area.

Text 9. Brexit: What you need to know about the UK leaving the EU

After months of negotiations, the UK and European Union finally agreed a deal that will define their future relationship, which comes into effect at 23.00GMT on 31 December.

I thought the UK had already left the EU?
It has. The UK voted to leave the EU in 2016 and officially left the trading bloc – its nearest and biggest trading partner – on 31 January 2020. However, both sides agreed to keep many things the same until 31 December 2020, to allow enough time to agree to the terms of a new trade deal. It was a complex, sometimes bitter negotiation, but they finally agreed a deal on 24 December.

So what changes on 1 January?
The deal contains new rules for how the UK and EU will live, work and trade together. While the UK was in the EU, companies could buy and sell goods across EU borders without paying taxes and there were no limits on the amount of things which could be traded.

Under the terms of the deal, that won't change on 1 January, but to be sure that neither side has an unfair advantage, both sides had to agree to some shared rules and standards on workers' rights, as well as many social and environmental regulations.

What's in the Brexit deal?
Freedom to work and live between the UK and the EU also comes to an end, and in 2021, UK nationals will need a visa if they want to stay in the EU more than 90 days in a 180-day period. Northern Ireland will continue to follow many of the EU's rules in order to avoid a hardening of its border with the Republic of Ireland. This will mean however that new checks will be introduced on goods entering Northern Ireland from the rest of the UK. Now that it's no longer in the EU, the UK is free to set its own trade policy and can negotiate deals with other countries. Talks are being held with the US,

Australia and New Zealand – countries that currently don't have free trade deals with the EU.

Will there be disruption at the borders?

There may not be new taxes to pay at the border, but there will be new paperwork, and the potential for it to cause delays is a serious concern. "This is the biggest imposition of red tape that businesses have had to deal with in 50 years," according to William Bain from the British Retail Consortium. The UK says it will delay making most checks for six months, to allow people to get used to the new system, but the EU will be checking paperwork and carrying out checks from day one. So if businesses are not prepared, or do not fill in the new paperwork correctly, it could cause delays and backlogs at ports like Dover.

The government has known about this for years, and has made plans to divert trade to other ports around the country and has built lorry parks in Kent, to avoid gridlock on the roads.

It's difficult to predict what the scale of any disruption might be, but government minister Michael Gove has said that UK businesses should prepare for some "bumpy moments".

Is this finally the end of having to hear about Brexit?

Sadly, no. Decisions are still to be made on data sharing and on financial services, and the agreement on fishing only lasts five years.

Also while the UK and EU have agreed to some identical rules now, they don't have to be identical in the future, and if one side takes exception to the changes, they can trigger a dispute, which could ultimately lead to tariffs (charges on imports) being imposed on some goods in the future. Expect the threat of disputes to be a new constant in UK-EU relations.

What Brexit words mean

The last few years have seen many words and phrases enter our lives. We haven't used them here, but politicians do use them. Here's what some of them mean:

Transition period: The 11-month period following the UK's exit from the EU (finishing at the end of 2020), during which time the UK has followed EU rules, to allow leaders to make a deal.

Free trade: Trade between two countries, where neither side charges taxes or duties on goods crossing borders.

Level playing field: A set of rules to ensure that one country, or group of countries, doesn't have an unfair advantage over another. This can involve areas such as workers' rights and environmental standards. Free trade agreements like the Brexit deal often include level playing field measures.

Tariff: A tax or duty to be paid on goods crossing borders.

NORTH ATLANTIC ALLIANCE (NATO)

Text 1. History of NATO

North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) is a military alliance established by the North Atlantic Treaty (also called the Washington Treaty) of April 4, 1949, which sought to create a counterweight to Soviet armies stationed in central and Eastern Europe after World War II.

Its original members were Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, the United Kingdom, and the United States. Joining the original signatories were Greece and Turkey (1952); West Germany (1955; from 1990 as Germany); Spain (1982); the Czech Republic, Hungary, and Poland (1999); Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia, and Slovenia (2004); and Albania and Croatia (2009). France withdrew from the integrated military command of NATO in 1966 but remained a member of the organization; it resumed its position in NATO's military command in 2009.

The heart of NATO is expressed in Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty, in which the signatory members agree that:

'an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all; and consequently they agree that, if such an armed attack occurs, each of them, in exercise of the right of individual or collective self-defense recognized by Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, will assist the Party or Parties so attacked by taking forthwith, individually and in concert with the other Parties, such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force, to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area'.

NATO invoked Article 5 for the first time in 2001, after terrorist attacks organized by exiled Saudi Arabian millionaire Osama bin Laden destroyed the World Trade Center in New York City and part of the Pentagon outside Washington, D.C., killing some 3,000 people.

Article 6 defines the geographic scope of the treaty as covering "an armed attack on the territory of any of the Parties in Europe or North America." Other articles commit the allies to strengthening their democratic institutions, to building their collective military capability, to consulting each other, and to remaining open to inviting other European states to join.

NATO during the Cold War

From its founding, NATO's primary purpose was to unify and strengthen the Western Allies' military response to a possible invasion of Western Europe by the Soviet Union and its Warsaw Pact allies. In the early 1950s NATO relied partly on the threat of massive nuclear retaliation from the United States

to counter the Warsaw Pact's much larger ground forces. Beginning in 1957, this policy was supplemented by the deployment of American nuclear weapons in western European bases. NATO later adopted a "flexible response" strategy, which the United States interpreted to mean that a war in Europe did not have to escalate to an all-out nuclear exchange. Under this strategy, many Allied forces were equipped with American battlefield and theatre nuclear weapons under a dual-control (or "dual-key") system, which allowed both the country hosting the weapons and the United States to veto their use. Britain retained control of its strategic nuclear arsenal but brought it within NATO's planning structures; France's nuclear forces remained completely autonomous.

A conventional and nuclear stalemate between the two sides continued through the construction of the Berlin Wall in the early 1960s, détente in the 1970s, and the resurgence of Cold War tensions in the 1980s after the Soviet Union's invasion of Afghanistan in 1979 and the election of U.S. President Ronald Reagan in 1980. After 1985, however, far-reaching economic and political reforms introduced by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev fundamentally altered the status quo. In July 1989 Gorbachev announced that Moscow would no longer prop up communist governments in central and Eastern Europe and thereby signaled his tacit acceptance of their replacement by freely elected (and noncommunist) administrations. Moscow's abandonment of control over central and eastern Europe meant the dissipation of much of the military threat that the Warsaw Pact had formerly posed to western Europe, a fact that led some to question the need to retain NATO as a military organization – especially after the Warsaw Pact's dissolution in 1991. The reunification of Germany in October 1990 and its retention of NATO membership created both a need and an opportunity for NATO to be transformed into a more "political" alliance devoted to maintaining international stability in Europe.

Text 2. NATO Concept

NATO's essential and enduring purpose set out in the Washington Treaty, is to safeguard the freedom and security of all its members by political and military means. Based on common values of democracy, human rights and the rule of law, the Alliance has striven since its inception to secure a just and lasting peaceful order in Europe. The achievement of this aim can be put at risk by crisis and conflict affecting the security of the Euro-Atlantic area. The Alliance therefore not only ensures the defense of its members but contributes to peace and stability in this region.

The fundamental guiding principle by which the Alliance works is that of common commitment and mutual cooperation among sovereign states in support of the indivisibility of security for all of its members. Solidarity and

cohesion within the Alliance, through daily cooperation in both the political and military spheres, ensure that no single Ally is forced to rely upon its own national efforts alone in dealing with basic security challenges. Without depriving member states of their right and duty to assume their sovereign responsibilities in the field of defense, the Alliance enables them through collective effort to realize their essential national security objectives.

To achieve its essential purpose, as an Alliance of nations committed to the Washington Treaty and the United Nations Charter, the Alliance performs the following fundamental security tasks:

Security: To provide one of the indispensable foundations for a stable Euro-Atlantic security environment, based on the growth of democratic institutions and commitment to the peaceful resolution of disputes, in which no country would be able to intimidate or coerce any other through the threat or use of force.

Consultation: To serve, as provided for in Article 4 of the Washington Treaty, as an essential transatlantic forum for Allied consultations on any issues that affect their vital interests, including possible developments posing risks for members' security, and for appropriate co-ordination of their efforts in fields of common concern.

Deterrence and Defense: To deter and defend against any threat of aggression against any NATO member state as provided for in Articles 5 and 6 of the Washington Treaty.

Security challenges and risks

Notwithstanding positive developments in the strategic environment and the fact that large-scale conventional aggression against the Alliance is highly unlikely, the possibility of such a threat emerging over the longer term exists. The security of the Alliance remains subject to a wide variety of military and non-military risks which are multi-directional and often difficult to predict.

These risks include uncertainty and instability in and around the Euro-Atlantic area and the possibility of regional crises at the periphery of the Alliance, which could evolve rapidly. Some countries in and around the Euro-Atlantic area face serious economic, social and political difficulties. Ethnic and religious rivalries, territorial disputes, inadequate or failed efforts at reform, the abuse of human rights, and the dissolution of states can lead to local and even regional instability. The resulting tensions could lead to crises affecting Euro-Atlantic stability, to human suffering, and to armed conflicts. Such conflicts could affect the security of the Alliance by spilling over into neighbouring countries, including NATO countries, or in other ways, and could also affect the security of other states.

The existence of powerful nuclear forces outside the Alliance also constitutes a significant factor which the Alliance has to take into account if security and stability in the Euro-Atlantic area are to be maintained.

The proliferation of NBC (Nuclear, Bacteriological and Chemical) weapons and their means of delivery remains a matter of serious concern. In spite of welcome progress in strengthening international non-proliferation regimes, major challenges with respect to proliferation remain. The Alliance recognizes that proliferation can occur despite efforts to prevent it and can pose a direct military threat to the Allies' populations, territory, and forces. Some states, including on NATO's periphery and in other regions, sell or acquire or try to acquire NBC weapons and delivery means. Commodities and technology that could be used to build these weapons of mass destruction and their delivery means are becoming more common, while detection and prevention of illicit trade in these materials and know-how continues to be difficult. Non-state actors have shown the potential to create and use some of these weapons.

The global spread of technology that can be of use in the production of weapons may result in the greater availability of sophisticated military capabilities, permitting adversaries to acquire highly capable offensive and defensive air, land, and sea-borne systems, cruise missiles, and other advanced weaponry. In addition, state and non-state adversaries may try to exploit the Alliance's growing reliance on information systems through information operations designed to disrupt such systems. They may attempt to use strategies of this kind to counter NATO's superiority in traditional weaponry.

Any armed attack on the territory of the Allies, from whatever direction, would be covered by Articles 5 and 6 of the Washington Treaty. However, Alliance's security must also take account of the global context. Alliance security interests can be affected by other risks of a wider nature, including acts of terrorism, sabotage and organized crime, and by the disruption of the flow of vital resources. The uncontrolled movement of large numbers of people, particularly as a consequence of armed conflicts, can also pose problems for security and stability affecting the Alliance. Arrangements exist within the Alliance for consultation among the Allies under Article 4 of the Washington Treaty and, where appropriate, coordination of their efforts including their responses to risks of this kind.

Text 3. NATO Today

Is NATO the right organization to assume the regional security responsibilities in Europe? It is not Europe's only security organization, not even its largest one. One alternative to NATO is Europe's largest collective security group, the 55-member Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE). Unlike the OSCE, NATO is an exclusive organization

involving about half of Europe's states. The alliance's selective nature inevitably raises questions about its legitimacy. By what right does a group of minority states enforce order among Europe's majority states? NATO's Bosnia mission was launched on the request of the United Nations' Security Council. But the Kosovo war received no such endorsement. NATO acted on the basis of a vote in the North Atlantic Council, the alliance's own highest decision-making body. NATO's unilateral action appeared to violate, if not the letter, then the spirit, of the UN Charter.

NATO remains a self-appointed interpreter and enforcer of these rules, and it is willing to enforce them with military might, and as such it inevitably arouses suspicions among some neighbors. Russia's objections to NATO's Kosovo operation focused not as much on the tactical issues as they did on the fact that the alliance launched the air war without a UN Security Council authorization. Even more worrisome to Moscow, nothing theoretically prevents the alliance from launching a similar operation against Russia itself. In polls conducted in April 1999, in the midst of the Kosovo war, 70 per cent to 73 per cent of Russians said they considered the NATO military operation in Yugoslavia a direct threat to Russia's security. Fears that NATO may potentially abuse its military might have translated into tensions and insecurity as countries such as Russia seek to form alliances implicitly aimed against NATO. The President of Belarus, justified the union between Russia and Belarus as a response to NATO's aggression against Yugoslavia.

Text 4. NATO enlargement and Russia: Myths and Realities

In his address to the Russian Parliament on 18 April 2014, in which President Putin justified the annexation of the Crimea, he stressed the humiliation Russia had suffered due to many broken promises by the West, including the alleged promise not to enlarge NATO beyond the borders of a reunited Germany. Putin touched a responsive chord among his audience. For more than 20 years the narrative of the alleged "broken promise" of not enlarging NATO eastward is part and parcel of Russia's post-Soviet identity. It is hardly surprising, therefore, that this narrative has resurfaced in the context of the Ukraine crisis. Dwelling on the past remains the most convenient tool to distract from the present.

But is there any truth to these claims? Over recent years countless records and other archival material has become available, allowing historians to go beyond the interviews or autobiographies of those political leaders who were in power during the crucial developments between the fall of the Berlin Wall in November 1989 and the Soviet acceptance of a reunified Germany in NATO in July 1990. Yet even these additional sources do not change the fundamental

conclusion: there have never been political or legally binding commitments of the West not to extend NATO beyond the borders of a reunified Germany. That such a myth could nevertheless emerge should not come as a surprise, however. The rapid pace of political change at the Cold War's end produced its fair share of confusion. It was a time where legends could easily emerge.

The origins of the myth of the "broken promise" lie in the unique political situation in which the key political actors found themselves in 1990, and which shaped their ideas about the future European order. Former USSR leader, Mikhail Gorbachev's reform policies had long spun out of control, the Baltic countries were demanding independence, and the countries of Central and Eastern Europe were showing signs of upheaval. The Berlin Wall had fallen; Germany was on the road to reunification. However, the Soviet Union still existed, as did the Warsaw Pact, who's Central and Eastern European member countries did not talk about joining NATO, but rather about the "dissolution of the two blocks".

Thus, the debate about the enlargement of NATO evolved solely in the context of German reunification. In these negotiations Bonn and Washington managed to allay Soviet reservations about a reunited Germany remaining in NATO. This was achieved by generous financial aid, and by the "2+4 Treaty" ruling out the stationing of foreign NATO forces on the territory of the former East Germany. However, it was also achieved through countless personal conversations in which Gorbachev and other Soviet leaders were assured that the West would not take advantage of the Soviet Union's weakness and willingness to withdraw militarily from Central and Eastern Europe.

It is these conversations that may have left some Soviet politicians with the impression that NATO enlargement, which started with the admission of the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland in 1999, had been a breach of these Western commitments. Some statements of Western politicians – particularly German Foreign Minister Hans Dietrich Genscher and his American counterpart James A. Baker – can indeed be interpreted as a general rejection of any NATO enlargement beyond East Germany. However, these statements were made in the context of the negotiations on German reunification, and the Soviet interlocutors never specified their concerns. In the crucial "2+4" negotiations, which finally led Gorbachev to accept a unified Germany in NATO in July 1990, the issue was never raised. As former Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze later put it, the idea of the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact dissolving and NATO taking in former Warsaw Pact members was beyond the imagination of the protagonists at the time.

Yet even if one were to assume that Genscher and others had indeed sought to forestall NATO's future enlargement with a view to respecting Soviet security interests, they could never have done so. The dissolution of the Warsaw Pact and the end of the Soviet Union in 1991 later created a

completely new situation, as the countries of Central and Eastern Europe were finally able to assert their sovereignty and define their own foreign and security policy goals. As these goals centered on integration with the West, any categorical refusal of NATO to respond would have meant the de facto continuation of Europe's division along former Cold War lines. The right to choose one's alliance, enshrined in the 1975 Helsinki Charter, would have been denied – an approach that the West could never have sustained, neither politically nor morally.

