

THE END OF COLD WAR. THE ROLE OF THE USSR

I.M. Uznarodov

Southern federal university. Rostov-on-Don, Russia
science-almanac@mail.ru

The article considers the end of the cold war and the role of the USSR in it. Attempts are being made to consider the final event of the process. It is analyzed political events such as the convening of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE), the meeting of the leaders of the United States and the Soviet Union in Malta in December 1989, negotiations on the reunification of Germany (1990), signed in 1990, the "Charter of Paris for a New Europe" in Paris. It notes the role of M.S. Gorbachev, its new policy on termination of confrontation of East and West. It is considered the political consequences of the Cold War for Russia and the West. It says about the losses suffered by Russia, trying to recreate the world, the obvious activation of the West in all regions of the world in order to promote and often impose their values there.

Key words: Cold War, confrontation, ideological confrontation, M.S. Gorbachev, superpower, the West, the Soviet Union.

XX century went down in history as the century of three world wars. November 2015 marks twenty-five years of the formal end of the Cold War – the signing of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe "Charter of Paris for a New Europe". However, the sharp deterioration in relations between Russia and the West in connection with the crisis in Ukraine has made topical again all that is connected with the end of the Cold War and its lessons. Not by chance more often heard the question today, and whether or not the Cold War ended, and did not take any wishful thinking?

In the early 1990s, after the collapse of the socialist system and the collapse of the Soviet Union in world historiography (including Russia) significantly increased attention to the history of the Cold War. It has proved to scientists new archival materials. There has been a departure from the old ideological schemes and patterns in the studies. Beginning of the creation "of a new history of the Cold War", the hallmarks of which were interdisciplinarity and internationalism [4]. The result of these changes has been a significant number of published both in Russia and in the West works devoted to subjects not previously studied the Cold War. In the 90s we increased the capacity of Russian historians to collaborate with colleagues from the USA and European countries. This cooperation is carried out on an individual basis and in the framework of international projects, primarily project to study the history of the Cold War at the Woodrow Wilson Center in Washington. Thus, work on the problems of Russian historians of the Cold War proceeded in an atmosphere of broad international cooperation. An important role in studying the problems of the Cold War, Russia has played formed in 1995 at the Institute of World History research team led by Director of the Institute Academician SA Chubaryan, which includes N.I. Egorov, M.M. Narinsky, A.M. Filitov, V.L. Malkov, I.V. Haiduk, M.L. Korobochkin, V.V. Pozdnyakov.

Russian scientists have essentially redefined the role of the Soviet and American diplomacy in the origins of the Cold War, we developed a more concrete understanding of the relationship between the Soviet domestic and foreign policy, the role of the military-industrial complex and new weapons programs, the importance of the appearance of nuclear weapons. The undoubted achievements should also include the study of the Stalinist period of the Cold War. Modern historical different balanced and diversified approach and the emergence of the Cold War, is increasingly seen as complex and contradictory process of interaction between the two systems, which have contributed to the two sides, although no specific ratio of these deposits is still a matter of debate [24; 2; 7; 4].

Despite the obvious achievements in the study of Russian historians of the Cold War, much remains to be done because they are lagging behind their western counterparts and the number of

fundamental works, and coverage problems and depth of analysis. Among the tasks that await explorers, and the problem should be called a serious analysis of the complex and multifaceted process that led to the end of the Cold War. This article attempts to examine the final event of this process, the role of the Soviet Union, as well as the political consequences of the Cold War.

After the Second World War, the balance of power has changed significantly in the international arena - to replace Eurocentric world came to a bipolar world. The United States, which did not conduct combat operations on its territory, escaped war damage and large loss of life is significantly ahead of other countries in the economically and militarily, and became a superpower and leader of the capitalist world. The second was the superpower Soviet Union made a decisive contribution to the defeat of Nazi Germany. Despite the enormous sacrifices and the destruction of the USSR by the end of the war he had a huge industrial and military potential. He controlled the countries of Central and Eastern Europe, and enjoyed the support of China - the country with the largest population in the world. He was supported by the Communists, left-wing people in different countries, who believed in a fair and brighter future. Both superpowers headed, respectively, the two worlds, two alternatives of social development, survived the war: social capitalism reformist and revolutionary socialism (communism). This is how the two main poles of attraction forces on the planet.

