

Volodymyr OHRYZKO,
Minister of Foreign Affairs of Ukraine (2007–2009),
Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary

THE NAME OF THE RUSSIAN GAME

Human Being and Society: Doomed to be Bound

The bestial nature of human beings takes its toll in unexpected turns of primal instincts. And when the wild calls, there is no preventing it. At the same time, humans are social animals suspended in cobwebs around their primordial nature. It is in the balance of this animality and social existence that certain social institutions emerge, take shape, develop and – sometimes – vanish in the absence of necessity along with the established notions of justice, honour, integrity and other moral qualities. Society instils the precepts of coexistence, ensures compliance therewith and subjects trespassers to punishment or moral sanctioning. That is the legal and societal backbone which human development rests upon.

Something of that kind also held true for foreign affairs, when nations gradually embarked on the path of defining their precepts of coexistence. Over time, customary law assumed an international dimension, embracing the ever increasing number of spheres of common activities. Its practical significance can hardly be exaggerated as it paved the way to a better understanding of the limits of one's discretion without intruding upon the rights of others.

However, the bestial nature still found its way to the surface in the guise of ideology of 'national interest', justifying predatory practices as it deemed fit. In the history of mankind, wars have been the outpouring of this animality. However, now they are more thoroughly disguised in the shroud of cynicism, lies and expediency. Humankind has learned how to masquerade its intentions, with its ideas too shallow and ideals too mundane. The liquidity of existence has become the new normal. This is the current regrettable face of global mores...

Character: Pertinent to People and Nations Alike

It may sound rather unorthodox but this is the way it works. We used to be taught to believe that the world was under the undivided sway of class society. Now we are aware that the global agenda is set by geography, history and culture. Together, they result in creating the collective psychological type of people and the ensuing national character.

Geography served as a natural starting point: The habitat chosen by a community defined not only its worldview but the mode of existence. It bears little validity

to compare the psychology of people with ample food and housing with that of people addressing the lack thereof as their principal aim and existential challenge.

History and culture have also left their noticeable mark on the existence of nations. This has particularly been the case over the last decade due to the transition of the world civilization to the globalized and interdependent development, but not without exceptions from this line of reasoning.

From the vantage point of geographical location, Ukrainians are lucky to be situated between the two extremes: the cold and wild North and hot and slow South. However, relations with other neighbouring ethnic groups did not turn out to be that fortunate.

Given their social underdevelopment, Finno-Ugrs of Zalissia would not have posed any substantial threat to Rus-Ukrainians if it had not been for the emergence of one historical phenomenon. It combined not only their backwardness but also the Mongol aggressiveness and hierarchy together with essentially Russian education and Christian faith. Nevertheless, the latter only gave them a slight impression of belonging to European civilization without changing their nature.

The then social and economic position of Finno-Ugrs living in the territory of soon-to-be Moscovia was not unique for the population of the North. Other tribes, for instance, in the Baltics or Scandinavia, were facing the same conditions. However, in the case of our immediate neighbours, centuries-long bonds of vassalage made a horrendous and lasting impression on them on the part of the Golden Horde, the most hierarchical and rigidly centralized state system at the time.

The local Zalissia population was perfectly aware of one fact engrained in its genetic memory: that there are rulers and there are slaves; that the former's word is law and the latter's role is obedience; that power is sacred and has to be feared and reckoned with.

Harsh environmental conditions introduced nomadism not only into the mode of its existence but also into the mode of its thinking. Constant movement in search for new fertile lands, negligent treatment of the acquired property as fleeting infatuation, and the belief that conquering others is a norm, culminated in aggressiveness, arrogance and assertiveness towards other peoples, which were perceived as an object of endless claims.

In Zalissia, the Christian religion, which was a mighty impetus of enlightenment in Europe, morphed into a dogma, petrified obscurantism and, most importantly, total distrust in anything foreign. Hiding from the world instead of being open to it, stealing to confront instead of sharing to cooperate and the paranoid delusion of foreign sinister intentions caused the local population to embrace the peculiar psychological type of severance, otherness and suspicion.

It is also necessary that we bear in mind the economic aspect of the Zalissia-Moscow mindset, which later came to be known as the Asiatic mode of production. The routine European formula 'money – goods – money' was adopted

in Moscovia with but one crucial alteration: 'goods' was supplanted by 'power'. Given the non-competitive administration system prevalent in the Horde, affiliation with or, better still, hold on power was the most lucrative business, thus leading to total corruption permeating the entire society from top to bottom.