Text 5. The NATO Enlargement Conundrum

Does the absence of a promise not to enlarge NATO mean that the West never had any obligations vis-à-vis Russia? Did the enlargement policy of Western institutions therefore proceed without taking Russian interests into account? Again, the facts tell a different story. However, they also demonstrate that the twin goals of admitting Central and Eastern European countries into NATO while at the same time developing a "strategic partnership" with Russia were far less compatible in practice than in theory.

When the NATO enlargement debate started in earnest around 1993, due to mounting pressure from countries in Central and Eastern Europe, it did so with considerable controversy. Some academic observers in particular opposed admitting new members into NATO, as this would inevitably antagonise Russia and risk undermining the positive achievements since the end of the Cold War. Indeed, ever since the beginning of NATO's post-Cold War enlargement process, the prime concern of the West was how to reconcile this process with Russian interests. Hence, NATO sought early on to create a cooperative environment that was conducive for enlargement while at the same time building special relations with Russia. In 1994 the "Partnership for Peace" programme established military cooperation with virtually all countries in the Euro-Atlantic area. In 1997 the NATO-Russia Founding Act established the Permanent Joint Council as a dedicated framework for consultation and cooperation. In 2002, as Allies were preparing the next major round of NATO enlargement, the NATO-Russia Council was established, giving the relationship more focus and structure. These steps were in line with other attempts by the international community to grant Russia its rightful place: Russia was admitted to the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, the G7 and the World Trade Organisation.

The need to avoid antagonising Russia was also evident in the way NATO enlargement took place in the military realm. As early as 1996, Allies declared that in the current circumstances they had "no intention, no plan, and no reason to deploy nuclear weapons on the territory of new members". These statements were incorporated into the 1997 NATO-Russia Founding Act, together with

similar references regarding substantial combat forces and infrastructure. This "soft" military approach to the enlargement process was supposed to signal to Russia that the goal of NATO enlargement was not Russia's military "encirclement", but the integration of Central and Eastern Europe into an Atlantic security space. In other words, the method was the message.

Russia never interpreted these developments as benignly as NATO hoped. For Russian Foreign Minister Primakov, the signing of the NATO-Russia Founding Act in 1997 was merely "damage limitation": As Russia had no means to stop NATO enlargement, it might as well take whatever the Allies were willing to offer, even at the risk of appearing to acquiesce in the enlargement process. The fundamental contradiction of all NATO-Russia bodies – that Russia was at the table and could co-decide, but could not veto, on key issues – could not be overcome.

However, these institutional weaknesses paled against the background of real political conflicts. NATO's military intervention in the Kosovo crisis was interpreted in Moscow as a geopolitical coup by a West that was bent on marginalising Russia's status as a permanent member of the UN Security Council. NATO's missile defence approach, though directed at third countries, was interpreted by Moscow as an attempt to undermine Russia's nuclear second strike capability. Worse, the "Orange Revolution" in Ukraine and the "Rose Revolution" in Georgia brought to power elites who envisioned the future of their respective countries in the EU and NATO.

Against this background, Western arguments about the benevolence of NATO enlargement never had – and probably never will have – much traction. Appealing to Russia to acknowledge the benign nature of NATO's enlargement misses a most essential point: NATO enlargement – as well as the enlargement of the European Union – is designed as a continental unification project. It therefore does not have an "end point" that could be convincingly defined either intellectually or morally. In other words, precisely because the two organisations' respective enlargement processes are not intended as anti-Russian projects, they are open-ended and – paradoxically – are bound to be perceived by Russia as a permanent assault on its status and influence. As long as Russia shirks an honest debate about why so many of its neighbors seek to orient themselves towards the West, this will not change – and the NATO-Russia relationship will remain haunted by myths of the past instead of looking to the future.

Text 6. Leaders agree NATO 2030 agenda to strengthen the Alliance

NATO leaders reaffirmed the Alliance's dual-track approach of defence and dialogue towards Russia. They also pledged to continue to support NATO partners Ukraine and Georgia, bringing them closer to the Alliance.

Leaders called on China to uphold its international commitments and to act responsibly in the international system. They agreed on the need to address the challenges posed by China's growing influence and international policies, and to engage with China to defend NATO's security interests.

Allied leaders agreed an ambitious NATO 2030 agenda to ensure the Alliance can face the challenges of today and tomorrow. They took decisions to strengthen political consultations, reinforce collective defence, enhance resilience, sharpen NATO's technological edge, uphold the rules-based international order, step up training and capacity building for partners, and address the security impact of climate change. They further agreed to develop NATO's next Strategic Concept for the summit in 2022.

"To do more, Allies agreed that we need to invest more together in NATO," said Secretary General Jens Stoltenberg. He noted that this will require increased resources across all three NATO budgets – military, civil, and infrastructure.

NATO leaders also agreed a new cyber defence policy for NATO, and made clear that the Alliance is determined to defend itself in space as effectively as in other military domains. Addressing Afghanistan, NATO leaders reaffirmed their commitment to stand with Afghanistan with training and financial support for Afghan forces and institutions, and funding to ensure the continued functioning of the international airport.

"We have made important decisions today to make NATO stronger in a more competitive world," stressed the Secretary General.

At the NATO summit in June, Allies agreed on the NATO 2030 agenda, which the Deputy Secretary General said focuses on evolving topics, including resilience, the security implications of climate change, cyber defence, partnerships, and NATO-EU cooperation. NATO's ability to adapt to security issues is one of the reasons that make NATO the most successful alliance in history, Mr Geoană said, adding that NATO 2030 will help NATO further adapt to a fundamentally changing international environment.

Included in these challenges are Emerging and Disruptive Technologies (EDTs) and cyber space, which the Deputy Secretary General said need global attention, stressing the need to establish a predictable international set of norms for them. The Alliance is the first to address an Artificial Intelligence strategy, he said. While NATO does not make laws, it is "setting best standards of

behavior", he explained, underlining the importance of ethical principles in the use of AI and other technologies.

Looking ahead, the NATO Summit also sets in train the revision of the Alliance's Strategic Concept, which will be renewed and agreed on by Allies at the NATO Summit 2022 in Madrid.

Text 7. NATO Summit: Leaders Declare China Presents Security Risk

Dan Sabbagh Defence and security editor and **Julian Borger** in Washington
Mon 14 Jun 2021 17.49 BST

Communiqué is first time alliance has asserted it needs to respond to Beijing's growing power

NATO leaders have declared China presents a security risk at their annual summit in Brussels, the first time the traditionally Russia-focused military alliance has asserted it needs to respond to Beijing's growing power.

The final communiqué, signed off by leaders of the 30-member alliance at the urging of the new US administration, said China's "stated ambitions and assertive behaviour present systemic challenges to the rules-based international order".

After the summit, Joe Biden said that the US had a "sacred commitment" to come to the defence of its NATO allies in an effort to soothe residual nervousness in the wake of Donald Trump's hostility. Biden said that his fellow leaders at the summit knew most Americans were committed to democracy and that the US was a "decent, honourable nation".

On the question of potential Ukrainian membership of NATO, Biden said the Russian occupation of Crimea would not be an impediment, but that Ukraine still had work to do on corruption before it could join a membership action plan. "It depends on whether they meet the criteria. The fact is, they still have to clean up corruption," Biden said.

The NATO leaders declared their concern about China's "coercive policies" – an apparent reference to the repression of the Uyghur Muslims in Xinjiang – the expansion of its nuclear arsenal and its "frequent lack of transparency and use of disinformation".

The language, notably stronger than the China remarks contained in the G7 statement agreed on Sunday, follows lobbying and pressure by the Biden administration, seeking to create a counterweight of democratic nations in response to Beijing's growing economic and military might.

However, NATO's secretary general, Jens Stoltenberg, insisted China was "not an adversary", saying instead the emerging strategy was to address "the

challenges" posed by Beijing, which will "soon be the biggest economy in the world" and "already has the second-largest defence budget, the biggest navy".

At the beginning of the summit, Biden said there was a growing recognition that NATO faced new challenges. "We have Russia, which is acting in a way that is not consistent with what we had hoped, and we have China."

NATO, founded in 1949 at the start of the cold war, was created to respond to the Soviet Union and more recently Russia, while Beijing rarely posed a serious security concern for its members.

China had never previously been mentioned in a NATO summit declaration, apart from a brief reference in 2019 to the "opportunities and challenges" the country posed for members of the western alliance – a time when Biden's predecessor, Donald Trump, was president.

On Sunday night, Jake Sullivan, the US national security adviser, promised NATO would increase its focus on Beijing, saying that China "will feature in the communiqué in a more robust way than we've ever seen before".

Other countries have highlighted the importance of striking a balance. Boris Johnson, the UK prime minister, said as he arrived at the gathering: "I think when it comes to China, I don't think anybody around the table today wants to descend into a new cold war."

G7 leaders criticised Beijing over human rights in its Xinjiang region, called for Hong Kong to keep a high degree of autonomy and demanded a full investigation of the origins of the coronavirus in China.

China's embassy in London said such mentions of Xinjiang, Hong Kong and Taiwan distorted the facts and exposed the "sinister intentions of a few countries such as the United States". It added: "China's reputation must not be slandered."

Stoltenberg also said the alliance's relationship with Russia was at "its lowest point since the end of the cold war". He blamed Russia's "aggressive actions" for the deterioration in relations at the start of a one-day summit attended by Biden for the first time since he took office.

Alliance members had hoped for a strong statement of support for NATO from Biden after several years in which Donald Trump dominated the summits, threatening to pull out of NATO in 2018 and storming home early in 2019.

"NATO is critically important for US interests in and of itself," Biden said as he met Stoltenberg. The president described NATO's article 5, under which an armed attack against one member is deemed an attack against them all, as "a sacred obligation". He added: "I want NATO to know America is there."

The allies denounced Moscow's "hybrid actions", "widespread disinformation campaigns", "malicious cyber activities", and election interference directed against NATO members. "Until Russia demonstrates compliance with international law and its international obligations and

responsibilities, there can be no return to 'business as usual'," the statement said. "We will continue to respond to the deteriorating security environment by enhancing our deterrence and defence posture."

Alliance members agreed a new cybersecurity strategy in response, and will for the first time help each other out in the case of "cyber-attacks of significance", mirroring NATO's obligation of collective defence in the traditional military sphere, enshrined in article 5.

Text 8. China Hits Back at 'Slanderous' NATO Claim it Poses Threat to West

Beijing's European mission issues a forceful response to NATO communique, saying it shows a 'cold war mentality'

China's mission to the European Union has urged NATO to stop exaggerating the "China threat theory" after the group's leaders warned that the country presents "systemic challenges".

Leaders from the transatlantic security alliance took a forceful stance towards Beijing on Monday in a communique at United States president Joe Biden's first summit with the alliance.

"China's stated ambitions and assertive behaviour present systemic challenges to the rules-based international order and to areas relevant to alliance security," NATO leaders said.

The new US president has urged his fellow NATO leaders to stand up to China's authoritarianism and growing military might, a change of focus for an alliance created to defend Europe from the Soviet Union during the cold war.

But China's European mission hit back on Tuesday, saying in a post on its website that the Nato statement "slandered" China's peaceful development, misjudged the international situation, and indicated a "cold war mentality".

China is always committed to peaceful development, it said. "We will not pose a 'systemic challenge' to anyone, but if anyone wants to pose a 'systemic challenge' to us, we will not remain indifferent."

G7 nations meeting in Britain over the weekend scolded China over human rights in its Xinjiang region, called for Hong Kong to keep a high degree of autonomy and demanded a full investigation of the origins of the coronavirus in China.

China's embassy in London said it was resolutely opposed to mentions of Xinjiang, Hong Kong and Taiwan, which it said distorted the facts and exposed the "sinister intentions of a few countries such as the United States".

6. ВОЙНЫ И КОНФЛИКТЫ/ DIFFERENCE BETWEEN WAR AND CONFLICT

Human civilization is replete with instances of wars and conflicts. In fact, at any given point of time, there are scores of conflicts, battles, skirmishes, and full scale wars carrying on between political entities and nations around the world. All there words smack of rift, tension and violence in some form but among these terms, war is decidedly the deadliest as it is of longer duration and declared while rest of the terms signify local level fights that cannot be considered as full fledged war. In this article, we shall concentrate upon the concepts of war and conflict and try to find out the major differences between the two.

War

When we talk of wars, two wars that stand out in the minds of all people are the two world wars that tool place in the twentieth century and are living examples of destruction of lives and property. If we count wars as open, declared, and intentional armed struggles between nations or political entities, more than 3000 wars have been fought on the face of the earth so far and despite concerted and united efforts by civilized nations, there seems to be no end to the use of this instrument of settling disputes between countries. Though it is common to refer to armed conflict of long duration between two countries as classical wars, civil wars inside countries are also considered wars. What would you call the latest call given by the ex President of US to fight against international terror. He described it as war on terror, and war indeed it is, involving cooperation and active support of the international community.

It is clear than fisticuffs between individuals, gang wars, killings by mafia and gang lords etc cannot be classified as wars. However, there is a lot of confusion in this regard as armed rebellions against a nation by a section of its population that feels oppressed are called as wars of independence by those who support these rebellions, and extremism or terrorism by those in power.

Mutual disdain between political parties and use of violence by them against each other does not constitute as war. To be classified as a war, the conflict must be widespread, intentional, and declared. It requires mobilization of personnel and fighter or soldiers moving to front positions to defend territories.

Conflict

Conflict arises from disagreement between two parties where parties perceive a threat to their needs and interests. It is a state of open and prolonged fighting between people, ideologies, and even countries. It is a known fact that

there are differences in the positions of parties involved in any conflict. As long as the level of disagreement remains manageable, conflict remains verbal and can be solved (or at least raises hopes of settlement) through negotiations. It is when the levels of disagreements go beyond control that conflicts give rise to violence and armed struggles.

In an organization, there is always a conflict between the management and the employees because of differences in interests. But there is a mechanism to resolve these conflicts like meetings, negotiations, and talks. Similarly in a political system, there is always a conflict between the party in power and those in opposition, but it does not get out of hand as there are rules and regulations and also norms of conduct that keep discordant elements in check.

There are international conflicts that are mostly pertaining to disputes about geographical boundaries as countries claim a particular region as their own which is denied vehemently by those who control those areas. One such international conflict is India Pakistan Kashmir conflict which has led to three full fledged wars between these two countries and remains a potential nuclear flash point with both countries now being nuclear powers. Another international conflict that has remained unresolved for the last 5 decades is the Israel Palestine conflict with Israel on one side and most of the Arab states on the other side

In brief: Difference Between War and Conflict
• War is intentional, disclosed, wide spread and long duration armed conflict between countries.
• War requires mobilization of troops and use of arms and ammunition to destroy enemy targets.
• Conflict is disagreement between parties where parties perceive threat to their interests and needs.
• Conflict can be between individuals, communities, or even countries.
• There are mechanisms to resolve conflicts but when they fail, conflicts can give rise to full scale wars (when involving countries).

Types of Wars

War is a state of armed conflict between societies. It is generally characterized by extreme collective aggression, destruction, and usually high mortality. The set of techniques and actions used to conduct war is known as warfare. An absence of war is usually called "peace". Total war is warfare that is not restricted to purely legitimate military targets, and can result in massive civilian or other non-combatant casualties.

In 2003, Richard Smalley identified war as the sixth (of ten) biggest problem facing humanity for the next fifty years. War usually results in significant deterioration of infrastructure and the ecosystem, a decrease in

social spending, famine, large-scale emigration from the war zone, and often the mistreatment of prisoners of war or civilians.

War must entail some degree of confrontation using weapons and other military technology and equipment by armed forces employing military tactics and operational art within a broad military strategy subject to military logistics.

Asymmetric warfare is a conflict between two populations of drastically different levels of military capability or size. Asymmetric conflicts often result in guerrilla tactics being used to overcome the sometimes vast gaps in technology and force size.