Global confrontation between the Soviet Union and led by the United States blocks the Cold War came to be called, as it was of an ideological nature. Moreover, during the Cold War, the spread of a certain lifestyle, worldview, establishing an appropriate regime - socialist or capitalist - backed up by military might rival superpowers and military-political blocs.

Ideological confrontation inevitably led to the ideologization of foreign policy and international relations, which in turn was followed by excessive suspiciousness, mistrust and hostility, propaganda and psychological impact on the population. As a result of the Cold War was not only the tensions and bitter rivalry between the two worlds, but also expressed a desire to bring the case to the complete victory of one of them. At the same time it should be noted that even during the Cold War confrontation between the two superpowers were not only the periods of exacerbation and periods of relaxation of tension. Which began at the turn of 60-70-ies the process of detente actively developed, and it culminated in the convening of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE). During his work in Helsinki on 1 August 1975, the heads of 33 European states, the United States and Canada signed the Final Act, which contained international legal recognition of political and territorial changes in Europe have occurred in the postwar period, and proclaimed support for the peaceful settlement of disputes and respect for fundamental rights and freedoms of citizens [5].

In the second half of the 80s, after the change of leadership in the USSR, it is time for new efforts to reduce tensions and improve the international political climate. MS Gorbachev spoke to the concept of "new thinking", the alleged "socialist pluralism" and "priority of human values over class." He examines the foreign policy not just as a way to break for reform in their own country, but also as a means to help these changes to fruition. He wanted to open the Soviet Union to the outside world and thereby overcome the Stalinist legacy, expressed primarily in opposition to Western countries. Soon the "new thinking" has become synonymous with a radical reassessment of the entire official ideology. Of course, Gorbachev had high hopes to reduce international tension, which could bring relief overvoltage budget - "peace dividend" by reducing military spending, of obtaining credits and the help of Western companies in the reconstruction of Soviet industry. When there were problems in economics and finance even the most orthodox members of the Politburo, it was clear that the international discharge, reduction in external liabilities and a reduction in defense spending is indispensable [6]. Indeed, the start of negotiations between the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States, a trend to radical changes in the system of international relations. Since 1987, the ideological, political and military confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union began to rapidly lose sharpness, and over the next two to three years, the confrontation is completely diminished.

It should be stressed that the decisive precondition for ending the Cold War was a change in the socio-political situation in the Soviet Union during perestroika. Professor at the London School of Economics and Political Science B. Zubok thoroughly documented in his book speaks directly about Westernism Gorbachev, who had not a grain of xenophobia or hostility to the West, of Western life and culture. A good example of Westerners last General Secretary of the CPSU could serve as the idea of "common European home", and commitment to European values formed the basis of his beliefs and actions of many. However, it is obvious that ardent pro-Western sentiment Gorbachev did not coincide with cautious pragmatism of most of its Western counterparts. According Zubok policy of the Americans and Western Europeans in relation to the Soviet Union was not based on some ideas, messianic plans, and personal integrity and on the geopolitical, economic and military interests of their states [6, chapter 10]. M.S. Gorbachev had used all the power at its disposal to carry out his plan. This secretary-general strongly supported most of the Soviet intelligentsia, who became a guide for the reinstatement of cooperation with the West as the leader of the intellectual and economic progress. The future of the country was attributed primarily to the cessation of confrontation in Europe, where Russia came in the culture, writing, science, etc.

The changes in the Soviet Union could not but affect its allies - the countries of Central and Eastern Europe, whose population before finding increased interest in its western neighbor. In the context of the deepening problems in the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance there grew pro-Western sentiments and expectations associated with the change of power. Since the end of World War II, the country is a top priority of Soviet foreign policy were the ideological, political and military allies. However, with the coming to power of Gorbachev's Soviet policy began to change, and in fact has led to the weakening of relations socialist states [27].