Consequently, at the turn of the 16th and 17th centuries the international area saw the advent of the state which treated human rights as nonsense, the world as a threat, and corruption and coercion as a norm.

Whereas Europe would soon begin to nurture a society with the right to hold personal opinions, Moscovia would naturally degenerate to a community of slaves and serfs entitled to nothing but submissiveness and suppression.

Alas, Moscovia, now under the name of the Russian Federation, continues to stand out as an embodiment of that monstrosity well into the present.

That said, it must also be admitted that (ancient) Ukrainians made their own contribution to this bloodthirsty beast by bringing to Zalissia their knowledge, experience and religion, whilst not shunning away from the company of emperors and empresses without due regard to the destiny of their homeland.

It is similarly worth noting that certain stages in the existence of other empires were also marred by derogation from humanist ideals. However, in their cases credit is due to history and culture, which helped to subdue natural aggressiveness, predation and imperialism. Such evolution allowed them to evolve into civilized democratic countries.

In the case of Russia, historical and, particularly, cultural factors failed to take their part. Despite certain cultural achievements, which were, in fact, shamelessly arrogated or stolen from other nations, the Russian mindset endured.

In consequence of this physical and mental severance of Moscovia from the rest of Europe over the centuries, its people found themselves under the dome of a very peculiar psychological type, heavily leaning towards the Asian mode of thinking and strongly differing from that in Europe. It was some sort of 'closing the gates' against progressive ideas about the world and its development. The remnants of civilization got the final gate in the Bolshevik-Soviet period, which was striving to create 'homo sovieticus', a Soviet man.

Hence, the situation one finds themselves today is anything but exceptional. Russia in its current iteration is the most unappealing product of its previous development, a sinister and hazardous phenomenon of modern history.

Environment

The Ukrainian Background

And what is around? Around is a stage, with many players acting their part. However, there are only two of particular interest: the Ukrainian and the Western. Lamentably, by and large, both of them are playing the same part defined by corruption, malleability, inertia and inability to discern their own vision.

Let us consider the Ukrainian player. It is certainly possible to claim that only during Petro Poroshenko's tenure did the world start telling the truth about Russia. I did deliver that truth as early as the mid-2000s, but remained unheard and unbelieved. In fact, nobody was willing to hear, the reason being that all the so-called Ukrainian 'elite' was readily gaslighted by noshing on sweet gas – and not just that – from Russia. To make things worse, in the mid-1990s, even the slightest sign of blemishing Russia's reputation was prohibited in view of perceived 'strategic partnership'.

Tamed by Moscow, on the one hand, and faced with politically invertebrate state authorities unwilling to take real, and not perceived, measures against the apparent anti-Ukrainian conduct of Russia, on the other hand, our political class failed to see the obvious. Generally speaking, it was a replication of old traditions of allegiance, Little Russia identity and provincialism.

It is with regret that I note that the existence of our people at all stages, save perchance Kyiv Rus, and at all social strata has been marked by malleability. History inculcated into us a full-on survival mode to accommodate to any conditions and any masters. It certainly had a positive effect too: In spite of all historical vicissitudes, the Ukrainian nation persisted, survived and took its place among relatively few peoples able to stick up for their independence.

On the other hand, such malleability has distorted our national genotype and brought up an insouciant population not showing much concern for where its loyalties lie. That brings to mind Taras Shevchenko's enduring words: 'For a mess of pottage sold away his dear mother...'

Difficult though it may be to stop glorifying Ukrainians' struggle for independence in the 20th century, let us muster the courage and admit that among the political leadership of the Tsentralna Rada, the Hetmanate and the Ukrainian National Republic, there was only a handful of genuine parishioners of statecraft who had a vision of independent Ukraine, let alone the general public, which, as usual, did not care who drew blood and what for – so long as it didn't affect it.

Hence, the question: where is our nobility? Where is Ukrainian Versailles, Sans-Souci, Hermitage or Wawel? Where are the examples of selfless dedication to our very own Ukrainian state, which could translate into a struggle for its assertion and preservation as an international actor? Poland rose from the ashes each time when it was torn to pieces because its elite and people were aware of the value of independence. Against that background, the question 'How many times has the Ukrainian statehood revived in a thousand years?' seems to be anything but rhetorical.

