ROLE OF RUSSIA IN NEW INTERNATIONAL WORLD ORDER
IN POST COLD WAR ERA

Polarity in International Relations refers to the arrangement of power within the international system. The concept arose from bipolarity during the Cold War, with the international system dominated by the conflict between two superpowers and has been applied retrospectively by theorists. However, the term bipolar was notably used by Stalin who said he saw the international system as a bipolar one with two opposing powerbases and ideologies. Consequently, the international system prior to 1945 can be described as multi-polar, with power being shared among Great powers. The collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991 had led to what some would call unipolarity, with the United States as a sole superpower.

World Order is Multipolar/Unipolar-views

After the fall of the Soviet Union, bringing an end to the Cold War, a New World Order began to form, the birth pangs of which were felt in the Middle East. This New World Order of creating a new global structure, of a more integrated global society, still has many conflicts arising out of it. After World War 1, the League of Nations was created in the hopes of securing a more integrated global community, which ultimately failed with the start of World War 2, after which the United Nations was created to serve the same purpose. Out of each world war, we see the move to create a more global society. Now, after the Cold War ended, we have a new conflict arising between the West and the East. This new conflict is about gaining supremacy in the New World Order, as many great powers seek to sway the balance away from a US-dominated New World Order, and towards a Russian or Chinese New World Order.

The post-Cold War world was sometimes considered as a Unipolar world with the United States as the world's sole remaining superpower but within the 21st century some analyst believe Russia has risen back to superpower status. In the words of Samuel P. Huntington, "The United States, of course, is the sole state with preeminence in every domain of power economic, military,
diplomatic, ideological, technological, and cultural with the reach and capabilities to promote its interests in virtually every part of the world."

Experts argue that this older assessment of global politics was too simplified, in part because of the difficulty in classifying the European Union at its current stage of development. Others argue that the notion of a superpower is outdated, considering complex global economic interdependencies, and propose that the world is multipolar. According to Samuel P. Huntington, "There is now only one superpower. But that does not mean that the world is unipolar. A unipolar system would have one superpower, no significant major powers, and many minor powers." Huntington thinks, "Contemporary international politics" ... "is instead a strange hybrid, a uni-multipolar system with one superpower and several major powers."5

Additionally, there has been some recent speculation that the United States is declining in relative power as the rest of the world rises to match its levels of economic and technological development. Citing economic hardships, Cold War allies becoming less dependent on the United States, a declining dollar, and the rise of other great powers around the world, some experts have suggested the possibility of the United States losing its superpower status in the distant future or even at the present.6 According to BBC news reporter John Simpson the Iraq War has negatively affected the superpower status of the United States and has weakened its worldwide standing.7

Defense Minister Sergei Ivanov revealed his perception that Russia was a dominant power in Eurasia at a 2004 Washington press conference. Even liberalist Anatolii Chubais, who was the architect of shock therapy during the Russian market reform, came up with the idea of a “liberal empire in Eurasia.”8

US-Russian relations are often described as a “Cold Peace” or “renewed Cold War.” It is evident that a close relationship similar to the one between the United States and the United Kingdom will not be realized in the near future. Russia will be neither an ally nor an enemy of the United States.9 In the contemporary international environment, Russia can stand against the United
States without fear of becoming involved in a war because today’s international order is based on a spirit of peaceful cooperation.

Russia’s first foreign minister (1990–96), Andrei Kozyrev, had also talked of Russia as a ‘normal great power’ and insisted that Russia would achieve its interests ‘not through confrontation but through cooperation’. Kozyrev stressed the distinction between ‘the normalization of relations with other countries and normal relations with them’, noting that while Gorbachev had begun the first task it was up to Russia to complete the second. A decade later Putin was still talking in precisely these terms, and even as he left the presidency Russia’s relations with the developed world were far from normal. Russia’s view of itself as a great power means that it considers itself to be in a very different category from all other European post-communist states, and hence refuses to accept the tutelary role of western institutions that in one way or another have imposed conditionality processes on its neighbours.