The Moscow leadership has proclaimed equal relations, respect for the sovereignty and independence of each country, mutual cooperation in all areas. The recognition of these principles meant both full responsibility for each party for the situation in his country. Now they had to rely on themselves and build their lives as they see fit. This policy is carried out in the years of perestroika, against the Eastern European States, called the "doctrine of Gorbachev's", which was considered the opposite of the so-called "Brezhnev doctrine". M.F. Polynov rightly notes that the Soviet leadership was unable to work out the right strategy towards its Eastern European allies. In addition, it is often worn at all destructive character not fulfill the objective interests of the Soviet Union. In fact, it came down to the loss of Soviet influence in the socialist countries, and then - to his withdrawal from the region [16].

In the fall of 1989 to Central and Eastern Europe was a wave of regime change, when for a few months longer exist pro-Soviet communist regime. Everywhere, except for Romania, the revolution took place peacefully, for which they called "velvet". Soviet troops stationed in Hungary, East Germany, Poland and Czechoslovakia did not participate in these events and were at their bases, which confirmed the presence of new approaches of the Moscow leadership to relations with allies. Taking advantage of their rights to determine their own destiny new authorities of East European countries held a radical reassessment of its political and economic interests. They put the question of the withdrawal of Soviet troops from their territories, condemned the Soviet intervention in their internal affairs in the past, rejected the claim on the Soviet political leadership, headed for the fastest possible integration of national economies into the world economy, particularly in Western Europe integration process. Thus began the liquidation of the Soviet bloc. 2-3 December of the same year, in Malta a meeting of leaders of the USSR and the USA. The content of the negotiations is still not enough is known, but after graduation, MS Gorbachev and US President George. W. Bush Sr. went to the journalists and said that the Cold War is over. Parties recognized the irreversibility of the changes began and although it is not reflected in official documents, this idea has received endorsement and support where appropriate. Later Gorbachev, Bush insisted that the main result of the meeting was the end of the Cold War, although this is not entirely true. However, negotiations in Malta led to an improvement in Soviet-American relations and a marked reduction in the level of confrontation in the Cold War. In addition, the leaders of the two superpowers began to coordinate their positions on key issues of world politics [28].

However, it is difficult not to notice that the weakening of confrontation largely was due compliance Soviet leader. A feature of the negotiations was that Gorbachev had promised a lot, and Bush nodded and agreed, but did not promise anything in turn. Western pressure on the Soviet Union began to decline, but this was not due to his peaceful attitude towards our country, and that the general course of events in the Soviet Union hosted the Western countries. After Malta meeting events unfolded more rapidly. Having received assurances from Gorbachev that the Soviet Union will not interfere in the affairs of the countries of Central and Eastern Europe, the elder Bush and his allies began to openly and secretly encouraged the opposition and anti-Soviet forces in the destruction of the socialist regimes in these countries.

The next milestone on the way to the end of the Cold War began talks on the reunification of Germany, which began shortly after the fall of the Berlin Wall. American and West German leaders were convinced that the Soviet Union would agree to leave East Germany. Both sides are aware that two of Germany is extremely important for both the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), and for the Warsaw Pact. And it has long been known that the power of a unified Germany, brings with it a dominant position in Europe. Interestingly, former Soviet ambassador to the United States AF Dobrynin later claimed that even in Malta, Gorbachev ignored the directive of the Politburo, according to which the unification of Germany was allowed only "when both units - NATO and the Warsaw Pact - will be disbanded or merged by mutual consent" [3].