Regrettably, for many generations of Ukrainians, statehood was not a value compared to doing well for themselves by serving noble houses.

Certainly, referring to it is not in any way intended to belittle or diminish the valour of many Ukrainians who have given their lives fighting for our freedom.

It is seemingly apparent that the revival of the long-awaited independence should have changed our 'elite'. Unfortunately, however, it has been heavily infected with the virus of irrelevance and inferiority. The more so that its representatives are, both collectively and individually, corruptly subjugated by Moscow.

It has, *inter alia*, brought about the sprawl of an already large over-conciliatory, over-yielding segment of the population (and not citizens, since the latter can and do think while the former live for bread and circuses), which has lived according to the 'it don't matter' formula when it comes to language, culture, history and religion – even after Russia started another war against us.

Fifty percent of Ukrainian population [*sic!*] takes a favourable view of Russia. The most lucrative transport routes of Ukrainian Railways are 'Kyiv – Moscow' and 'Lviv – Moscow' [*sic!*]. Nearly twenty percent vote for pro-Russian groveling sycophants and jesters. More than a half of Ukrainians would like the war to end on the enemy's terms, waving the white flag of surrender. Our population is totally disconcerted and even the war has not knocked some sense into us.

From my standpoint, such a situation is suggestive of the political failure of the previous government and, unfortunately, a new chance for Russia. Moscow continues to do whatever it wants – and we continue to condone its subversive acts.

Over the last three decades, Ukraine has been searching for its path, yet to no avail. The question is not where to go: commitment to the EU and NATO is enshrined. Rather, the question is with whom: with a rudderless population or with a confident nation with its own vision.

Ukrainian foreign policy (and 'Russian policy' as part thereof) will not succeed unless we are consolidated, united and self-reliant. It is only under such circumstances that our humiliating foreign policy fawning, which is especially shameful in relation to Russia, will vanish.

Is that possible? The answer is yes, but it will require a profound reset of the people's consciousness, the formation of a genuine Ukrainian elite instead of an army of venal 'patriots'. This, in its own right, requires the advent of truthful society benchmarks and quality parameters of societal development, which Ukrainians will be willing to defend.

Above all, we have to achieve the level at which society would be able to make sure, independently and quickly, that Russia is no role model and that it only replicates negative messages and threats for Ukraine. Still, it will become a persistent belief only when based on sincere intentions of authorities to work for the benefit of Ukraine and its citizens.

Thus, the 'Russian policy' of Ukraine shall, in my opinion:

– clearly and unambiguously recognise that equal relations with Russia are impossible due to the latter's traditional imperial essence. Russia's fundamental objective is to neutralize and destroy Ukraine as an undesirable positive ex-

ample of societal development for its own people. The threat of a successful Ukraine for the Kremlin regime is credible because, by their rationale, ‘we are one people’;

- minimize all existing economic relations with the aggressor state, which is only disorienting Ukrainian society. The ‘daytime war, nighttime trade’ formula is unacceptable. Ukraine has to put an end to all Russian business activities and capital, both overt and covert. Any economic dependence on Russia, let alone military and technical, has to be overcome as soon as possible. It will also help decrease corruption, unrestrictedly exported by Russia to Ukraine over nearly last three decades;

- formulate and implement Ukraine-centric humanitarian policies providing for an impenetrable wall for Russian ideological venom, on the one hand, and making national information, cultural and art production truly Ukrainian in letter and in spirit. It is also high time we started to systematically and convincingly tell our people the truth about Russia and form an appropriate attitude to it;

- urgently diminish and, in the near future, put an end to the influence of the Russian fifth column in Ukraine in all spheres of public life. This should include prompt and rigorous measures, whatever possible negative response of the West;

- develop and implement a program of ensuring support of Ukraine in each of its Western partners and of severing international sanctions against Russia. Containment and pressure policy in relation to Moscow should become one of the principal vectors of Ukraine’s foreign and “Russian” policy;

- ensure, in the short term, Ukraine’s unconditional admission to NATO, and, in the medium term, to the EU. Joining these alliances of democratic countries will serve as the sole assurance of the stable and independent development of Ukraine in the future.