Chemical warfare involves the intentional use of chemicals in combat. Poison gas as a chemical weapon was principally used during World War I, and resulted in an estimated 1.3 million casualties, including 100,000–260,000 civilians. Tens of thousands or more civilians and military personnel died from chemical weapon effects such as scarring of the lungs, skin damage, and cerebral damage in the years after the Great War ended. Various treaties have sought to ban its further use. Non-lethal chemical weapons, such as tear gas and pepper spray, are widely used, sometimes with deadly effect.

Civil war is a war where the forces in conflict belong to the same nation or political entity and are vying for control of or independence from that nation or political entity.

Conventional warfare is an attempt to reduce the enemy's capability through open battle. It is a declared war between existing states in which nuclear, biological, or chemical weapons are not used or only see limited deployment in support of conventional military goals and maneuvers.

Cyberwarfare involves the actions by a nation-state or international organization to attack and attempt to damage another nation's computers or information networks.

Globalizing war refers to a form of war which extends beyond the national or regional boundaries of the immediate combatants to have implications for the whole planet. An obvious example of this form of war is World War II, but others such as the Vietnam War also qualify. Globalizing war thus includes world war with that category tending to be restricted by convention to the two main examples. Transnational war, a cognate concept, refers to wars fought locally, but with implications or hostilities across the boundaries of nation-states.

Total war is warfare by any means possible, disregarding the laws of war, placing no limits on legitimate military targets, using weapons and tactics that result in significant civilian casualties, or demanding a war effort that requires significant sacrifices by the friendly civilian population.

Nuclear warfare is warfare in which nuclear weapons are the primary, or a major, method of coercing the capitulation of the other side, as opposed to a supporting tactical or strategic role in a conventional conflict.

Unconventional warfare, the opposite of conventional warfare, is an attempt to achieve military victory through acquiescence, capitulation, or clandestine support for one side of an existing conflict.

War of aggression is a war for conquest or gain rather than self-defense; this can be the basis of war crimes under customary international law.

Changing the Face of War

Post-Cold War conflicts have become contests between powerful armies and inferior forces that use violent and nonviolent means meant to wear down, rather than vanquish opponents

Some analysts contend that the age of unquestioned Western military superiority has ended. They point to Iraq where the U.S., the world's only superpower, finds itself in a protracted conflict with an inferior enemy force and Israel's campaign in southern Lebanon.

After decades of failed attempts by Arab states to fight Israel with conventional armies built on the Western model, actors like the Palestine Liberation Organization, Hamas and Hezbollah have come up with a new strategy. It blends violent and non-violent means intended to exhaust, not defeat a superior military force.

This new way of warfare does not pose a threat to the West, it can prevent conventional armies from achieving decisive results. It's ambushes, suicide bombing attacks, assassinations and the intimidation of the population. It includes propaganda and efforts to rouse the population to engage in popular resistance. It's a way of warfare, which poses an acute challenge to a conventionally organized Western nation state trying to defeat it. The battlefields and frontlines of such conflicts are hard to define and that wars that are expected to be short often become open-ended.

Some experts say the West is losing the battle in the war on terrorism to adversaries that are as agile as they are cunning, very networked, very quick to adapt. They are able to run this global insurgency with command and control, propaganda, recruiting, financing.

The use of private contractors increased significantly after the end of the Cold War. Privatizing military operations has accelerated since the U.S.-led military action in Iraq. Companies like Blackwater or others are able to be more flexible, more adaptive than the U.S. government.

But other experts argue that private armies owe allegiance to no country or government and are unregulated. By relying on these private military contractors, we are undermining the unity of a strong military with the defense of the state as its main goal. These contractors' main goal is to get paid, not the defense of a country.

ISRAELI-PALESTINIAN CONFLICT

Text 1. The History of the Palestine Conflict

The Creation of Israel and the 1948 War

To the Jews, the 1948 war proved they were alone in the Middle East, surrounded by hostile populations that would rather kill them than share the Holy Land. The story of how Israel was attacked in 1948 by the combined forces of Jordan, Syria, Lebanon, Iraq and Egypt (just a day after it declared independence) is an important part of the Israeli consciousness. By the time the 1948 war ended (through a 1949 agreement called the Rhodes Armistice) some 700,000 Palestinians had left their homes, most moving into the area now known as the West Bank and creating the refugee crisis that still exists. At the same time, a similar number of Jewish refugees fled their homes in neighboring areas and other Arab countries because of the turmoil. U.N. Resolution 194, passed in December 1948, endorsed the right of refugees "wanting to live at peace with their neighbors" to return to their homes or receive compensation for lost land and property. Palestinian refugees were neither compensated nor allowed to return. Arab countries, with the exception of Jordan, refused to absorb them, preferring to maintain the refugee camps for more than half a century as a way of keeping the issue from fading away. Jewish refugees were eagerly absorbed by Israel. After the 1948 war, Israel possessed approximately 8,000 square miles of Palestine – reducing the Arab lands set up in the 1947 U.N. partition by some 50 percent. Jerusalem was divided, with Arabs on the east side of the armistice line – the Green Line – and the Jews on the west.

The Suez Crisis, 1956: the U.S. Gets a Foothold

In 1956, Egyptian leader Gamal Abdel Nasser nationalized the Suez Canal, which had been run by a private British-French consortium, and closed the Straits of Tiran to Israeli shipping, cutting off the Gulf of Aqaba, Israel's only link to the Red Sea. And, Nasser had been supporting violent guerrilla raids from the Sinai into Israel. Britain and France, fearful of losing their oil-shipping lane, plotted with Israel to wrest control of the canal from Nasser. On Oct. 29, 1956, Israel invaded the Sinai Peninsula, driving the Egyptians all the way to the west side of the canal. The plan was for Britain and France to then drop troops into Egypt to "defend" the canal. But the plan unfolded differently. The United States intervened. President Eisenhower threatened to withhold a $1 billion loan to Britain, and on Nov. 2, the United States sponsored a U.N. resolution demanding Israel's immediate withdrawal from Egypt. It was overwhelmingly approved. Within a year, the borders had returned to their

previous arrangement and Egypt regained the canal. The incident was the first direct U.S. involvement in the affairs of the region.

The Six-Day War, 1967

In the spring of 1967, Egypt ordered U.N. peacekeepers out of the Sinai and again closed the Strait of Tiran to Israeli ships. Belligerent talk and Arab alliances made it evident that Egypt, Syria and Jordan were planning to attack Israel. In response, Israel launched a preemptive strike on June 5. Over six days, Israel captured the Sinai Peninsula from Egypt, the West Bank from Jordan, and the Golan Heights from Syria, and took control of Jerusalem. The fighting stopped June 10. U.N. Resolution 242, which dealt with the new boundaries, has become the basis for negotiations between Israel, the Arab states and the Palestinians. An Israeli withdrawal from the West Bank and Gaza now would result in the creation of a Palestinian state, not a return of the lands to Jordan and Egypt. Resolution 242 called for "withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from territories occupied in the recent conflict." To the Arabs, this has always meant that Israel must return to its pre-1967 borders. For Israelis, "withdrawal... from territories occupied in the recent conflict" meant something less than a full withdrawal. Resolution 242 reaffirmed the right of Israel to exist peacefully amid its Arab neighbors. Also, the resolution reiterated the message of Resolution 194 by calling for a "just settlement of the refugee problem," which was exacerbated by the 1967 conflict.

The Yom Kippur War, 1973

After its stunning military success in the 1967 war, Israel appeared the dominant power in the region. It became more confident, holding onto the conquered territories and saying it was waiting to return them in exchange for peace negotiations. What came, instead, was another war. On Oct. 6, 1973, Egypt and Syria attacked Israel. The attack caught Israel off guard. It was Yom Kippur, the holiest day on the Jewish calendar, and most of Israel was shut down for the holiday. After suffering heavy losses (more than 2,500 Israelis would die and some 3,000 would be wounded in the 18 days of fighting that followed) Israel appealed for help from the United States. At first, the U.S. was reluctant to aid Israel. It did not want to upset Arab states on which it had become increasingly dependent for oil. And it did not want to raise tensions with the Soviet Union, its Cold War adversary and patron of Syria and Egypt. But after learning that the Soviets were airlifting huge amounts of weaponry to Egypt and Syria, President Nixon decided the U.S. had to act. Eventually, Israel was able to turn back the Syrian and Egyptian armies and even pursue them into their own territories. The battle between the Israelis and the Arabs raised the tensions between the superpowers considerably, and on Oct. 22 the U.S. and Russia moved to halt the hostilities by proposing U.N. Resolution

338, which called for an immediate end to the fighting and the resumption of efforts toward peace under the guidelines set out in Resolution 242. The resolution passed unanimously. The war left Israel as the Mideast's dominant military power once again, but it also established the Arab states' ability to inflict heavy damage on Israel.

Rise of the PLO and Invasions of Lebanon: 1970s and 1980s

The Palestine Liberation Organization was created in 1964 with the dual aims of creating a Palestinian state and destroying Israel. Not a key player in the region at first, the organization gained strength with the failure of Egypt in the Six Day War in 1967. Though the PLO's stated aims were to change radically with the 1993 Oslo accords, for nearly 30 years the PLO and its leader, Yasser Arafat, supported guerrilla warfare and terrorism as a primary means of promoting the Palestinian cause. Kicked out of Jordan in 1970 because of its destabilizing effect, the PLO soon became ensconced in Lebanon, where hundreds of thousands of Palestinian refugees lived in generally miserable conditions. From its new position just north of Israel, the PLO supported guerrilla attacks on Israeli territory – attacks that in 1978 provoked an Israeli response. Israel invaded Lebanon in March 1978 in an attempt to crush the PLO guerrillas. The operation was brief and of limited success. In 1982, Israel again invaded Lebanon, this time with the intent of fully crushing the PLO. The invasion reached all the way to Beirut and succeeded in crippling the PLO and exiling Arafat to Tunisia. But the operation also turned into a quagmire for Israel that lasted three years, cost the lives of more than 650 Israeli soldiers and wounded almost 4,000 others. Scores more Israeli soldiers were killed before Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Barak in May 2000 ordered a complete withdrawal from Lebanon, saying: "This 18-year tragedy is over."

The Intifadas: 1987 And 2000

The Arabic word intifada means "shaking off," and is used by Palestinians to describe periods of extended conflict with Israelis in the occupied territories and, more recently, in Israeli cities. The first major Palestinian intifada began in 1987 in Gaza with Palestinian youths disillusioned by two decades of Israeli occupation. The tactics were far less violent than those seen in confrontations these days; Palestinians threw stones and Molotov cocktails, and Israelis fired rubber bullets in response. Strikes and boycotts were also used. The fierceness and widespread participation of West Bank and Gaza Palestinians in the first intifada caught Israel by surprise. The intifada ended in 1993 with the Oslo accords, and Palestinians believe the power of the intifada, along with the worldwide attention it generated, pressured Israel to begin negotiating seriously with the PLO. The second intifada began in September 2000 after years of failed peace negotiations. Continuing to this day, the second intifada is far

more violent and bloody than the first, with Palestinians employing suicide bombers and guns. Israel contends the autonomy granted Palestinians after the Oslo accords requires the Palestinian Authority to put down the current uprising.

Text 2. Gaza Strip

Gaza was part of Palestine when it was administered by Britain in a mandate granted by the League of Nations after World War I. In fighting after Israel declared its independence in large areas of Palestine in 1948, the Egyptians captured the Gaza Strip. Palestinian refugees from the coastal cities to the north took refuge there. They or their descendants still live in UN camps in Gaza. Israel captured it in the war of 1967 and eventually moved about 8,000 settlers there, but all Israeli settlers and soldiers left in 2005. Gaza has a population of 1.4 million of whom about some three-quarters are registered with the United Nations as refugees. It is 40km (25 miles) long and between six and 12km (4 and 8 miles) wide. How did Hamas come to control Gaza?

Under the Oslo peace accords signed in 1993, Gaza was turned over to the newly created Palestinian Authority, to form one wing of a nascent Palestinian state, along with the West Bank and a potential land corridor between them. Yassir Arafat, the president of the authority and leader of the Fatah movement (which, unlike Hamas, thinks that a final agreement with Israel for a two-state solution – Israel and Palestine – can be made), ruled both areas. But as the years passed, it became clear that the Fatah party had less of a hold on Gaza than on the West Bank. Hamas became steadily more popular in Gaza, both because of the social services it provided and because of its more militant stance. In September 2005, the Israeli prime minister at the time, Ariel Sharon, unilaterally withdrew all Israeli settlers from Gaza, making it the first territory completely in Palestinian hands. Israel, however, kept tight control over all border crossings and continued to conduct raids. In January 2006, after Arafat's death, Hamas won a surprise victory in the Palestinian parliamentary elections, ousting the Fatah government, but not Arafat's successor, Mahmoud Abbas, who had succeeded him as Fatah leader as well as president. A unity government between Hamas and Fatah was then formed in March 2007 but the Palestinian Authority President Mahmoud Abbas subsequently dissolved the government. In June 2007, Hamas, claiming that Fatah forces were trying to launch a coup, took control of Gaza by force, but not the West Bank territories. The brief war ended with the rout of Fatah. Hamas was boycotted by the international community, which demands that it renounce violence and recognise Israel. Israel, which like the United States considers Hamas a terrorist group, clamped down on the area's borders, restricting access and

supplies. Militant groups in Gaza fired rockets at Israeli border towns, with Hamas's approval.

In the summer of 2008 a six-month ceasefire was brokered by Egypt. But while the level of rocket fire fell, it never ceased entirely, and Israel made only minor changes in its border policy. After the truce lapsed on Dec. 19, 2008, Hamas stepped up the firing of rockets and mortars. On Dec. 27, Israel responded with a devastating air and ground campaign that left at least 1,300 Palestinians dead by the time a cease-fire was unilaterally declared by both sides on Jan. 18, 2009. Much of the region's civil infrastructure and many homes were left in ruins. The Israeli government's stated war goals were relatively modest: to reduce Hamas's ability and will to fire rockets and to change the security equation in the south. The extent of the destruction wrought by the Israeli military was breathtaking. Bombs pulverized the Parliament and cabinet buildings, the Ministry of Justice, the main university and the police station, paralyzing Gaza's central nervous system and leaving residents in a state of shock. Thousands dragged belongings from ruined homes. Support for the invasion was nearly unanimous among an Israeli public long frustrated at having to endure rocket attacks from what they regarded as an implacable foe. But the fighting drew widespread international criticism, particularly as only 13 Israelis were reported killed to the 1,300 or more Palestinians, especially civilian casualties. The conflict also strained relations between Israel and the United Nations, when Israeli mortars hit a school run by the United Nations, killing more than 40 people.

The invasion has effects beyond Gaza as well. Many Palestinians living in the West Bank expressed disgust with Fatah, which was widely seen to have been weakened by Israel's brutal use of force. And the Arab community was split in its reaction to the conflict. Qatar and Syria supported Hamas – as did non-Arab Iran – while Egypt, Jordan and Saudi Arabia sought to help the Palestinian Authority of Mr. Abbas. Opinion in Arab countries appeared to be firmly on Hamas's side, further deepening rifts between governments and their populace. Despite the cease-fire, Palestinian militants have sporadically fired rockets into Israeli territory, and Israel has retaliated with limited air-strikes against smuggling tunnels and with other small-scale raids. But a tenuous calm remains.

Preconditions for Peace

Egypt has been holding separate talks with Israel and Hamas. In return for a cease-fire lasting a year or more, Hamas is demanding the lifting of Israel's 18-month economic embargo on Gaza and the opening of the border crossings for regular commerce. In the months that followed the conflict, Israeli officials remained skeptical of opening the borders. Many believe that their war served as deterrence and note the drastic reduction in rocket fire as evidence. They

fear that steel or cement will be siphoned off by Hamas for arms. But they are feeling pressure from the Americans and United Nations, and they are discussing a pilot project. The aim of the blockade is to keep Gaza at subsistence and offer a contrast with the West Bank, which in theory benefits from foreign aid and economic and political development. Hamas supporters will then realize their mistake. The plan has not gone well, how-ever, partly because the West Bank under Israeli occupation remains no one's idea of paradise and partly because Hamas seems more in control here every year, with cleaner streets and lower crime, although its popularity is hard to gauge.