Declassified documents - including transcripts of the US State Department - can imagine today, as it was negotiated. Representatives of the Bush administration and its allies have struggled to convince the Soviet leaders that order in Europe after the Cold War would be mutually acceptable, because the Soviet Union will retreat, and NATO will remain in place. And US Secretary of State George. Baker, and German Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher gave promise MS Gorbachev and EA Shevardnadze's jurisdiction and NATO forces will not move to the east after the unification of Germany. Moreover, Washington throughout 1990 confirmed that Moscow no one will be isolated, and that Washington would not completely dominate. To calm the fears of the Soviet side, Western leaders have put forward a number of initiatives. Among them was a promise to expand the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, to limit the military presence on the European continent, as well as to transform NATO, making it increasingly political organization. Soviet leaders such proposals seemed a boon, because, Shevardnadze said, "they sought to obtain certain guarantees of security against the backdrop of the events unfolding not only in Germany but also in Eastern Europe." So today, the leaders of Russia have every reason to believe that the United States and its allies have failed to fulfill their promises [29; 10]. Unfortunately, the negotiations have not concluded any written agreements on the future presence of NATO to the east, allowing some Western authors and diplomats denied breaking promises.

Negotiations on the reunification of Germany showed indecision Gorbachev. Chancellor Helmut Kohl in contrast to the constantly delayed Gorbachev acted quickly and decisively. With the support of Bush administration Kohl headed for the full integration of the East German state disintegrating. October 3, 1990 ended with the unification of Germany - in the GDR and the FRG entered West Berlin. This did not create a new state, and in the emerging "new lands" have enacted the constitution of Germany in 1949. Through coordinated action, which became, in the words of two young members of the Bush administration, "a model example of international diplomacy," the United States and Germany have reached the desired result: a united Germany became a part of NATO. At the same time the Soviet Union had not received any firm guarantees about the future of the European security system and about what role it would play in the Eastern Europe in general and Moscow in particular [6]. 19-21 November of the same year in Paris was the main event of the final phase of the Cold War - a meeting of heads of state and government - the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. The heads of the delegations signed "Charter of Paris for a New Europe," said the end of the era of confrontation and division of Europe, a new era of democracy, peace and unity, the era of prosperity through economic liberty and social justice, proclaimed equal security for all countries of the European continent on the basis of friendly relationships between them. "With the end of the division of Europe, - stated in the Charter, - we

will seek to give a new quality to our relations in the sphere of security, with full respect for each continuing freedom of choice in this area. Security is indivisible and the security of each participating State is inseparably linked to that of everyone else. Therefore, we commit ourselves to work together in strengthening confidence and security among us and in promoting arms control and disarmament" [15].

Then the leaders of 22 countries of the Warsaw Pact and NATO said in a joint declaration that in the new era, which opens in European relations, they are no longer adversaries, will build new partnerships and stretch each other the hand of friendship. They have been signed and the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE Treaty), the main aim of which was to establish secure balance in Europe by cutting the main weapons of conventional armed forces, t. E. Of battle tanks, armored vehicles, artillery systems, combat aircraft and attack helicopters. For each Party to establish maximum levels of Treaty and technology. Armaments and equipment in excess of these levels to be reduced. Thus, it is at the Paris meeting of the CSCE was line be drawn under the Cold War. It is also important to emphasize that while no one spoke about the victory. And no one had thought to consider the Soviet Union losing party.

Socio-political union in Central and Eastern Europe, which was called "socialist community" and for several decades is an important component of the bipolar system, completely disappeared from the international scene in 1991, on June 27 signed a protocol on the dissolution of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance, and 1 July - Protocol for the termination of the Warsaw Treaty Organization. Following this, the countries of Eastern Europe have accelerated the process of revising the bilateral political treaty with the Soviet Union and began to form a new system of its foreign policy priorities, which now involves the integration of the Council of Europe, the European Union and NATO. Although the Cold War ended in the interaction of two opposing blocs, the main contribution to its termination was made by the Soviet Union. It is hard to disagree with AI Utkin is what our country has gone to "enormous sacrifice of his steps" in order to break down the barriers that separate it from the West, as the leader of the world's technological and humanitarian progress. Between 1988 and 1993, the West has not heard from the Russian "no" on any significant issues of international life. The willingness of the new Russia to cooperate with the West became almost absolute. Whatever the explanation put forward no later than the Western world, according to Utkin, almost indisputable fact is that "the Russian elite has made its choice on their own (not) understanding, not some inexorable pressure of objective circumstances." There was a voluntary decision to almost all Russian society, from left to right, the idea of rapprochement with the West and its vanguard - the United States. This decision was based on a desire to "finish the work of Peter", to become part of the global avant-garde, to directly participate in the information technology revolution, raise living standards, to carry out planetary freedom of movement, to look beyond the horizons of post-industrial society [21].