The implementation of the aforementioned tasks will be possible provided only that the new government proves its transparency, responsibility and commitment to the principles of civilized public administration, and, most importantly, only when it proves in practice that it serves Ukrainian interests.

Communication Links with Russia: Sever or Maintain?

What is the defining characteristic for the other, Western actor, i. e. ‘Russian policy’ of the West? From my perspective, it is an attempt to straddle two worlds: to politically condemn Russia for violating international law, while at the same time continuing economic cooperation to make stable profits.

It is with regret that I state that the collective West is no longer unitary. Wedges have been driven both inside the EU and between the EU and the US. I do not intend to discuss why it is so and what role Russia played in it. Suffice it to say, the latter extensively capitalizes on the current situation.

Add to that the successful corruption policies of Moscow aimed at certain representatives of Western political elites and that will paint an unhappy picture of Western general inability to put up a spirited resistance to the Russian offensive.

The occupation of Crimea and the war in Donbas laid fertile ground for the West to awaken and change its perception of Moscow. Therein lies Putin's main miscalculation. He thought that, as in the case of the Russian aggression against Georgia in 2008, the West would readily bite the 'Ukrainian bullet' and promptly return to business as usual. This was not the case but Putin cannot yield as he has painted himself into a corner.

The result is a stalemate which, however, will need to be addressed at one point.

Nevertheless, the collective West has so far attempted, under various pretexts, to defer the unpleasant moment of decision-making for as long as possible in a move to simplify things. Inaction and the absence of political will to act in accordance with the principles on which it rests upon are disguised as the necessity to maintain a dialogue with Russia and reluctance to provoke it to further aggressive action.

A rational but small group of Western politicians seeing real threat posed by Russia so far cannot have a far-reaching effect on the agenda of West – Russia relations, although it constrains the drift of local slavish appeasers to ever softer policy with regard to Russia. Unfortunately, they failed to prevent the shameful and unprincipled decision to return Russia to PACE. What is behind it is not even money: re-apportionment of the Russian contribution would be fairly enough to address financial difficulties. Rather, the decision was motivated by an ingenuous belief that Russia could be changed and, therefore, that the communication link should be maintained.

On 27 July 2019, Russia replied with an unparalleled cruelty when dispersing a demonstration in Moscow in a move to suppress the right of the people to include all applicants in local polls.

Is the policy of outright appeasement a short-sighted political bromide or an apparent inability to assess the extent of the Russian menace? My take is that both factors are in force along with reluctance to think long-term and a substitution of national interests for corporate concerns of one's own businesses, which according to Thomas Dunning's catch expression, cited in Karl Marx's *Capital*, will not scruple any crime to achieve 300 percent profit.

I am not suggesting that Western business commits crimes. It is just that it has taught its politicians to overlook crimes of others when it is beneficial for it, the business. Yes, it is criminal offence. It is a moral misdeed and a derogation from 'high' principles, which they use to sermonize others.

The battle between morality and enrichment has become a core issue since the advent of money and private property. Much to our regret, morality is on

the back foot. Although the immorality of politicians eventually costs millions of innocent lives, money still have the upper hand. Today's situation is the same with the only difference: the scale of possible catastrophic repercussions of immoral political decisions is ever higher, making them potentially fatal for the whole of humankind.

It is certainly necessary to laud certain bona fide attempts at containing Russia, which is a right step. However, what comes first cannot be the last. The ability of the Russian population to endure severe belt-tightening while preserving the sense of 'greatness' renders appeasement policy in its current soft form largely unproductive. Adopting a passive stance cannot change Russia. It is the paradigm of action that must be altered without fear: Russia should be confronted with a tough choice. Only then can we expect changes in its behaviour.

In this context, we cannot but laud conclusions of Dutch diplomats and military who have explicitly stated that 'Russian thinking is fundamentally different from that of Europeans. Russians think in terms of 'spheres of influence', whereas Europeans think in terms of 'a right to self-determination', as well as fundamental rights and freedoms and these views are mutually exclusive. With this in mind, the possibility of convincing Russians looks highly unlikely' and '... it is important to understand that, although Russia is part of the European continent, Russians differ. Their mode of action stems from a fundamentally disparate sociocultural background...' While the conclusions are right, appropriate action is still pending.

Instead, according to a felicitous statement of Lilia Shevtsova, a renowned expert, the West '... fears lest Russia's aggressiveness should rise in case of its isolation, ... and is searching for a new formula of attitude towards Russia as a hostile subject it should be wary of and which should be contained (hence the strengthening of NATO) but not provoked'.