Gaza Today

In May 2009, at the time of President Obama's first visit to the Mideast, Gaza was suspended in a state of continuing misery that fell somewhere short of catastrophic. While Israel and Egypt were both still blocking Gaza's borders to squeeze Hamas, Israel allows a daily shipment of rations and other aid, while the United Nations does an efficient job of running schools and clinics. One of the wars appears to have been a decision by Hamas to suspend its use of rockets and shift focus to winning support at home and abroad through cultural initiatives and public relations. In June 2009, a total of two rockets were fired from Gaza, according to the Israeli military, one of the lowest monthly tallies since the firing began in 2002.But the decision to suspend the use of the short-range Qassam rockets that for years have flown into Israel, often dozens a day, has been partly the result of popular pressure. Increasingly, people in Gaza are questioning the value of the rockets, not be-cause they hit civilians but because they are seen as relatively ineffective.

Text 3. West Bank

The West Bank, so named for its location on the western shore of the Jordan river, is a Palestinian territory under military occupation by Israel since the end of the Six-Day War in 1967. The Israeli population of the West Bank, not including East Jerusalem, has tripled since the Israeli-Palestinian peace effort started in the early 1990s, and it now approaches 300,000. The settlers live among 2.5 million Palestinians in about 120 settlements, which much of the world considers a violation of international law, as well as in dozens of outposts erected without official Israeli authorization. Israel argues that the settlement enterprise does not violate the law against transferring populations into occupied territories.

Along with the Gaza strip, the smaller, poorer territory along the Mediterranean coast, the West Bank is controlled in part by Israel and in part by the Palestinian Authority under terms negotiated during the 1993 Oslo accords. Rivalry between Palestinian political organizations Hamas and Fatah

has further divided the area, with moderate Fatah in control of the West Bank and supported by the United States, Europe and Israel as the only workable Palestinian government, while the more radical Hamas holds power in an increasingly isolated Gaza. For the first time since the second Palestinian uprising broke out in late 2000, leading to terrorist bombings and fierce Israeli countermeasures, a sense of personal security and economic potential is spreading across the West Bank as the Palestinian Authority's security forces enter their second year of consolidating order. In coordination with Israeli defense officials and with funding from the U.S. and the European Union, Palestinian troops and police officers have taken over from Israeli soldiers much of the patrolling in the West Bank cities of Jenin, Nablus, Bethlehem and parts of Hebron.

American and European policy in the region aims to stitch Palestinian politics back together by strengthening the Palestinian Authority under the presidency of Mahmoud Abbas, which favors a two-state solution with Israel, while weakening the Islamists of Hamas in Gaza. The Israeli government of Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu says it shares the goal of helping Mr. Abbas, which is why it is seeking to improve West Bank economic conditions as a platform for moving to a political discussion. The biggest object of those potential discussions remains the continued expansion of Israeli settlements in the West Bank (Israel unilaterally withdrew all settlements from Gaza in 2005). While every American administration has objected to Israeli settlement building in occupied lands, the Obama administration has selected it as the opening issue that could begin to untie the Gordian knot of the conflict.

American officials hope that by getting Israel to freeze settlement building on land where the Palestinians expect to build their future state, they can then press Saudi Arabia and other regional powers to offer Israel concessions like low-level trade or tourism. In addition, stopping the construction would remove a major concern of the Palestinians that their land is slowly disappearing under settler housing. In his Cairo speech in June 2009, the president again called for an end to the settlement building.

Text 4. New Jerusalem Settlement Hits Peace Process

By Catrina Stewart in Jerusalem Monday, 17 January 2011 Israel is moving ahead with a project to build 1,400 new homes in predominantly Arab East Jerusalem, a development that critics claim will deliver a death knell to the already faltering peace process. The controversial plan drew furious condemnation from the Palestinian Authority and threatened to dash any prospect of a revival of the US-sponsored peace talks, which collapsed last year over the issue of Jewish settlements.

Saeb Erekat, the Palestinians' chief negotiator, said. "This proves the Israeli government has chosen settlements over peace." Plans for the expansion, expected to be presented to Jerusalem's planning commission this week, were also criticized by Washington as "counterproductive" in efforts to get the two sides back into negotiations. The international community last week condemned the demolition of an historic hotel in east Jerusalem to make way for 20 apartments for Jews, prompting a defiant declaration from Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu that Jews should be free to live where they like in the city. This latest project would extend the existing Gilo settlement, a large neighborhood in East Jerusalem built on lands captured by Israel in 1967 after the Six-Day War, and later annexed. All settlement construction in the occupied sector is regarded as illegal by the international community. The homes would be built on what is currently a picturesque hillside on the other side of the valley from the Cremisan monastery, a popular picnicking spot for Palestinians from the West Bank. Campaigners opposed to the project fear the expansion of Gilo would lead to an unbroken ring of settlements stretching from Jerusalem to Gush Etzion, to the south of Bethlehem, effectively ensuring that that part of the West Bank is never handed back in a peace deal. Meir Margalit, a Jerusalem councilor from the left-leaning Meretz party, said it might be years before the houses are actually built, but that the political repercussions could be immediate. "If there is any chance of the peace process being renewed, after this it's clear it will not happen," he said. "The Palestinians cannot live with this kind of provocation. If [US President Barack] Obama still believes the US can do something to bring peace in the Middle East, this is the time to do it." The Palestinians have opposed settlements on the grounds that Israel cannot negotiate in good faith as long as it is building more settler homes on West Bank land that the Palestinians hope will form the basis of their future state. The Palestinians also covet East Jerusalem as their future capital and fear that Israel is attempting to predetermine its "indivisible" status. But Israel remains unrepentant, arguing that there is an understanding that Israel will never hand back the Jewish areas in East Jerusalem. "In every peace plan put forward over the last two decades, the Jewish neighborhoods of Jerusalem remained part of Israel in a final status [agreement]," said Mark Regev, the prime minister's spokesman. "The Palestinians have unfortunately adopted a position where they refuse to engage."

Israel's announcement that it would build 1,600 new homes in east Jerusalem during US Vice-President Joe Biden's visit last March soured relations between the two countries for several months. Washington, meanwhile, is seeking ways to bring the two sides back to negotiations, but the Palestinians appear now to favor a plan to seek recognition in the United Nations.

Text 5. More Controversial Construction on Track for Jerusalem, Official Says

From Shira Medding, CNN January 16, 2011 Jerusalem (CNN) – Israeli officials could approve plans for building more than a thousand houses in a disputed neighborhood of Jerusalem, a city councilman said Sunday. The Jerusalem municipality's planning commission is set to consider the construction of 1,400 more housing units near the neighborhood of Gilo, a large Jewish community on the southern outskirts of the city. Meir Margalit, a Jerusalem city councilman from the left-wing Meretz party, said plans to build the units will be presented to the planning commission January 24. "Even though it will take years before the construction begins, this action is beyond the last nail in the coffin of the peace process," he said. "After the peace process has already been killed they are firing a few more bullets into it, to make sure it's dead." The spokesman's office for the Jerusalem municipality said Sunday that the planning commission is obligated by law to discuss any plan presented to it. "When the plans reach the commission, they will be reviewed to see if they meet the professional criteria for city plans," the office said. "There has been no change in the planning policy in Jerusalem in the last 40 years. The Jerusalem municipality continues to advance construction for both Arabs and Jews according to the city plans," the office said. "New construction in Jerusalem is necessary for the development of the city." Chief Palestinian negotiator Saeb Erakat told CNN, "We condemn this Israeli decision in all possible terms. It is time for the United States administration to hold Israel responsible for the failure of the peace process. In view of that, we seek to the United Nations Security council this week a resolution declaring all Israeli settlements illegal." The United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs considers Gilo an Israeli settlement built on Palestinian land. Palestinians want East Jerusalem to be the capital of a future Palestinian state. Israel, which annexed the eastern part of Jerusalem in 1967, considers the entire city to be its sovereign capital, a claim not recognized by the international community.

The Obama administration and Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu have been at constant odds over plans for construction in disputed areas of Jerusalem. In November 2008, the United States strongly opposed a plan to build 900 housing units in Gilo. And a plan to build 1,600 houses in Ramat Shlomo, announced during U.S. Vice President Joe Biden's visit to the area last March, caused a major rift between Israel and the United States. Settlement construction remains a divisive issue in Israel. American-sponsored talks between Israelis and Palestinians fell apart in September when Israel resumed settlement construction in the occupied West Bank after a 10-month freeze. Erakat told CNN that was the reason Palestinians would not return to

the negotiating table. "The Israeli government had the choice between settlements and peace and they chose settlements," he said last month.

Text 6. Dmitry Medvedev Restates Russian Support for Palestinian State

On visit to the West Bank, Russian president backs Palestinian demands for Israel to renew freeze on settlement building

Dmitry Medvedev today reiterated Russia's endorsement of an independent Palestinian state, amid mounting concern in Israel over a push for wider international recognition. The Russian president, on a visit to the West Bank, stopped short of explicitly recognising a Palestinian state based on 1967 borders but repeated the position the then Soviet Union adopted in 1988. "Russia's position remains unchanged," he said. "Russia made its choice a long time ago... We supported and we will support the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to an independent state with its capital in East Jerusalem." His comments will boost a Palestinian drive to win recognition of a state based on all territory in the West Bank, Gaza and East Jerusalem occupied by Israel in 1967. In the past two months a string of Latin American countries have recognized a Palestinian state, including Brazil, Argentina and Ecuador. Palestinian officials, frustrated at the stalled peace talks, are considering submit-ting a resolution on recognition to the UN Security Council – a move that would be vetoed by the US.

Israel has publicly dismissed the recent spate of endorsements, but some officials are concerned that it reflects growing sympathy for the Palestinian cause. More countries are expected to recognize a Palestinian state ahead of the UN general assembly in September. Israel has warned that a unilateral declaration of statehood would be a harmful step and that a Palestinian state can only be achieved through negotiations.

Medvedev's comments carried additional weight because Russia is a member of the Middle East quartet of peacemakers, which also includes the US, the UN and the European Union. The Russian president backed Palestinian demands that Israel renew a freeze on settlement building before talks can resume. At a press conference in Jericho with the Palestinian president, Mahmoud Abbas, Medvedev said: "We discussed the conditions for resuming talks with Israel, which include continued self-control and strictly abiding by commitments and, before anything else, freezing all Israeli settlement activities in the West Bank and East Jerusalem." Abbas said: "There are two options, either peace or terror and violence. We shall not choose terror and violence." The Palestinians claim that continued settlement activity is fast making a viable state impossible. There are around half a million Israelis living in settlements in the West Bank and East Jerusalem, which are illegal under international law.

In 1988 the Soviet Union backed a declaration of statehood by Yasser Arafat, the leader of the Palestine Liberation Organization, a move that gained little traction outside the Soviet bloc. The planned Israeli leg of Medvedev's trip fell victim to long-running industrial action by staff at the foreign ministry over pay. As a result, the Russian president entered the West Bank across the historic Allenby Bridge from Jordan, which was shut to normal traffic.

7. ПРОТЕСТЫ И ДЕМОНСТРАЦИИ: ИСТОРИЯ И СОВРЕМЕННОСТЬ

Text 1. When Politics Takes to the Street

Iraq War Protest

Saturday 15 February 2003 saw what is considered to be the largest public protest in British history. An estimated one million people marched in London in opposition to the impending war against Iraq, although organisers claimed the true figure was double that. The official police tally was 750,000 plus. The Stop the War demonstration, mirrored on a smaller scale in Glasgow and Belfast, was part of a worldwide weekend of protest with hundreds of rallies and marches in up to 60 countries. Following a three-and-a-half mile route through central London to rally in Hyde Park, participants cheered, shouted, banged drums and waved banners with anti-war slogans. Despite the scale of the protest – which attracted contingents from about 250 cities and towns across the UK – parliament voted a month later to go to war.

May Day Protests

Thousands of anti-capitalist campaigners have taken to London's streets for May Day protests since 1999, as part of worldwide demonstrations against globalisation. In 2000, what had been billed as a peaceful protest ended in mayhem as a core of protesters smashed up chain stores and restaurants, and defaced a statue of Sir Winston Churchill and the Cenotaph. Dozens were arrested. The following year 6,000 officers were drafted in – out-numbering the 4,000 demonstrators – to contain the protest to London's Ox-ford Circus for several hours. Police denied claims they had over-reacted. Many businesses around Oxford Street lost an estimated J20m in revenue after closing for the day because of the threat of violence.

Rural Marchers

Large scale street protests need not necessarily result in violence. The Countryside Alliance's Liberty and Livelihood march, in September 2002, brought together more than 300,000 marchers in London. The main focus was opposition to a ban on hunting with dogs in England and Wales but the demonstration also reflected a wide range of other grievances from rural communities. Only one arrest was reported on the day, of an anti-hunt demonstrator at a rival rally.

1998 Birmingham G8 Summit

Some 50,000 protesters travelled to Birmingham in 1998 to pressure G8 leaders to cut debt for the world's poorest nations. The demonstrators formed a seven-mile human chain around the city centre and carried out a noisy protest, combining church bells, car horns, drums and voices to create a two-minute cacophony. Leaders of the world's eight richest nations agreed some measures on debt relief but failed to meet campaigners' demands. About 30 environmental activists were arrested after clashes with police.

Poll Tax Riots

An anti-poll tax rally in central London on 31 March 1990 erupted into the worst riots seen in the city for a century. What began as a peaceful protest by an estimated 100,000 people flared into violence as a minority clashed with police, leaving a trail of smashed windows and looted businesses in the West End. The demonstration – which had been preceded by many smaller rallies across the country – resulted in 400 arrests and a bill of J400,000 for damaged property. The unpopularity of the poll tax contributed to the down-fall of Margaret Thatcher, who resigned in November 1990.

Anti-Nuclear Protests

The Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND) attracted widespread popular support in the 1980s, when the Cold War was at its height. Hundreds of thousands joined demonstrations in London against the nuclear arms race, with the largest march in 1981 attended by about 250,000 people. Attention also focused that year on Greenham Common, in Berkshire, where three dozen women marched from Cardiff to set up a peace camp outside a US air base, in opposition to plans to site cruise missiles there. By the mid 1980s, more than 1,000 women had moved to Greenham Common, and many tens of thousands more came for weekends and to lend part-time support. Scotland's Faslane nuclear submarine base on the Clyde has seen a series of protests since the decision in the 1970s to replace Britain's Polaris fleet with Tridents. Hundreds of arrests have taken place as demonstrators staged blockades of the base, and a series of activists broke in through security cordons.

1958 Aldermaston March

On Good Friday 1958, thousands of people gathered in Trafalgar Square to demonstrate against Britain's first hydrogen bomb tests. Some 10,000 then set off on a four-day march to Aldermaston, in Berkshire, where peace activists had discovered a secret atomic weapons plant was being built. The event became an annual pilgrimage in the 1960s, with more marchers traversing the 50-mile route every year to what became the Aldermaston Atomic Weapons Research Establishment.

Text 2. Vote On Political Protests

There have been many popular protests over the years in which ordinary people have challenged governments and changed the course of history. 17

No 1 – Stop The War Britain's biggest ever protest march in February 2003. And the issue still haunts the Prime Minister.

No 2 – Mahatma Gandhi Mahatma Gandhi was nominated by several people including Rahul Mahajan, Bhup Heer and D Cresswell. Gandhi was the man who believed in non-violent direct action. He led the peaceful resistance against Britain rule in India in the 1920's and 1930's.

No 3 – Paris 1968 In May 1968 Paris witnessed a massive revolt by French university students. The protests nearly brought the government down, and the riots between police and demonstrators lasted for several days.

No 4 – Rosa Parks Rosa Parks' refusal to give up her seat to a white man on a bus triggered a mass black boycott of buses in 1955. Her stance against the segregation laws in Alabama made political history.