The end of the Cold War gave rise to the illusion of the beginning of a new stage in history when there is an acute ideological conflict between the major powers, and the logic of the capitalist market economy principles will be adopted everywhere. The norms of international conduct, formulated by the Western democracies seemed irrefutable, and the prospects for cooperation in the distribution of the common good, and in addressing global and regional challenges greatly enhanced. Along with the dismantling of the Yalta-Potsdam system of the postwar, formation of the new world order. At the same time the end of the Cold War gave rise to a question about the results of such a hotly contested. Realities are as follows. There has been a redistribution of spheres of geopolitical influence. Russia has lost control over the countries of Central and South-Eastern Europe, and its troops left their territory. Russia retained nuclear missiles, but its defense power and economic potential of significantly weakened. This suggests that the price of ending the Cold War, our country was very high.

Unfortunately, the leaders of the United States and its allies have not been able to feel all the nuances of what happened, and behaved like real winners. When Reagan was asked about the greatest achievement of his presidency, he replied that won the Cold War. In the same vein, George. W. Bush, stressing that the "Soviet communism was not able to compete on an equal footing with

the system of free enterprise" [20]. A.M. Filitov drew attention to the fact that the thesis "The West won, lost the East" was initially widely represented in the pages of the Western press, and in most cases it was a "politicized rhetoric." Then joined and scientists are trying to use more serious arguments [22]. So there was an official interpretation of the outcome of the Cold War: that the Reagan-Bush policies led to the collapse of communism.

However, such an explanation the Cold War there were many opponents among politicians, scholars and experts, especially in America. According to A.I. Utkin, they all believed unproven conclusion that it is the actions of the US administration have pushed the Soviet Union to radical changes. It is not known how long it would take effort and resources to determine the winner if the Soviet leaders themselves did not sign the death sentence [20]. B. Zubok also confirms this conclusion. "Most serious historians and political scientists - wrote a scientist - noted that the Soviet superpower, died from internal crisis, as a result of acts or omissions of its own management, under the influence of revolutionary ideas, events and circumstances" [6].

The latest evidence of this approach was the book Harvard scientist of Ukrainian origin "The Last Empire: The final days of the Soviet Union", released in 2014. The author was able to find new and interesting materials in the archives of Kiev, Moscow and the United States, which suggests a much more complicated and not fully understood history. He cites new data showing that in 1991 B.N. Yeltsin wanted to create a "Slavic" union of Russia and Ukraine, separate from the rest of the Soviet Union. However, it claims independence for Ukraine and its refusal to stay in any union led to the collapse of the USSR. Ukraine's modern history might have been different if at the moment L.M. Kravchuk lost to Russian pressure.

Highly detailed and thorough discussion among the Russian scientists on the issue discussed in the monograph TA Shaklein [26]. Recognizing reached the West an advantage in economic competition with the Soviet Union, it stresses that the disappearance of the Soviet Union still was not so much a victory of the West as a result of internal causes and the struggle for power of political elites. Author of the study indicates fair judgments SV Kortunova and SE Kurginyan that there are three types of disaster. First, the exhaustion of the disaster, in which the potential of a civilized community, developed, and in this connection there is a civilizational fate - death of civilization; secondly, disaster shift in which the mechanisms of influence of society on elite and mechanisms nomination of its controlling minority become ineffective; Third, disaster inversion at which the regeneration of control systems and their integration into new ciphers and codes, while maintaining national identity. Catastrophe collapse of the USSR - it's a disaster and shift to some extent - the inversion, but not a disaster exhaustion. T.A. Shakleina notes that, despite the differences in the estimates of the outcome of the cold war and the causes of the Soviet collapse, most Russian scientists paid attention to the fact of voluntary activities in the USSR within and without. It is our country in the late 1980s, unilaterally ended the Cold War with the West.