Regrettably, we can draw a conclusion that as of now the collective West is still not poised to resolute action. For the sake of sweet comfort and calm, it continues to turn a blind eye on Russia's crimes, thereby undermining, in particular, the foundations of its own security. This is an utterly hazardous and short-sighted policy.

How to Move Forward?

Many people both in the West and in Ukraine ingenuously believe that a change of government in the Kremlin will cause Russia to change for the better, not answering the question when and why so.

Let us reflect on it: no Russian ruler has left his position voluntarily. They were either compelled to abdicate by a force majeure, like Nickolay II, or reigned until their dying breath. The reason is clear: in Russia, power means everything: money, safety, respect, and in case of absolute power, the latter bestows upon its wielder a right of impunity.

Bearing in mind all the crimes committed both in Russia and beyond, can the current Kremlin regime relinquish its powers? The affirmative response can be given only by a *Putinversteh'er*, either desperately unwell from the West or dependent – from Ukraine. As Stanislav Belkovskiy rightly put it, ‘any authoritarian ruler faces a situation, in which he can neither go, nor stay’.

Still, let us assume the impossible: under some extraordinary circumstances, the transition of power in Russia takes place. But will it change anything in the situation with Russia? I would answer in the negative and try to explain why. Any authorities, including the Russian ones, are elected by people, either formally, as it is in Russia, or democratically, as it is in the West.

Who can be brought to power by the people with Soviet Union sentiments waxing nostalgic for the reign of Stalin? Only Putin, whatever the name, a strong-arm enforcer. The underlying problem of Russia is not some kind of putin, medvedev or surkov – rather, it lies in them, Russian society, its primal aggressiveness, immutable chauvinism and genetically enshrined slave mindset. According to Viktor Chernomyrdin, former Russian prime minister, ‘whatever party your establish in Russia, it always ends up looking like the Communist Party’. Put otherwise, whoever sweeps to power in Russia, it slides into totalitarianism.

The whole history of Russia is a glaring example. Even after the dissolution of the USSR, which shone as a beacon of hope for democracy, Russia succumbed to totalitarianism all over again. Some researchers, even among those from Russia, see signs of fascism in the country (see, for instance, Yurii Fedorov’s *Russia between Fascism and Disintegration*, Kyiv, 2017, p. 144).

That said, why should power transition bring about any drastic changes, except ‘Russian revolt, pointless and pitiless’?

Valerii Pekar, a faculty member of the Kyiv Mohyla Business School, had a good point in saying that Russia is a continental empire significantly different from those of the sea. The latter, similar to the British, can afford to ‘modernize on their own, keeping their colonies stuck in medieval times. On the contrary, a continental empire is forced both to impede modernization and especially make it inaccessible for its colonies’.

His conclusion sounds rather fatal: ‘Russia is a typical continental empire which is compelled to remain pre-modern in order to maintain control over its borders, as any attempt at modernization will result in collapse’.

The objective failure to modernize is reinforced by an utterly incomprehensible reluctance of the Moscow regime to introduce political changes of any kind whatsoever. As pertinently remarked by an American historian Timothy Snyder, ‘Russia... wants to stop the flow of time. It looks at the world and says: ok, the future does not exist. Everything we have at the moment, our present, is eternal. The current playing field in the state and society is eternal, Putin is eternal...’

Snyder refers to it as *the politics of eternity*, i. e. 'constant attempts at making political processes cyclical, while corrupting politicians and causing confusion in customary values of other cultures... Today, Russia leaves no stone unturned in trying to perpetuate the perception of its people that it is perfectly fine and normal when nothing changes.'

Is there any chance of survival in the modern world for a backward country subject to sanctions and not willing to change? For a country which presents a defiant challenge for the civilized world? My answer is decidedly negative.

But what further action should the civilized world undertake?

The concepts of a dialogue with Russia, engagement with Russia, or maintaining communication with Russia are completely played out; all shrewd politicians have long realized this. To hold onto them means to replicate the situation when the collapse of the USSR took the West by such surprise that its leaders could not believe how lucky they were and were feverishly trying to come up with an adequate response. At that time, they succeeded – Boris Yeltsin and Co. saw the West if not as an ally, then at least not as an enemy. Today, the situation is substantially different. The Kremlin thinks in terms of the departed USSR: the West is either a liege or an enemy. In his recent article, Andrii Piontkovskiy provides a riveting analysis of such adventurous thinking.