No 5 – Berlin Wall These memorable scenes following the Fall of the Berlin Wall started with a pro-democracy demo in East Berlin's main square. Within days of the protest, the East German Government resigned and thousands streamed into West Berlin.

No 6 – Battle for Seattle Six years ago tens of thousands of demonstrators from 87 countries descended on Seattle. Protesters were calling for the reform of the World Trade Organisation which was meeting in the City.

No 7 – Gdansk Strike In 1980 the name of one man became synonymous with the most potent threat to Communism in years. Lech Walesa's leadership of workers at the Lenin shipyard in Gdansk and the formation of Solidarity Polish rippled out across the world.

No 8 – Poll Tax Riots The poll tax riots of 1990 were nominated by Phil Harris, Roger Bannister and Beryl Archer. There was a mass demonstration in central London of 31 March, which turned very ugly. The result? The infamous poll tax was consigned history.

No 9 – Suffragettes In 1918 British women were finally given the vote, thanks to this woman... Emmeline Pankhurst. Pankhurst led the Suffrage Movement and it was the first time in Britain that women had used militant means to fight their cause.

No 10 – Tiananmen Square Tiananmen square in Beijing was nominated by Barbara Gordon and Michael May. In June 1989 Chinese students occupied the main square demanding more democracy. 18

Text 3. Massacre in Tiananmen Square

Several hundred civilians have been shot dead by the Chinese army during a bloody military operation to crush a democratic uprising in Peking's (Beijing) Tiananmen Square. The dead were the result of China's bloody suppression of demonstrations that had transfixed the world. They started with a march by students in memory of former party leader Hu Yaobang, who had died. But as the days passed, millions of people joined in, angered by wide-spread corruption and calling for democracy.

After weeks of indecision, hardliners in the Chinese leadership won out and martial law was declared. On the night of 3 June, tanks rolled through the streets of Beijing, charged with clearing the square at all costs. On the streets, even as gunfire rang out around them, people sang the workers' anthem, the Internationale. They seemed unable to understand what was happening. Tanks rumbled through the capital's streets late on 3 June as the army moved into the square from several directions, randomly firing on unarmed protesters. The injured were rushed to hospital on bicycle rickshaws by frantic residents shocked by the army's sudden and extreme response to the peaceful mass protest. Demonstrators, mainly students, had occupied the square for seven weeks, refusing to move until their demands for democratic reform were met.

The military offensive came after several failed attempts to persuade the protesters to leave. Throughout Saturday the government warned it would do whatever it saw necessary to clamp down on what it described as "social chaos". But even though violence was expected, the ferocity of the attack took many by surprise, bringing condemnation from around the world.

US President George Bush said he deeply deplored the use of force, and UK Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher said she was "shocked and appalled by the shootings". Amid the panic and confusion students could be heard shouting "fascists stop killing," and "down with the government".

At a nearby children's hospital operating theatres were filled with casualties with gunshot wounds, many of them local residents who were not taking part in the protests. Early this morning at least 30 more were killed in two volleys of gunfire, which came without warning. Terrified crowds fled, leaving bodies in the road.

Meanwhile reports have emerged of troops searching the main Peking university campus for ringleaders, beating and killing those they suspect of coordinating the protests. The demonstrations in Tiananmen Square have been described as the greatest challenge to the communist state in China since the 1949 revolution. They were called to coincide with a visit to the capital by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev, by students seeking democratic reform.

Troops were used to clear the square despite repeated assurances from Chinese politicians that there would be no violence. It has been suggested that

the Communist leader Deng Xiaoping personally ordered their deployment as a way of shoring up his leadership. Hundreds, and possibly thou-sands, of people were killed in the massacre, although it is unlikely a precise number will ever be known. Peking has since become more widely known as Beijing.

Choosing Silence

Ding Zilin's 17-year-old son was killed on 4 June, 1989. Ever since, she has coordinated the Tiananmen Mothers, a group consisting of family members of those killed and injured. They want the government to reassess the protests and label them a "patriotic movement", rather than "counter-revolutionary turmoil". But Mrs Ding acknowledged that it was an uphill struggle. "I have to admit that the Chinese Government's behaviour has, from their point of view, been successful. For those Chinese people who under-stand what really happened and for people in Beijing, no-one can forget 4 June. But most people have chosen silence," she said.

Today's students were little more than toddlers 15 years ago. They are the direct beneficiaries of the government's post-Tiananmen strategy – to win people over, or maybe buy them off, by pushing forward economic reforms and improving their lives.

Herry, a 21-year-old student, is sympathetic. "I can understand the action of the government at that time," she said. "If our government didn't do that at that time, maybe China will become mess, and maybe we can't enjoy the life today like now we have."

Another student, Zhang Xin, said priorities have changed since then. "Students now are more secular, more practical. They want to improve their English, they want to go abroad, they want to get rich, make money, get good jobs. Some years ago it wasn't the case. They were ideal (istic.)".

Today's undergraduates look inwards at their own lives rather than out-wards at the life of the nation. The party has succeeded in marginalizing those who disagree with it, and in rewriting the history of 4 June within China. But economic reforms and the scars left by its actions mean that few people actually believe in Chinese communism any more.

Text 4. Romanian Revolution

1989: Romania's 'First Couple' Executed

Deposed Romanian president Nicolae Ceausescu and his wife Elena have been shot by a firing squad after a secret military tribunal found them both guilty of crimes against the state. They were charged and convicted of genocide and undermining the national economy among a series of other of-20 fences, officials said. News of their death was announced to the people of Romania on national television amid reports the couple had been found

smuggling large amounts of money out of the country. A stunned reaction from the public gave way to scenes of delight and a public outpouring on the streets to celebrate. But there was some unrest from troops who supported the former leader. The deaths end the dictator's 24 years as communist party leader – 21 of them as Romania's president – during which he suppressed all opposition using brutal force. The National Salvation Front is now running Romania, and America and the Soviet Union have recognized the new government. But the White House said it was "regrettable" the trial had not been held in public

Christmas celebrated The new government has pledged democracy will replace the tyranny of Ceausescu's rule and promised to allow free speech, free thought and free enterprise in Romania. Party leaders called on the West to aid and support its new reform programme. The executions come after 10 tumultuous days of violence and an upsurge of mass protests against Ceausescu's regime. Demonstrations began in the western city of Timisoara against the harassment of a dissident ethnic-Hungarian priest, Laszlo Tokes. It led to protests about a lack of basic supplies such as bread but the backlash from Ceausescu's armed forces led to accusations many people were massacred. Demonstrators stormed Ceausescu's palace and he and his wife tried to flee Bucharest but they were captured by military forces who had turned against them.

1990: Romanians Call for Government Change
Tens of thousands of pro-democracy demonstrators have taken to the streets of the Romanian capital, Bucharest to protest against the interim government of Ion Iliescu. It was the biggest demonstration in the capital, since the revolution just over a month ago which led to the fall and execution of the former communist dictator Nicolae Ceausescu. The protesters converged on Victory Square, where Mr Iliescu's National Salvation Front party has its headquarters. They called for the resignation of Mr Iliescu and the removal of all former communists from the party. The demonstrators claim the interim president is denying opposition parties the chance to stand on equal terms with the ruling party in the free elections planned for May. Mr Iliescu himself appeared on a balcony overlooking the square and promised to carry on talking with the opposition parties. Ion Ratiu, leader of the opposition National Peasants' Party, told the BBC: "We are at long last emerging from a dictatorship that's lasted virtually 45 years and we had hoped we could advance toward democracy and this is precisely why the young people shed their blood.

"Yet these demonstrations today make it look to me as if there is going to be a new attempt at taking over power from the people." He is holding more talks with Mr Iliesu later this week, but said the opposition's limited access to the media meant there was little hope of a fair election. The revolution began in mid-December with a protest in the town of Timisoara against the deportation

of Hungarian priest, Laszlo Tokes, who had denounced Ceausescu in a sermon. What began as a small protest, quickly grew into a massive anti-government riot. Many demonstrators were shot when troops were brought in to restore order. But the demonstrations continued and Ceausescu and his wife were captured trying to flee the country, tried and executed on Christ-mas day. Ion Iliescu remained in power until 1996. But rather than pushing through democratic reforms as he had promised, he blocked moves to prose-cute those who behind the shootings in the December revolution. There has been much speculation since the overthrow of Ceausescu that it was not so much a revolution as a coup, plotted by Iliescu and his supporters it was Iliescu who ordered Ceausescu's trial and subsequent execution. He was finally ousted from power by a centre-right government in 1996 – but three governments later and prolonged political feuding led to the re-emergence of Iliescu's opposition party. He was returned to power in 2000 at the head of the party of Social Democracy, promising faster reforms to get Romania into the European Union.

Text 5. 1990: Violence Flares in Poll Tax Demonstration

An anti-poll tax rally in central London has erupted into the worst riots seen in the city for a century. Forty-five police officers are among the 113 people injured as well as 20 police horses. A total of 340 people have been arrested in the heart of London's West End, popular with musical and theatre goers, as cars have been overturned and set alight. Four tube stations have been shut for safety reasons as police try to clear the streets, with much of central London now cordoned off. Demonstrators have attacked police with bricks and cans. Fire fighters attempting to extinguish the blazes have been hit with wood and stones. Restaurants have been forced to close early by the violence which left shop windows smashed and many businesses with their contents looted. Eyewitness reports describe a cloud of black smoke over Trafalgar Square.

Peaceful Protests

The violence erupted just after 1600 BST following a peaceful march against the poll tax which saw up to 70,000 people take to the streets in pro-test at the new government levy. A group of protesters involved in a sit-in at Whitehall, close to the Downing Street entrance, refused to move after re-quests from police and stewards. As police arrested offenders, placards and cans were thrown from the crowd and the trouble spread to Charing Cross

Road, Pall Mall, Regent Street and Covent Garden. David Meynell, deputy assistant commissioner of the Metropolitan Police, in charge of the operation, said a peaceful march had been "completely overshadowed by the actions of about 3,000 to 3,500 people in minority groups". He said they "without any doubt at all" had launched "a ferocious and sustained attack on the police". The

Home Secretary David Waddington is expected to make a statement to the House of Commons on the rioting tomorrow. More than 400 people were arrested and property was damaged with re-pairs estimated at?400,000 after the demonstration which saw 100,000 people turn out to protest against the poll tax. The demonstration had been proceeded by many smaller rallies across the country. The poll tax enraged people because it was a levy on individuals regardless of means. Its unpopularity contributed to the downfall of Margaret Thatcher who resigned in November 1990 after 11 years at the helm of British politics. Her successor, John Major, appointed Michael Heseltine Environment Secretary to dismantle the poll tax. It was replaced by the council tax – a levy related to the value of a house.

Text 6. Hundreds of Thousands Protest French Labor Law

Paris, March 28 Hundreds of thousands of people poured into the streets of cities across France today in the biggest show of force to date against Prime Minister Dominique de Villepin and his new labor law targeting youth. The police said that 450,000 people turned out nationwide, not including Paris, where hundreds of thousands more people marched in a colorful, mainly peaceful demonstration marked by scattered incidents of violence. One of the country's largest unions, the CGT, put the nationwide figure at 3 million, a turnout that the CGT secretary general, Bernard Thibault, hailed as "historic." Incidents erupted in Paris and several other cities, including Nantes, La Rochelle, Grenoble and Bordeaux, Europe 1 radio reported. In Paris, about 100 hooded youths clashed with the police in midafternoon, the radio and witnesses said, and toward the end of the march the police fired tear gas to disperse hard-core elements. The marches were part of a nationwide day of action against the Villepin legislation, which was intended to encourage hiring by making it easy for companies to fire workers under age 26 during their first two years on the job. Student and union opposition to the law has ballooned into one of the biggest protest movements in France in years.

From early this morning, traffic was disrupted on trains, planes, buses and the Paris Metro as unions heeded calls for a one-day strike. School children and teachers stayed home, newsstands were empty, the main French radio network broadcast only music, mail went undelivered, some banks were closed and most universities remained shut down. In Paris, demonstrators of all ages marched for several hours in a largely good-natured protest. Marchers sported banners, flags, bicycles, and mainly umbrellas, greeting a sudden downpour with a loud cheer. But as the march reached its destination, Place de la Republique in eastern Paris, small groups of youths began harassing other demonstrators, kicking, punching and stealing handbags and portable phones,

the radio said. The police fired tear gas, forcing demonstrators to run for cover into nearby side-streets.

Even as the protest wound its way through Paris, Mr. Villepin faced hostile questioning from opponents of the law in Parliament. Braving cries of "Sit down!" and "Stop!" he defended the labor law as the best way to meet the anxiety of young people at a time when youth unemployment in France tops 20 percent. "We must convince all the French that tomorrow can be better than today and especially young people," Mr. Villepin said, adding that if unions sought to open a dialogue, "I am ready." When boos erupted from the benches of the left, Mr. Villepin retorted that the Socialists, who were in power for most of the 1980's and 1990's, had "never addressed this problem." The protests and strikes represent a test of wills, with students and trade unions demanding that the unpopular labor law be rescinded and Mr. Villepin insisting that it go into effect, albeit with possible changes. The law was drafted and hastily enacted by Mr. Villepin after riots, mainly by unemployed youths, shook France last autumn. Detractors say the law gives employers license to use youthful workers for two years then drop them to avoid having to provide the social benefits attached to long-term contracts. Efforts by Mr. Villepin to defuse tension over the law have so far borne no fruit. He offered Monday to meet with student and union leaders on Wednesday, the day after the protests, "to advance and get out of the current crisis." But the leaders of two main unions, FO and CFDT, said they would not sit down again with Mr. Villepin until he rescinded the law. Some student leaders have moved from demanding the law's withdrawal to calling for Mr. Villepin's resignation. The government was on edge today, even before the street protests, following a march Thursday in Paris that degenerated in the shadow of the Invalides monument to Napoleon, with hardcore elements attacking both the riot police and students, smashing shop windows, battering cars and setting them on fire. Police officers were patrolling commuter trains into the capital today in an effort to weed out potential troublemakers. Asked how she felt about the disruption caused by the strikes, one Marseille woman interviewed on LCI television complained that not enough people had stopped work. "Everyone should be on strike," she said.

Text 7. Climate Change Activists Stage G7 Protest on Cornwall Beach

By AP with Euronews Updated: 12/06/2021

Hundreds of environmental protesters took to the Cornish seaside Saturday morning in a bid to draw the attention of world leaders and the international media outlets that have descended on southwest England for the G-7 summit.

Some protesters paddled out to sea, while others sunbathed on the beach wearing masks of leaders' faces.

A crowd of surfers, kayakers and swimmers gathered Saturday on a beach in Falmouth for a mass "paddle out protest" organized by the group Surfers Against Sewage, which is campaigning for more action to protect oceans.

U.S. President Joe Biden and fellow leaders from the Group of Seven wealthy democracies are meeting near the town of St. Ives for talks focusing on the pandemic and climate change.

Max Lawson, Oxfam's head of policy, said activists want the G-7 countries – Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, the U.K. and the United States – to commit to bigger reductions in carbon emissions and to financing to help poor countries adapt to the impacts of climate change.

"We've only got nine years left to halve carbon emissions if we are going to stop dangerous climate change happening, so it is great that Joe Biden has given new impetus to climate talks which are crucial and happening at the end of the year in the UK, but the G-7 need to do a lot more," he said.

Earlier, as activists from Oxfam assembled on Falmouth beach to protest climate change they put on masks depicting the leaders attending the G-7 summit.

The protesters also brought a message in a bottle to launch an SOS call for climate, as they sat sunbathing and building sand castles on the beach.

Climate change is among the top issues on the agenda of the summit, but activists say G-7 leaders have been talking for years now while more action is needed to cut carbon emissions.

8. ТЕРРОРИЗМ И ПРОБЛЕМЫ БЕЗОПАСНОСТИ В СОВРЕМЕННОМ МИРЕ

Text 1. The Changing Faces of Terrorism

The oft-repeated statement 'One man's terrorist is another man's freedom fighter' reflects genuine doubts about what constitutes 'terrorism'. Sir Adam Roberts surveys the ever-changing definition of terrorist activity, including mass murder of civilians exemplified by the events of September 11.