Renowned American historian S. Cohen, more than twenty years writing about erroneous Washington's policy toward post-Soviet Russia, once again spoke about it last year in an article published in the weekly magazine "The Nation". He stressed that since the beginning of the 90s of the last century, all American presidents, as well as the US Congress handled the new Russia as a defeated country. Such an attitude on the principle of "winner takes all" has found its reflection in the main NATO expansion, which was accompanied by a lack of reciprocity in the negotiations and plans to establish a comprehensive missile defense system. According to Cohen, NATO invaded the traditional areas of national security of Russia, but she excluded her from the European security system. This meant that the United States could expand its sphere of influence as they please, until the Russian border, and Russia did not have the right to preserve his or her sphere of influence at all [31]. Very uncharacteristic for the American political establishment view expressed April 5, 2015 in an interview to CNN former Secretary of State George. Baker, head of the Foreign Ministry from 1989 to 1992. Regretting the intensification of relations between Washington and Moscow, he drew attention to the fact that the United States has been able to avoid such developments. According to him, after the Cold War and the collapse of the Soviet Union should come up with a way that would enable Russia to join NATO is both a political organization, and the alliance's security. Behave with

Russia had just as Germany and Japan after World War II, ie give her a chance to be part of the international community, to include in the team. "However, this did not happen" - complained Baker. [19].

After the Cold War became apparent intensification of the West in all regions of the world in order to promote and often impose their values there. Rather than creating new institutions, reflecting the changes have been made a different choice, namely the transformation of international structures that existed within the Western bloc winning in the universal. The disappearance of the Soviet Union transformed the US into a single superpower, which gave rise in the minds of American leaders illusions about the transformation of America into a recognized world leader and the possibility of building a unipolar world order led by the United States. It seemed true words of Truman entrusted to the American people the burden of responsibility for the future leadership of the world [12].

Soon after taking office in January 1993, one of the main goals of his administration President Bill Clinton called the US to ensure its leading position on the world stage. This course has received confirmation in the "Clinton Doctrine", according to which the United States is the leader of the free world in the defense of freedom and democracy, taking on global responsibility for security in the world [26]. The disappearance of the bipolar world has given rise to first rainbow perception of prospects for the development of the world community. But the reality was different. On the surface out problems and conflicts, previously masked tension of the Cold War. In the 90s the rigidity of the international structures of the previous decades has been replaced by their mobility, it gave way to the certainty of uncertainty. The boundaries between the regions and communities have become more transparent, and international relations allow a plurality of choices. Most countries may take foreign policy decisions on the basis of their real national interests, rather than being guided by their belonging to a particular block. Thus, the Cold War really over twenty-five years ago. This is confirmed by the dismantling of the Eastern Bloc and the end of a global ideological confrontation. Although the end of the Cold War - the result of the interaction of both parties, a crucial role is played by the change in leadership in the USSR, and the new policy MS Gorbachev. If not for that, it is not known how long it would continue to Cold War.

Important for the end of the Cold War had a meeting of the leaders of the United States and the Soviet Union in Malta in December 1989, when it was agreed in principle on the termination of the confrontation of East and West. But the end of confrontation documents issued in November 1990 signing of the "Charter of Paris for a New Europe." Then no one spoke about the victory in the Cold War and the defeat of the Soviet Union. Termination of the Soviet Union was not directly related to the struggle of East and West, and was primarily the result of internal developments and the struggle for power between different groups of the party elite. Russia has paid too high a price for ending the Cold War, and the United States learned from this maximum benefit, creating the myth of the victory over the Soviet Union. Western policy towards post-Soviet Russia not only did not reflect the real contribution of the parties to the end of the Cold War, but also showed the attitude to Russia as a defeated country.