Given such circumstances, the approach to the future inevitable collapse of Russia should be shrewd, calm and level-headed. It is necessary that we prepare for it in advance.

To the ears of ordinary Western politicians, it may sound as an outright blasphemy – and not only to them. 'You can't speak about Russia that way. It could not possibly happen. Russia is a monolith!'

Your humble servant happened to hear something of that kind from many a 'resolute' politician in Europe and America. The reason is simple: over decades of massive propaganda, Russia was able to impose on the West the view that Russia is an impregnable fortress. The truth is it is far from being that and, in fact, has never been. It is just that *na avos*, or the cross-your-fingers principle often went off well and helped Moscow in the most dramatic moments.

The only power of today's Russia is its nuclear arsenal which it continues to employ for blackmailing the world. However, having triggered a new arms race by violating the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty, Russia sealed its fate: its backward economy will simply not endure it. Russia, either consciously or subconsciously, is following the footsteps of the USSR's last years.

Hence, for a shrewd, unbiased and uncorrupted politician in Ukraine or in the West who is also capable of thinking strategically, fostering Russia's agony should be out of the question. Rather, he should reflect on how to protect the

world from the ramifications of its inevitable collapse. It is for that reason that the latter should be controlled and each of its phases dealt with finesse.

Today it is difficult to foresee what the starting point of the collapse will be. The question is how fast can a so far insignificant but truly democratic opposition mobilize for acts of civil disobedience with such a turnout as to paralyze Moscow. Why is it important? Because everyone has long been aware that revolutions take place in the capitals.

Many an expert agrees that loss of control in Moscow will pave the way for the regime's demise and the potential collapse of the country. It is also the zero hour for *okrainy* (outskirts) in many of which the motto '*Stop Feeding Moscow!*' is quite popular. It was similarly popular shortly before the fall of the USSR. What follows will be a chain reaction of a loss of controllability in the field with the ensuing collapse of the entire system.

Moscow is well aware of that. That was the reason for the cruel and brutal action of police, which dispersed the rally in Moscow at the end of July and at the beginning of August. The Kremlin is trying to clamp down on any protest to prevent it from escalating into organized resistance against the regime.

Therefore, the people who outnumber security forces solely in physical terms will have the last word. Any police in any country in the world will not stand a chance against a 800,000 to 900,000-strong crowd. It certainly might take a chance to shoot. The results thereof, though incredibly gory, were thrown into bold relief during the 2014 Revolution of Dignity.

I believe that the only problem is that Russia does not have at hand enough people for whom dignity is dearer than slavery. For Moscow, a 20, 30 or 50,000-strong rally is a gift to the regime always painting a black picture of West-induced 'traitors, outlaws and public enemies' in its state-run media in the absence of any viable alternative.

Of necessity, therefore, there arises a need at least to strengthen monitoring and assessment of the processes occurring in the regime and around it, of the situation on the ground, but especially in Moscow. On that basis alone, it will be possible to accurately predict when a situation is heated to its boiling point. A lot more, of course, remains to be done.

It requires the political will of the Western policy-makers along with the necessity to explain to its business the fallacy of its trump card that Russia is a supposedly huge market for Western goods.

The latter point is highly dubious as these same goods in even greater numbers (compare the trade volume of the West with the USSR and post-Soviet countries) can be sold to the states, which will arise in the place of Russia, with the only difference that they will be non-nuclear and hence non-adversarial. Eventually, they will end up joining the club of democratic countries – if they make the right choice.

In the end, it is the West and the whole civilized world which will benefit most from such a course of events. This will allow us to bring finality to security threats in the northern hemisphere once and for all and begin the development of an efficient global security system based on NATO's new role due to the acute crisis of the UN.

Isn't it in accordance with the deep-seated interests of all civilized countries of the world?

Both Ukraine and the West should finally decide whether to remain captive to policies of the delusional Kremlin or work on their safe future.

It is time to make a choice until it is not too late.

The basic survival instinct has to prevail over the others, both natural and learned: animality, aggressiveness and avarice.

Then we will stand a chance of survival.

The Russian game is up when it is not given free rein...