Origins

The attacks on the World Trade Centre and the Pentagon on September 11 confirmed that terrorism had acquired a new face. Terrorists were now engaged in a campaign of suicide and mass murder on a huge scale. Previously it had been possible to believe that there were limits beyond which even terrorists would not go. After the thousands of deaths on September 11, it was evident that at least one group would stop at nothing. '...terror is often at its bloodiest when used by dictatorial governments against their own citizens.' Terrorism was not always like this. Its history is as much European as Middle Eastern, and as much secular as religious. Far from being willfully indiscriminate, it was often pointedly discriminate. Yet there are some common threads that can be traced through the history of terrorism. What happened on September 11 was a sinister new twist in an old story of fascination with political violence. The word 'terrorism' entered into European languages in the wake of the French revolution of 1789. In the early revolutionary years, it was largely by violence that governments in Paris tried to impose their radical new order on a reluctant citizenry. As a result, the first meaning of the word 'terrorism', as recorded by the Academie Francaise in 1798, was 'system or rule of terror'. This serves as a healthy reminder that terror is often at its bloodiest when used by dictatorial governments against their own citizens.

Assassination

During the 19th century terrorism underwent a fateful transformation, coming to be associated, as it still is today, with non-governmental groups. They developed certain ideas that were to become the hallmark of subsequent terrorism in many countries. They believed in the targeted killing of the 'leaders of oppression'; they were convinced that the developing technologies of the age – symbolized by bombs and bullets – enabled them to strike directly and discriminately. Terrorism continued for many decades to be associated primarily with the assassination of political leaders and heads of state. In

general, the extensive practice of assassination in the 20th century seldom had the particular effects for which terrorists hoped.

In the half-century after the World War Two, terrorism broadened well beyond assassination of political leaders and heads of state. In certain European colonies, terrorist movements developed, often with two distinct purposes. The first was obvious: to put pressure on the colonial powers (such as Britain, France, and the Netherlands) to hasten their withdrawal. The second was more subtle: to intimidate the indigenous population into supporting a particular group's claims to leadership of the emerging post-colonial state. Sometimes these strategies had some success, but not always. (By Professor Adam Roberts 11 May 2007)

Text 2. Terrorism: A Brief History

What is terrorism? There are more than a hundred definitions. The Department of State has one, Title 22 of the U.S. Code Section 2656: "premeditated, politically motivated violence perpetrated against noncombatant targets by subnational groups or clandestine agents, usually intended to influence an audience." The Department of Defense has another, and also the Federal Bureau of Investigation, while the present writer has contributed two or three definitions of his own. But none is wholly satisfactory. Too much has been made, in my opinion, of the element of "noncombatant targets" in order to define terrorism; there has not been a terrorist group in history that has attacked only soldiers or policemen. And what if a group of gunmen attack soldiers in the morning and civilians at night: Are they terrorists, do they belong to a different category, or do they change their character in the course of a day?

No all-embracing definition will ever be found for the simple reason that there is not one terrorism, but there have been many terrorisms, greatly differing in time and space, in motivation, and in manifestations and aims.

Initial Studies
When the systematic study of terrorism began in the 1970s, it was – mistakenly – believed by some that terrorism was more or less a monopoly of extreme left-wing groups, such as the Italian Red Brigades or the German Red Army or various Latin American groups. (There was also ethnic-nationalist terrorism, such as in Northern Ireland, but it figured less prominently.) Hence the conclusion: Terrorism comes into being wherever people are most exploited and most cruelly oppressed. Terrorism, therefore, could easily be ended by removing exploitation and oppression.

However, it should have been clear even then that this could not possibly be a correct explanation because terrorism had been altogether absent precisely in the most oppressive regimes of the 20th century – Nazi Germany and

Stalinist Russia. True, there was virtually no terrorism in the very richest societies and the most egalitarian – but nor was there terrorism in the very poorest. A decade passed and most of the terrorist groups of the Far Left disappeared. If there was terrorism during the 1980s, it came to large extent from small cells of the Extreme Right. Were some instances of aircraft hijackings and bombings (such as over Lockerbie, Scotland), and a few embassies were attacked or even seized (such as in Tehran), but these operations were not carried out by groups of the Extreme Left. The most deadly terrorist act in the United States prior to September 11, 2001, was the 1995 bombing of a federal building in Oklahoma City, carried out by right-wing extremist sectarians. Nationalist terrorism continued (in Ulster, the Basque region of Spain, Sri Lanka, Israel, and some other places), but the Islamist terrorism that figures so prominently today was, as yet, hardly in appearance except, sporadically, in some Middle Eastern countries. Today, terrorism and al-Qaida, and similar groups motivated by religious fanaticism, have virtually become synonyms, inevitably, perhaps, be-cause most contemporary terrorism is carried out by their adherents. But the temptation to equate terrorism with these groups should be resisted for the simple reason that terrorism antedates militant Islamism by a very long time and, for all one knows, will continue to exist well after the present protagonists of jihadism have disappeared. Terrorism is not a political doctrine, even though some have attempted to transform it into an ideology; it is, instead, one of the oldest forms of violence – even though it goes without saying that not all violence is terrorism. It probably antedates regular warfare because the fighting of armies involves a certain amount of organization and sophisticated logistics that primitive man did not have.

The High Tide of Terrorism

The high tide of terrorism rose toward the end of the 19th century. Among the main active groups were the Irish rebels, the Russian Socialist Revolutionaries, and assorted anarchists all over Europe and North America. But secret societies were also actively engaging in terrorism outside Europe – in Egypt, for instance, as well as in India and China – aiming at national liberation. Some of these attacks had tragic consequences; others were more successful in the long, rather than the short, run.

The violence of the 19th century terrorists was notable – they killed a Russian tsar (Alexander II), as well as many ministers, archdukes, and generals; American presidents (William McKinley in 1901 and, before him in 1881, James Garfield); King Umberto of Italy; an empress of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy; Sadi Carnot, president of France; Antonio Canovas, the Spanish prime minister – to mention only some of the most prominent victims. The First World War, of course, was triggered by the murder of Franz

Ferdinand, the Austrian heir to the throne, in Sarajevo in 1914. Rereading the press of that period (and also novels by leading writers from Fyodor Dostoevsky to Henry James and Joseph Conrad), one could easily gain the impression that terrorism was the greatest danger facing mankind and that the end of civilized life was at hand. But as so often before and after, the terrorist danger passed, and, as the Russian Bolshevik revolutionary Leon Trotsky noted on one occasion, one minister was killed, but several others were only too eager to replace him.

Contemporary Terrorism

Terrorism reappeared after World War I in various countries, such as Germany and the Balkan nations. Before coming to power, both Fascists and Communists believed in mass violence rather than individual terrorist acts – with some occasional exceptions, such as the assassination of the Italian Socialist leader Giacomo Matteoti. There was little terrorism during World War II and during the two decades thereafter. This explains, perhaps, why the renewal of terrorist operations in the 1970s and, a *fortiori*, the appearance of Islamist terrorism were interpreted by many, oblivious of the long, earlier history of terrorism, as something wholly new and unprecedented. This was particularly striking with regard to suicide terrorism. As noted earlier, most terrorism up to the late 19th century had been suicide missions, simply because the only available weapons were daggers, short-range pistols, or highly unstable bombs likely to explode in the hands of the attackers. It is true, however, that contemporary terrorism differs in some essential respects from that perpetrated in the 19th century and earlier on. Traditional terrorism had its "code of honor": It targeted kings, military leaders, ministers, and other leading public figures, but if there were a danger that the wife or the children of the target would be killed in an attack, terrorists would refrain from striking, even if doing so endangered their own lives. Today, indiscriminate terrorism has become the rule; very few leading politicians or generals have been killed, but very many wholly innocent people have. The term terrorism has, therefore, very negative connotations, and terrorists now insist on being called by another name. When Boris Savinkov, who headed the Russian Socialist Revolutionaries before World War I, published his autobiography, he had no hesitation in giving it the title *Memoirs of a Terrorist*. Today this would be unthinkable – the modern terrorist wants to be known as a freedom fighter, a guerrilla, a militant, an insurgent, a rebel, a revolutionary – anything but a terrorist, a killer of random innocents.

If there is no agreement concerning a definition of terrorism, does it mean that total confusion and relativism prevail, that one view is as good as another? It is perfectly true that, as an often quoted saying goes, one person's terrorist is another's freedom fighter. But since even the greatest mass murderers in

history had their admirers, from Hitler to Pol Pot, such wisdom does not take us very far. Most of those who have studied terrorism and are reasonably free from bias will agree much of the time in their judgment of an action, even if perfect definitions of terrorism do not exist. Someone has compared it with pornography or obscenity, which is also difficult to define, but an observer with some experience will know it when he sees it. There are no shortcuts to explain why people choose to be terrorists, no magic formulas or laws similar to Newton's and Einstein's in the physical world. From time to time, new insights are offered that do not, however, usually survive critical examination. Recently, for instance, it has been suggested that terrorism occurs only (or mainly) where there has been a foreign invasion of a country. This proposition is true in some cases, such as Napoleon's occupation of Spain or the presence of U.S. troops in Iraq. But a look at the geopolitical map of contemporary terrorism shows that, in most cases, from Sri Lanka to Bangladesh to Algeria to Europe, foreign invasion is not the decisive factor. And even in Iraq, the great majority of terrorist victims occur not among the occupying forces but as the result of attacks of Sunnis against Shiites, and vice versa. (By Walter Laqueur)

Text 3. What is Terrorism?

What exactly is terrorism? A terrorist act would appear to be easily recognizable. Despite laws and international treaties defining terrorism as criminal behavior, many people have their own perceptions as to what constitutes terrorism. The pattern is familiar. First, a bomb attack or other violent act takes place. Then, frequently, a so-called "communique" is issued by some group claiming responsibility for the attack. Meanwhile, authorities and the society at large deal with the impact – death and destruction. Terrorism can occur anywhere, and it usually comes in the form of a surprise attack. In Samarra, Iraq, a Shi'a shrine was blasted into ruins in February. On the Indonesian island of Bali, three suicide bombers took 20 lives last October. In London, bombs ripped apart three subway stations and a bus last July. And in the United States, on September 11, 2001, hijacked airliners toppled New York City's World Trade Center and slammed into the Pentagon near Washington.

Violence Linked By a Common Goal

Analyst Brian Jackson, with the RAND Corporation in Washington, says that while the goals of specific terrorist groups may vary, there is a common thread linking these acts of violence. He says, "Terrorism is a psychological weapon. It's attempting to cause fear, and, through causing that fear, influence others. So by injuring some members of the population, you attempt to cause fear across that population and, by doing that, have that population exert pressure on the government to change its decisions."

Terror and a Change in Government

That is exactly what happened in Spain two years ago. Three days be-fore national elections, a series of explosions ripped apart four commuter trains, killing about 200 people. Conservative Prime Minister Jose Maria Aznar, who had sent troops to join the U.S.-led coalition in Iraq, blamed the Basque separatist group ETA for the bombings. Then, al-Qaida claimed responsibility for the blasts and demanded that Spain withdraw its troops from Iraq. Spanish voters responded by electing the opposition Socialist Party of Jose Luis Rodriguez Zapatero. One of Mr. Zapatero's first acts as Spain's leader was to pull Spanish forces out of Iraq.

A Broadview and the Legal Perspective

At the Center for Defense Information in Washington, analyst Steven Welsh says there is a broadly accepted view of what constitutes terrorism. According to Mr. Welsh, "Traditional definitions usually include the use of violence in order to intimidate a civilian population or to coerce a government, usually carried out by non-state actors or clandestine agents who do not have a lawful basis, in order to disrupt otherwise peaceful settings or the con-duct of national affairs." Although most experts on the subject say terrorism is a political term rather than a legal one, nations and international treaties have sought to put terrorist-related crimes like aircraft hijacking and the murder of diplomats into a legal context. But these definitions can vary in scope and content. Jeffrey Breinholt is Deputy Chief for Counterterrorism at the U.S. Department of Justice. He says, "There is no such thing in the United States as a 'crime of terrorism.' Instead, what we do as a government is to list those things that we know terrorists do from our experience with them, and then make it a crime to commit those various acts." Unlawful possession of weapons and explosives and destruction of U.S. government property are some of the terrorism-connected acts covered by U.S. federal law.

The Influence of Perceptions

Regardless of how terrorism is defined, Brent Heminger at the independent Terrorism Research Center in Washington says there are people who do not see specific acts as terrorism because of their own political or social beliefs. Mr. Heminger contends, "If you went out in the streets in the U.S. and asked 10 separate Americans of all nationalities and creeds what terrorism is, you would get 10 different answers. Each person's perception of a terrorism fighter and a 'freedom fighter' is different, especially in the U.S. In the 1980s, terrorists in Central America were, in fact, our 'freedom fighters.'"

Some people have defended the Irish Republican Army's violence in Northern Ireland as part of a legitimate effort to unite the British-ruled region with the Irish Republic. Similar justifications have been made regarding

violence by Chechen and Sri Lankan separatists. Perceptions of terrorism can also be shaped by religion. Some people claim that the holy writings of their faith contain passages that provide justification for violence – this, despite the fact that all major religions say the killing of innocent people is unacceptable.

Violence Rises to Maintain Terror's Shock Value

The death toll from a single act of terrorism soared to new heights with the murder of roughly 3 thousand people in the September 11, 2001 attacks on New York and Washington. To RAND Corporation analyst Brian Jack-son, terrorism's mounting bloodshed reflects the perpetrators' attempts to always make the greatest possible impact with their crimes. "In the 1970s and 1980s, terrorism was frequently a case where the group tried to kill a few to scare many for whatever reason," says Mr. Jackson. "As societies have gradually become more accustomed to violence, as we see groups with different goals, we've seen terrorist organizations that have really scaled up their activities to try to kill more people." Fighting Terrorism the West views terrorism as a significant threat to peace and stability that compels strong and comprehensive action. Center for Defense Information analyst Steven Welsh says efforts to combat such violence have to go far beyond the apprehension and punishment of those who perpetrate violence. Mr. Welsh contends, "In order to cast the broad net, to get everybody who shares the guilt and to look at things we need to put a stop to in order to prevent terrorism, we need to look at the ancillary activities that radiate out from the violent act itself – such as the financing, the planning and the incitement to violence." Those activities, aided by modern technologies to allow surreptitious movement and communications, make the global war against terrorists increasingly complex and difficult. But the United States and other nations say they will not be deterred in their effort to defeat them. In our next report on terrorism, we'll explore the socio-economic, religious and political factors that motivate terrorists.

Text 4. What Motivates a Terrorist?

Terrorism existed for thousands of years before the word entered European languages after the French Revolution in the late 18th century. The violent and random tactics of terror have been used by groups on the political left and right, by religious fanatics of various faiths, by the rich and poor, by nationalists and revolutionaries. Terrorist Mohammed Atta was motivated out of hatred for America to fly an airplane into a New York City skyscraper. Ulrike Meinhof waged a terror campaign against West Germany in the 1970s out of disenchantment with its society. Former Israeli Prime Minister Menachim Begin was driven by a vision of an independent Jewish homeland to bomb a hotel in Jerusalem.

A Justification for Violence

Whatever the reason – rational or irrational, political, economic, religious or personal – terror specialist Bruce Hoffman of the RAND Corporation think tank here in Washington, says that those who engage in terrorism believe that they have no alternative. "And that becomes the justification or the rationale for violence. Often attached to that or married to that is the catharsis of violence, in other words, the satisfaction they feel of the David against a Goliath, the weak striking out against the powerful," says Hoffman. A common perception of a terrorist is that of a poor and ignorant individual who acts out of desperation. But the Red Brigades, which terrorized Italy in the 1970s and '80s are but one example of organizations created by educated members of the middle class. Bard O'Neill, Director of Insurgency Studies at the National War College in Washington, says another such group is al-Qaida, which launched the September 11, 2001 attacks against the United States. "Al-Qaida people come from middle class backgrounds," says O'Neill. "And when you begin to look at that, you find out that their motivation is very much psychological. People who are searching for a sense of identity, a sense of respect, searching to address humiliation – these are the kinds of things that tend to motivate them rather than poverty." O'Neill says al-Qaida leaders motivate their members through claims that the West has socially, economically and politically humiliated Islamic society. He adds that the inner circle of any terrorist organization tends to be close-minded. "They are the ideologues. They are committed; they are in it for the duration. But when you get beyond the inner core, to the outer circles of a terrorist organization, there you're dealing with people with all different kinds of motivations. And as you move further and further out, you may find people who are there, simply perhaps to make money, to seize opportunities," says O'Neill.