References

1. Bystrov I.V. Modern historical // New Cold War History Bulletin. 2004. № 10. Scientific Library KiberLeninka: <http://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/sovremennaya-otechestvennaya-istoriografiya-holodnoy-voyny#ixzz3Tcg3JJZO>;
2. Haiduk I.V. On the issue of creating a "new history" of the Cold War // Stalin decade of the Cold War: facts and hypotheses. M., 1999.
3. Dobrynin A.F. Strictly confidential. The ambassador in Washington with six US presidents (1962-1986 gg.). M., 1996.
4. Egorov N.I. "New History" cold war in modern foreign investigations // Modern and Contemporary History. 2009. № 4.
5. Zagorski A. Helsinki process. M., 2005.

6. Zubok B. Failed Empire: The Soviet Union in the Cold War from Stalin to Gorbachev. M., 2011.
7. Zubok V.M., Domestic historiography of the "cold war": total some decades // National History. 2003. №4.
8. "InoSmi.ru." [Electronic resource]. URL: <http://inosmi.ru/russia/20140705/221461285.html#ixzz36cjwHxI3>
9. "InoSmi.ru." [Electronic resource]. URL: <http://inosmi.ru/world/20140910/222889704.html>
10. "InoSmi.ru" [electronic resource]. URL: <http://inosmi.ru/world/20141002/223391386.html#ixzz3F1Cg1svd>
11. Information portal BBC [electronic resource]. URL: http://www.bbc.co.uk/russian/russia/2015/03/150327_putins_germany_shock
12. History of the United States. 4. T. M. : Science, 1987.
13. Kosov A.P. Russian historiography of the US role in the outbreak of the "cold war." // Belarusian Journal of International Law and International Relations. 2004. № 3.
14. "Round Table" in the IVI RAN: The phenomenon of "cold war" in the international relations of the XX century: results and perspectives // Modern and Contemporary History. 2006. № 6.
15. Charter of Paris for a New Europe // Website of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe [electronic resource]. URL: <http://www.osce.org/ru/mc/39520>
16. Polynov M.F. "Gorbachev doctrine" and care of the Soviet Union in Eastern Europe // The recent history of Russia. 2011. № 2.
17. Polynov M.F. Closed meeting with big consequences. Negotiations M.S. Gorbachev and George. W. Bush in Malta in 1989 // Society. Wednesday. Development (Terra Humana). 2011. № 3.
18. "Radio Liberty" [Electronic resource]. URL: <http://www.svoboda.org/content/article/26764365.html>
19. "Rossiyskaya Gazeta" [Electronic resource]. URL: <http://www.rg.ru/2015/04/06/nato-site.html>
20. Utkin A.I. The West and Russia: the history of civilizations. M., 2000.
21. Utkin A.I. Cold War world. M., 2005.
22. Filitov A.M. "Cold War": historiographical debates in the West. M., 1991.
23. Chernyaev A.S. Six years with Gorbachev. According to diary entries. M., 1993.
24. Chubarian S.A. A New History of the "cold war" // Modern and Contemporary History. 1997. № 6.
25. Shakleina T.A. "Clinton Doctrine" and the future of American foreign policy // USA. Economics, politics, ideology. 1997. № 10.
26. Shakleina T.A. Russia and the US in the new world order. Discussions in the political and academic communities of Russia and the United States (1991-2002). M., 2002.
27. Shakhnazarov A.A. The price of freedom. Reformation Gorbachev eyes of his assistant. M., 1993.
28. Yakovlev A.N. Twilight. M., 2005.
29. «Foreign Affairs» [electronic resource]. URL: <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/142310/joshua-r-itzkowitz-shiffrinson/put-it-in-writing>;
30. Ploky S. The Last Empire. The final days of the Soviet Union. L. : Oneworld Publications, 2014. 512 p. ; Site Spectator [electronic resource]. URL: <http://www.spectator.co.uk/books/books-feature/9257561/the-last-empire-by-serhii-ploky-review/>
31. «The Nation» [electronic resource]. URL: <http://www.thenation.com/article/179119/cold-war-again-whos-responsible>

January, 30, 2015