Religious Motives

Another powerful motivating force is religion. The RAND Corporation's Bruce Hoffman says Islamic terrorist organizations that recruit members who are willing to die redefine self-destruction as a social good. "It becomes positive in the sense that if it's a religious context, the bomber is rewarded with a glorious ascent to heaven. But there are also financial and material incentives for the bomber's family that transcend both religious and secular groups. The families themselves are often well taken care of and looked after," says Hoffman.

Scholars say that Islamic terrorists who volunteer to die adhere to the concept of "istishad", or martyrdom, which promises entry into paradise for those who go to their deaths in an attack against an enemy. However, terrorism by definition targets innocent civilians, which violates Islamic teaching. As a result, the prospective martyr is faced with a contradiction. Radwan Masmoudi,

135

President of the Center for the Study of Islam and Democracy in Washington, says it is resolved by mentally denying the civilian status of people on buses or in restaurants. "They are saying that, 'No, these are not really civilians. They are somehow associated with this war and that is why we are targeting them.' They know that it is clearly forbidden in Islam to kill civilians, so they have to find an explanation or a way to say these targets are not really civilians, that they are somehow associated with the military," says Masmoudi. In recent years, Osama bin Laden and other terrorist leaders have portrayed the West's presence in the Muslim world as an attack on Islam. Michael Scheuer, a former CIA officer who was involved in the hunt for bin Laden, says U.S. foreign policy often feeds that perception. "Whether it's our unqualified support for Israel, now our military presence in Afghanistan, in the Philippines and Iraq, our presence on the Arabian Peninsula, our physical presence is pushing that even further – the idea that jihad needs to be waged in defense of Islam," says Scheuer.

Social Issues

Radwan Masmoudi of the Center for the Study of Islam and Democracy says there is widespread unemployment and corruption in Arab societies. He also points to the loss of Islam's position as a dominant culture centuries ago, adding that anger over such failures has driven some Arabs to terrorism. Masmoudi, however, warns that the anger should not be directed against innocents, but at ways of finding peaceful solutions to serious problems. "As an Arab and a Muslim, I think – we have to think – 'Why are we in such a mess?' But we cannot let that anger control us. We have to control our anger. Anger is good because anger gives you energy, it gives you motivation, as long as you're still using your head to determine your reaction," says Masmoudi. Experts recognize that terrorism often works on a tactical level by raising public awareness about particular goals or grievances. But they note that there are few examples of terrorists who gain and keep power without setting limits on violence and without an ability to peacefully engage in the art of politics.

Text 5. Terrorism, the Future, and U.S. Foreign Policy

International terrorism has long been recognized as a foreign and domestic security threat. The tragic events of September 11 in New York, the 40 Washington, D.C., area, and Pennsylvania have dramatically reenergized the nation's focus and resolve on terrorism. This issue brief examines international terrorist actions and threats and the U.S. policy response. Available policy options range from diplomacy, international cooperation, and constructive engagement to economic sanctions, covert action, physical security enhancement, and military force. The September 11th terrorist

incidents in the United States, the subsequent anthrax attacks, as well as bombings of the U.S.S. Cole, Oklahoma City, World Trade Center in 1993, and of the U.S. embassies in Kenya and Tanzania in 1998, have brought the issue of terrorism to the forefront of American public interest. Questions relate to whether U.S. policy and organizational mechanisms are adequate to deal with both state-sponsored or abetted terrorism and that undertaken by independent groups. Terrorist activities supported by sophisticated planning and logistics as well as possible access to unconventional weaponry raise a host of new is-sues. Some analysts' long-held belief that a comprehensive review of U.S. counterterrorism policy, organizational structure, and intelligence capabilities is needed has now become a mainstream view. U.S. policy toward international terrorism contains a significant military component, reflected in current U.S. operations in Afghanistan and (on a smaller scale) the Philippines and in planned deployments of U.S. forces to Yemen and the former Soviet republic of Georgia. President Bush has expressed a willingness to provide military aid to "governments everywhere" in the fight against terrorism. Important issues for Congress include whether the Administration is providing sufficient information about the long-term goals and costs of its military strategy and whether military force is necessarily an effective anti-terrorism instrument in some circumstances.

A modern trend in terrorism is toward loosely organized, self-financed, international networks of terrorists. Another trend is toward terrorism that is religiously or ideologically-motivated. Radical Islamic fundamentalist groups, or groups using religion as a pretext, pose terrorist threats of varying kinds to U.S. interests and to friendly regimes. A third trend is the apparent growth of crossnational links among different terrorist organizations, which may involve combinations of military training, funding, technology transfer or political advice.

Looming over the entire issue of international terrorism is a trend to-ward proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD). For instance Iran, seen as the most active state sponsor of terrorism, has been aggressively seeking a nuclear arms capability. Iraq is thought to be stockpiling chemical and biological agents, and to be rebuilding its nuclear weapons program. North Korea recently admitted to having a clandestine program for uranium enrichment. Also, indications have surfaced that the Al Qaeda organization attempted to acquire chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear weapons. As a result, stakes in the war against international terrorism are increasing and margins for error in selecting appropriate policy instruments or combinations of them to prevent terrorist attacks are diminishing correspondingly.

Text 6. History of Terrorism

Terrorist acts or the threat of such action have been in existence for millennia. Despite having a history longer than the modern nation-state, the use of terror by governments and those that contest their power remains poorly understood. While the meaning of the word terror itself is clear, when it is applied to acts and actors in the real world it becomes confused. Part of this is due to the use of terror tactics by actors at all levels in the social and political environment. Is the Unabomber, with his solo campaign of terror, a criminal, terrorist, or revolutionary? Can he be compared to the French revolutionary governments who coined the word terrorism by instituting systematic state terror against the population of France in the 1790s, killing thou-sands? Are either the same as revolutionary terrorist groups such as the Baader-Mienhof Gang of West Germany or the Weather Underground in the United States? So we see that distinctions of size and political legitimacy of the actors using terror raise questions as to what is and is not terrorism. The concept of moral equivalency is frequently used as an argument to broaden and blur the definition of terrorism as well. This concept argues that the outcome of an action is what matters, not the intent. Collateral or unintended damage to civilians from an attack by uniformed military forces on a legitimate military target is the same as a terrorist bomb directed deliberately at the civilian tar-get with the intent of creating that damage. Simply put, a car bomb on a city street and a jet fighter dropping a bomb on a tank are both acts of violence that produce death and terror. Therefore (at the extreme end of this argument) any military action is simply terrorism by a different name. This is the reasoning behind the famous phrase "One man's terrorist is another man's freedom fighter". It is also a legacy of legitimizing the use of terror by successful revolutionary movements after the fact. The very flexibility and adaptability of terror throughout the years has contributed to the confusion. Those seeking to disrupt, reorder or destroy the status quo have continuously sought new and creative ways to achieve their goals. Changes in the tactics and techniques of terrorists have been significant, but even more significant are the growth in the number of causes and social contexts where terrorism is used.

Over the past 20 years, terrorists have committed extremely violent acts for alleged political or religious reasons. Political ideology ranges from the far left to the far right. For example, the far left can consist of groups such as Marxists and Leninists who propose a revolution of workers led by a revolutionary elite. On the far right, we find dictatorships that typically believe in a merging of state and business leadership. Nationalism is the devotion to the interests or culture of a group of people or a nation. Typically, nationalists share a common ethnic background and wish to establish or regain a homeland. Religious extremists often reject the authority of secular governments and view legal

systems that are not based on their religious beliefs as illegitimate. They often view modernization efforts as corrupting influences on traditional culture. Special interest groups include people on the radical fringe of many legitimate causes; e.g., people who use terrorism to uphold antiabortion views, animal rights, radical environmentalism. These groups believe that violence is morally justifiable to achieve their goals.

Text 7. Preventing Nuclear Terrorism

Nuclear materials have a wide range of characteristics. Enriched uranium or plutonium has awesome explosive potential. Cesium emits deadly radiation, while isotopes of some radioactive substances, such as thallium, can be safely injected into patients undergoing medical procedures. Any kind of nuclear material in the hands of terrorists could have serious security implications. Nuclear energy is a double-edged sword. Contained in the controlled environment of a nuclear power plant, it can generate electricity to run entire cities. Unleashed in a bomb blast, nuclear energy can destroy a metropolis. The catastrophic consequences of such an explosion have prompted U.N. Secretary-General Kofi Annan to call nuclear terrorism one of the most urgent threats of our time. "Even one such attack could inflict mass casualties and change our world forever. That prospect should compel all of us to do our part to strengthen our common defenses," says Annan.

Nuclear Safeguards

Last year, 91 nations signed the U.N. International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism. The convention prohibits individuals from possessing radioactive material with the intention of causing death or serious bodily injury. But some countries have weak nuclear safeguards. Paul Leventhal, founder of the non-governmental Nuclear Control Institute in Washington, D.C. says terrorists could exploit such weakness. "The states today that we're most worried about in terms of assisting terrorist organizations are Iran and North Korea," says Leventhal. "If they were able to acquire fissile material, not necessarily from the state apparatus itself, but one or two entrepreneurial physicists like A. Q. Khan of Pakistan, and I think you also have to include Pakistan also as a potential supplier of terrorist organizations." 43

A.Q. Khan, or Abdul Qadeer Khan, is the developer of Pakistan's nuclear bomb. He is under house arrest in that nation for selling nuclear technology to North Korea and Iran. Pakistan denies any prior knowledge of the transfer, but Khan remains a national hero. A member of Pakistan's Cabinet, Sheikh Rashid Ahmad, said last year that the scientist would not be sent to a third country for prosecution. "I support the idea that the government should tell the people

about these sensitive matters, no matter what the effect of that will be. I am not a spokesman for a cowardly nation. Yes, we supplied Iran with the centrifuge system. Yes, Dr. Qadeer gave Iran this technology. But we are not going to hand over Dr. Qadeer to any one. We will not," says Ah-mad. A centrifuge is used in a costly and complicated industrial process to concentrate uranium as fuel for nuclear power plants. Further processing creates fissile material for bombs. Paul Leventhal of the Nuclear Control Institute says that kind of material is very difficult, but not impossible to obtain. "One can assume that a group would either have a very sophisticated opera-tion to steal or otherwise acquire the material without the knowledge of a nation or a corporation, or they would have people on the inside". Leventhal says about five kilograms of enriched uranium or plutonium atomic bomb. Ivan Oelrich, a physicist with the Federation of American Scientists, says that assembling a bomb is easier than obtaining the fissile material. "You need to have machinists, people who can do computer models and mechanics, people who can actually make the components of the bomb and operate machinery," says Oerlich.

A "Dirty Bomb"

Terrorists could also spread fear with a so-called "dirty bomb," in which radioactive material would be dispersed by conventional explosives. Pavel Felgenhauer, an independent Russian military analyst, says corrupt elements in former Soviet republics could sell nuclear material for such bombs. "The fact that these materials have been spreading out from the former Soviet Union and the fact that terrorists do get their hands on such kind of materials or can do that, the facts exist. And maybe we just don't know all of the story at all," says Felgenhauer. Physicist Ivan Oelrich says highly radioactive material would create a genuine physical threat, but it could also kill the terrorists before they had a chance to explode the device. He says low-grade radioactive contamination also could spread psychological terror. "To be honest, the health dangers would be virtually zero. But people would know, 'Oh, they've put radioactivity into the building, I'm not going to work there.' It might be that because of the reaction, you know, we're human beings and not always rational, and from reaction of people you might have to abandon a building, not because it's actually dangerous, but because people think it is," says Oelrich.

A Power Plant Attack

Another example of nuclear terror would be an attack on a nuclear power plant, turning it, in effect, into a huge dirty bomb. But Ivan Oelrich says such facilities have numerous safeguards against that. "Nuclear containment vessels are supposed to be able to withstand a crash from an aircraft, for example. It's not going to be easy for a terrorist to disrupt the operation of a nuclear power plant. There is, or course, the question of somebody on the inside who wants to

betray the plant. That's another question, but there are ways to deal with that – two man rules, you have background security checks, etc.," says Oelrich. Given that benefits of nuclear technology are tied to the potential for nuclear terrorism, experts underscore the constant need for security. Some, such as Paul Leventhal of the Nuclear Control Institute, even call for development of alternative energy sources to avoid disaster at the hands of nuclear terrorists. (By Peter Fedynsky Washington, D.C.)

Text 8. Combating Nuclear Terrorism

Experts say the international community must continue efforts to ensure that nuclear weapons don't fall into the wrong hands. "Loose nukes" is a colloquial term referring to nuclear bomb material – or actual nuclear weapons – that are not adequately secured or accounted for. Experts say the danger is that these materials could be stolen or sold to a criminal or terrorist organization that would then manufacture a crude nuclear weapon. Matthew Bunn, a nuclear threat and terrorism expert at Harvard University's Belfer Center, says there are four major factors in assessing how urgent the nuclear threat is in a particular country or at a particular facility. "First, the quantity of material – that is, is there enough material there to make a nuclear bomb or is it much less than what you need for a bomb? Second, the quality of the material – would it be very difficult to process to make it into a bomb? Third, the security level at the facility; and fourth, the level of threat at the facility," says Bunn.

Russian Weapons Control
Based on those criteria, Bunn and other experts – such as Daryl Kim-ball, head of the Arms Control Association – say the greatest concern for the last 15 years has been Russia. "During the communist era, Russia had a relatively good security system enforced by the K.G.B. [secret police] to make sure that Russia's rather extensive network of research facilities and military facilities with these materials and weapons were secure. But with the collapse of the Soviet Union and the breakup, the ability of the Russian government – and especially the governments in some of the other former Soviet states – to secure these materials has degraded," says Kimball. But experts say since the fall of the Soviet Union [in 1991], the United States has been helping Russia to secure so-called "loose nukes." David Mosher, a nuclear weapons expert with the RAND Corporation, says "The United States has spent a lot of money working with the Russians to try to get materials and weapons locked up or consolidated in fewer places. At the end of the Cold War, they were spread out over Russia in a lot of different places. And there has been some consolidation that has gone on – helping the Russians dismantle old weapons, so that weapons that are no longer being used have been taken apart. And some of the

fissile material from those weapons has actually been bought by the United States to turn to fuel for nuclear reactors."

Nuclear Threats and Islamic Radicals

Mosher says the problem with Russian "loose nukes" has not been nearly as bad as previously thought. But he says one country that must tightly secure its nuclear arsenal is Pakistan. "Because there is Islamic radicalism in Pakistan and some parts of the Pakistani government are very sympathetic to those forces, there is concern that either during a coup or some other problem in Pakistan, that control of the weapons could be turned over to Islamic radicals which, in turn, might be willing to use them against their foes on the peninsula – that is India – or perhaps against the United States or Western interests," says Mosher. Daryl Kimball from the Arms Control Association says the United States and Pakistan are addressing the issue of nuclear security. "The United States government has very quietly, behind the scenes, been discussing with the government of Pervez Musharraf certain strategies to better secure Pakistan's [nuclear] facilities. But what the United States government has done and how much Pakistan has cooperated is not known outside of very small government circles." Kimball says there is another dimension to the nuclear issue, not tied to weapons. "We also need to be thinking about the dozens of other countries around the world that possess reactors that use highly enriched uranium as fuel. There are research reactors, generally smaller reactors, in dozens of countries that were built with the assistance decades ago of the United States or the Soviet Union, that still contain highly enriched uranium which is usable in nuclear weapons," says Kimball.

Nukes for Sale?

Analysts say a major concern is that someone working either at a nuclear weapons facility or civilian reactor might sell nuclear materials to a terrorist group. But Matthew Bunn from Harvard University says that hasn't happened yet. "We are not aware of any cases so far where highly enriched uranium or plutonium, which are the essential ingredients of nuclear weapons, have in fact been transferred to terrorists," says Bunn. "That doesn't mean it hasn't happened, it just means that we don't have any evidence that it has. And there does not appear to be a sort of organized, consistent market for this kind of material in the way that there is for illegal drugs or something like that." Analysts say it would take several kilograms of plutonium or about 20 kilograms of highly enriched uranium to make a nuclear bomb. So far, the documented cases of people trying to sell those substances illegally involved just several grams. In addition, Kimball says it would be difficult for a terrorist group to obtain nuclear materials. "It would require an extremely sophisticated, well-financed organization to acquire substantial quantities of plutonium or

highly enriched uranium to make a bomb. Then you also have to consider that that organization would have to have the expertise or hire the expertise to manufacture a crude nuclear weapon." Kimball and others believe the best way to ensure that "loose nukes" do not fall into the wrong hands is for governments to devote far greater resources and cooperate closely in establishing ever more stringent security measures around facilities housing nuclear materials. (By Andre de Nesnera Washington, D.C.)

Text 9. Hamas

Hamas is one of the two main Palestinian political groups. Since June 2007 it has been in de facto control of the Gaza Strip, after seizing power from the Fatah party in a series of bloody clashes. In 2009, after Israel waged a fierce three-week military campaign in Gaza to stop rockets from being fired on its southern communities, Hamas suspended its use of rockets and shifted focus to winning support at home and abroad through cultural initiatives and public relations. Hamas derives its name from an acronym for the Arabic words "Harakat al-Muqawama al-Islamiya," which translates into English as the Islamic Resistance Movement. It was founded in 1987 during the first Palestinian uprising with its roots in Muslim Brotherhood politics in Gaza and became more active in the second Palestinian uprising which started in 2000. The group's 9,000-word charter, written in 1988, includes a description of the struggle for Palestine as a religious obligation, saying the land is an endowment that can-not be abandoned. It recognizes the fact of Israel but refuses to recognize its right to exist, and has been responsible for many of the deadliest suicide at-tacks in Israel. But the social programs that were the group's initial focus made the group widely popular among ordinary Palestinians – it created centers for health care, welfare, day care, kindergartens and preschools along with pro-grams for widows of suicide bombers. In January 2006, facing a divided Fatah, the party created by Yassir Arafat, Hamas won a decisive victory in parliamentary elections.

After Hamas took office, it faced increasing turmoil. Israel withheld tax revenues it collected on behalf of the Palestinian Authority, and Western assistance to the Palestinian government was cut off until Hamas renounced violence and agreed to recognize Israel. After months of negotiations, Prime Minister Ismail Haniyah of Hamas and President Mahmoud Abbas, the leader of Fatah, agreed in March 2007 to form a national unity government in an attempt to end the Palestinians' international isolation. The pact did not succeed in restoring the flow of aid and did not last. Clashes between the two groups steadily escalated until gunmen loyal to Hamas took control of Gaza in June, ousting the remnants of Fatah. Hamas now was in sole control of a territory, but one of the poorest in the world, and conditions in Gaza quickly went

downhill. Israel sealed off its borders, causing businesses to wither. Hamas remained defiant, and increased the rate of rocket attacks against border communities within Israel. For months, what followed was a steady cycle of Gazan rockets, Israeli retaliation, more rockets and more Israeli raids.

By June 2008, Hamas and Israel were both ready to reach some sort of accommodation, and the six-month truce was declared, although never formally defined. Their job, the Hamas officials said, was to stop the rocket attacks on Israel not only from its own armed groups but also from others based in Gaza, including Islamic Jihad and Al Aksa Martyrs Brigades. It took some days, but they were largely successful. Hamas imposed its will and even imprisoned some of those who were firing rockets. But the shipments of goods, while up some 25 to 30 percent, never approached what Hamas thought it was going to get. Israel said it planned to increase the shipments in stages, and noted that the rockets never stopped completely. After the truce lapsed on Dec. 19, rocket firing stepped up quickly, with more than 60 rockets and mortar shells falling on Israeli border towns on Dec. 24 alone. On Dec. 27, Israel began a sweeping campaign of airstrikes across Gaza, targeting not only military installations but the infrastructure of Hamas's control. On Jan. 3, 2009, Israel opened a ground war, sending tanks and troops across the border into Gaza.

On Jan. 18, 2009 Israel, then Hamas, announced unilateral cease-fires, ending a devastating 23-day battle in which more than 1,300 Palestinians and 13 Israelis died. In May, Khaled Meshal, the head of Hamas's political wing, who is based in Damascus, declared in an interview that rocket attacks against Israel had been stopped for the moment. In April, only six rockets and mortar rounds were fired at Israel from Gaza, a marked change from the previous three months, when dozens were shot, according to the Israeli military.

Mr. Meshal said his group was eager for a cease-fire with Israel and for a deal that would return an Israeli soldier it is holding captive, Cpl. Gilad Shalit, in exchange for many Palestinian prisoners. He also appeared to reach out to the Obama administration, which has refused to talk with Hamas, saying that his movement only wanted to return to the land occupied by Israel in 1967, and that it was open to negotiating a 10-year truce. By July 2009, Hamas's Gaza leaders had clearly opted for a switch from rocket attacks to what they call a "culture of resistance," which was the topic of a two-day conference focused on the plight of Palestinians there. In June, a total of two rockets were fired from Gaza, according to the Israeli military, one of the lowest monthly tallies since the firing began in 2002. In that tactical sense, the war was a victory for Israel and a loss for Ha-mas. But in the field of public opinion, Hamas took the upper hand. Its leaders have noted the international condemnation of Israel over allegations of disproportionate force, a perception they hope to continue to use to their advantage. Suspending the rocket fire could also serve that goal.

Text 10. Europe Knows Fear, but this Time it's Different

After the murderous bombings in Madrid on Thursday, Spanish news-papers immediately compared 11-M – March 11 – to 9/11. But there was a flaw in the analogy. On Sept. 11, 2001, the United States was caught off guard. In contrast, Spain and several other European countries have experienced terrorism for more than three decades. And lately they had been bracing for a big terrorist action somewhere in the region. Despite this, many Europeans, although not all governments, have so far resisted the American call for an all-out "war on terrorism." To some, that looks like the overreaction of a nation unaccustomed to terrorism on its own territory. For the critics, the slogan has been misused – to alienate the Islamic world, to undermine civil liberties, to justify invading Iraq and to promote President Bush's re-election campaign. Now, after the murder of close to 200 people and the injuring of 1,400 more in Madrid's train bombings, fresh questions are being asked: Will European attitudes toward terrorism harden? Will Europe recognize that its cities are as vulnerable as New York and Washington were on 9/11 and Madrid was on 11-M? Will it too start reorganizing its security services to confront a new enlarged threat? The quick answer, many European security experts say, is "perhaps," with the final response dependent on who is blamed for the bombings: the Basque separatist group known as ETA, which has killed more than 850 people in the past 35 years and on Friday was the Spanish government's principal suspect in the case, or Al Qaeda or another external terrorist group, which may have made Spain a target for its support of the American-led war in Iraq.

"If this is shown to be an ETA bombing, the response will be, 'This is dreadful, worse than anything we have seen, we have to do what we can to help, but it is not new,' " said Frans Heisbourg, director of the Foundation for Security Research, based in Paris. "If it emerges that this is Al Qaeda or a combination of Al Qaeda and ETA, then I think we will have crossed a threshold in the level and intensity of terrorism." In that sense, then, Europe would prefer homegrown terrorism. Since the 1970's, Germany and Greece have known leftist terrorism, while Italy has suffered both leftist and rightist violence: in 1980, Italian neo-Fascists killed 84 people and wounded 200 in a bombing in Bologna. Until the peace agreement in Northern Ireland six years ago, the Irish Republican Army also sponsored separatist violence in Britain, while France still struggles against nationalist extremism in Corsica. Because of these European conflicts, plus spillovers of violence from the Arab world like bombs in the Paris in the 1990's that were linked to the Algerian civil war, Europeans grew used to seeing military patrols at airports and railroad stations and to living with bomb scares or worse. After 9/11, they had reason to fear terrorism of a different magnitude, and that is the specter now being

contemplated in Madrid. In the first days after the bombings in Spain, one senior German official, who asked not to be named, said the initial evidence all pointed to ETA. Still, he noted that news reports raising the possibility of a Qaeda role would be well received in the Arab world. "Afterward, when it is shown to be ETA, they can say, 'We know the truth, our brothers were successful but no one is willing to give them credit,' " he suggested. Martin Ortega, a fellow at the European Union's Institute for Security Studies in Paris, offered a different view: that with general elections taking place in Spain today, the ruling conservative People's Party had an interest in blaming ETA. "Undecided voters may think a center-right government will be tougher on terrorism," he said. "If Al Qaeda is punishing Spain for Iraq, the opposition Socialist Party will benefit because it opposed the war." Mr. Ortega, who is Spanish, added, "In my personal opinion, it's Al Qaeda." Other experts were keeping an open mind late last week. "If ETA has done this, it will be easier to deal with inside Spanish territory," said Rolf Tophoven, director of the Institute for Terrorism Research and Security Policy in Essen, Germany. "If it is Al Qaeda or some spin-off group, it will represent an attack against democracy and freedom. It will mean similar terror could happen in any European city tomorrow or next week."

Of course, even if ETA acted alone last week, the most frightening aspect of the attack was its scale. And Al Qaeda could still strike in Europe at any time. Spain had already been named by Al Qaeda as a potential target because of its stance on Iraq, where it now has 1,300 troops. Britain expects even more to be a target for a terrorist attack because of its direct engagement in the Iraq war, while Italy also supported Washington. Even France and Germany, which took the lead in opposing the war, feel vulnerable, having aided in the American-led effort to dismantle Al Qaeda. And France is facing radical Muslim threats over its recent ban on head scarves in public schools. As a result, security experts say, cooperation between the European police and intelligence agencies has grown substantially since Sept. 11, 2001. They said that, despite Washington's anger over French and German opposition to the war in Iraq, European and American intelligence groups continue to work closely. And this has led to the arrest of numerous Al Qaeda suspects in Britain, France, Germany, Spain, Portugal and Italy. "I think that at an intelligence level Europe has made tremendous progress in degrading the capability of Al Qaeda in certain key countries," said Magnus Ranstorp of the Center on Terrorism and Political Violence at St. Andrews University in Scotland. "But there is still much to do, notably on the issue of identity theft. It is still easy to buy a passport off the street in Europe. The United States is sealing itself off and the question is whether Europe should follow." Most experts here say no. "Every European country has strengthened its police and judiciary since 9/11," said Sergio Romano, a former Italian ambassador to

Russia and NATO. "But they cannot go much beyond that. There is a great deal of resistance in Europe to more radical measures impinging on individual rights." Other political variables also affect European attitudes. Britain was quick to endorse President Bush's war on terrorism as evidence of its "special relationship" with the United States. But Britain, like France and Germany, is also wary of radicalizing Europe's large Muslim populations by appearing to link them to Islamic terrorism (although France risked Muslim anger with its decision to ban the head scarf, in the name of social integration). Spain, like Britain, embraced the American approach, principally in order to place its fight against ETA in the context of a global war on terrorism. France, though, has played a more crucial tactical role in the Basque conflict, by clamping down on ETA's traditional use of France's own Basque region as a logistical rear guard. Several top leaders of ETA are among 124 suspects or militants currently in French jails, and until last Thursday, those arrests, in addition to arrests and weapons seizures in Spain, had convinced Spanish leaders that ETA had been weakened. More than anything, political differences over Iraq have altered European perceptions of the terrorist threat. "I think Europeans soured on the 'war on terrorism' because the United States applied it to the war in Iraq," said Gary Saymore, director of studies at the London-based International Institute for Strategic Studies, who served as a special assistant to President Bill Clinton. "Before Iraq, I don't think there were major differences in terms of policy responses."

Yet even if Al Qaeda is ultimately blamed for the Madrid bombings, few experts believe Europe will respond as the United States did after 9/11. "Some weeks ago, we discussed whether Europe would react violently to its own 9/11," Mr. Ortega said, "and we agreed that instead it would take measures to increase the safety of citizens, to advance on homeland security, to improve ties with the Islamic world. I think that's what we'll see." On the other hand, if ETA is found responsible, the experts believe the Madrid bombings should still serve as a warning. "Among counterterrorism experts watching Al Qaeda and other Islamic groups," Mr. Ranstorp said, "the question is not 'if,' but 'when.' "(By ALAN RIDING)

СПИСОК ИСПОЛЬЗОВАННЫХ ИСТОЧНИКОВ

1. Борисенко, И.И. Английский язык в международных документах (право, торговля, дипломатия): учебное пособие для студ. факультетов междунар. отношений, междунар. права и ин.яз. – 3-е изд., перераб. и доп. / И.И. Борисенко, Л.И. Евтушенко. – Киев: Логос, 2005. – 480 с.

2. Кубъяс, Л.Н. Английский язык для международников = English for International Relations: учебник для студентов вузов: в 2 ч. / Л.Н. Кубъяс, И.В. Кудачкина; Моск. гос. ун-т междунар. отношений МИД России. – Москва: МГИМО-Университет, 2011. – Ч. 1. – 397 с.

3. Кравцова, О.А. Английский язык для специальных и академических целей: международные отношения и зарубежное регионоведение. Уровень С1 = English for Specific and Academic Purposes: For Students of International Relations and Regional Studies: учеб. пособие для студентов вузов: в 2 ч. / О.А. Кравцова, Е.Б. Ястребова; Моск. гос. ин-т междунар. отношений МИД России. – Москва: МГИМО-Университет, 2015. – Ч. 1. – 214 с. – (Иностранные языки в МГИМО).

4. Яницкая, Л.К. Английский язык в дипломатии и политике. Уровень В2 = English for Diplomacy and Politics: учебник для студентов вузов, обуч. по направл. подгот. «Междунар. Отношения» и «Зарубеж. Регионоведение»: в 2 ч. / Л.К. Яницкая; Моск. гос. ин-т междунар. отношений МИД России. – 3-е изд., испр. и перераб. – Москва: МГИМО-Университет, 2015. – Ч. 1. – 328 [1] с.

5. Анкудинова, И.Ф. Английский язык: Проблемы безопасности в современном мире: хрестоматия / И.Ф. Анкудинова, Т.А. Беркович. – Владивосток: Изд-во ВГУЭС, 2011. – 64 с.

6. Glenn Curtis. How to Master the Art of Negotiation. – URL: https://www.investopedia.com/articles/pf/07/negotiation_tips.asp (дата обращения: 19.11.2021).

7. Euronews: [сайт]. – URL: https://www.euronews.com (дата обращения: 19.11.2021).

8. Financial Post: [сайт]. – URL: https://financialpost.com (дата обращения: 19.06.2021).

9. Reuters: [сайт]. – URL: https://www.reuters.com (дата обращения: 06.09.2021).

10. RTE: [сайт]. – URL: https://www.rte.ie/ (дата обращения: 20.08.2021).

11. The BBC: [сайт]. – URL: https://www.bbc.com (дата обращения: 13.06.2021).

12. The Guardian: [сайт]. – URL: https://www.theguardian.com (дата обращения: 19.06.2021).

13. The Hill: [сайт]. – URL: http://thehill.com (дата обращения: 27.08.2021).

14. The National: [сайт]. – URL: http:// www.thenationalnews.com (дата обращения: 27.08.2021).

15. Voice of America: [сайт]. – URL: https://www.voanews.com (дата обращения: 29.08.2021).

16. United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees: [сайт]. – URL: https://www.refworld.org/docid/3b00f221f.html (дата обращения: 30.11.2021).

17. https://www.differencebetween.com/difference-between-war-and-vs-conflict (дата обращения: 30.11.2021).