The debate over the onset of a new Cold War raises fundamental issues that we ignore at our peril. The attacks on America in September 2001 and the ensuing ‘war on terror’, accompanied by a broader disruption in world affairs, has distracted attention from perhaps the most important problem of our era: integrating Russia, China and other rising powers into an expanded global consensus. The end of the Cold War has been repeatedly announced, yet the beast stubbornly lives on. nearly, two decades after the fall of communism we have once again entered a period of self-reinforcing suspicion and distrust between the major nuclear powers. This does not necessarily mean that the world will enter a period of sustained and institutionalized rivalry between two powers that act as magnetic poles in global affairs. The conditions for a replay of the old Cold War in its classic form are simply not present. Russia and America do not lead rival ideological projects on a global scale; although disagreements over such issues as the appropriate role of multilateral mechanisms do exist, they exist also between NATO allies. Nor are there sustained and entrenched policy differences over such issues as nuclear proliferation, global warming or any number of other fundamental issues facing the world. Russia is just one among a number of
potential great powers, and therefore old-fashioned bipolarism is a thing of the past and Russian–American relations are no longer the axis on which world politics turns. Even the issue that has much exercised the policy community in Washington, Russia’s alleged ‘democratic backsliding’, is a matter of interpretation, and in any case new leaderships in both countries may provide an opportunity for the regime question to become less sharp.\textsuperscript{15} The term ‘Cold War’, therefore, is a contemporary international relations metaphor for a fundamentally strained relationship that cannot be resolved within the framework of the world views of either party but requires a rethinking of both.

Russian foreign policy in the Putin era was characterized by conformity to the realities of power relations in the international system coupled with a redefinition of what constitutes Russia’s national interests. A type of constrained adaptation to the international system emerged in which the strategic direction was clear—integration without accession but the pace and forms of integration would remain at Russia’s discretion. Russia under Putin sought to enter the core of the international system, and to do so on its own terms and thus to redefine the hegemonic structure of the core states. In trying both to join and remain autonomous, Russia’s policy was fundamentally ambiguous, if not contradictory. There is no precedent for a dual core to a hegemonic system. Instead, new forms of polarity began to emerge. The idea of Russia establishing itself as a ‘new West’, unable to integrate into the existing core but not setting itself up as an alternative, captures some of the dilemmas facing the country.\textsuperscript{16} The new realism promoted constrained adaptation, a policy of autonomy without alternatively. Domestic reconstruction became the priority, but external ambitions in Eurasia and the world were not abandoned. At the same time, the West lacks a convincing paradigm within which to understand Russia’s concerns, leading to major political, strategic, intellectual and cultural failures. It is still not clear what a ‘normal’ relationship between Russia and the West would look like. Encountering hostility to its claims to autonomy, Russia once again began to espouse the claims of alter nativity. The outlines of a very peculiar new Cold War are in the making,
but even this constrained conflict may be preferable to the global failure that attended the twenty years’ crisis.

The New New World Order

The world has finally entered the real post-Cold War era. With Russia’s military intervention in Georgia, we are embarking on a new era in international relations. This will be neither a return to the Cold War (as various US spokespersons appear to want the world to believe), nor a return to classic 19th-century balance of power politics (as some Russians might hope). By demonstrating that Moscow, too, has “red lines”, the Georgian conflict has exploded the myth of the unipolar world.

What we are seeing is the emergence of an unprecedented form of multipolarity as already mentioned in which the international scene will be structured by an ever smaller number of ever larger units. Some will be classic nation states such as China and India; others will be regional regimes such as the European Union, the African Union and ASEAN. But the agenda will be dominated by economics, trade, development, resources, and the environment. War between any of the major actors is scarcely an option. Complex multilateralism is the new name of the game.

We have already seen two versions of the “new world order” since 1989. Both were rendered artificial by the aberrant and unexpected implosion of the Soviet Union and the protracted re-emergence of Russia as a serious actor. Both versions featured twin illusions. The first, typified by the Clinton years, showcased the illusion of liberalism and the illusion of interventionism. The second, typified by the Bush years, projected the illusion of democracy-promotion and the illusion of pre-emption. These two artificial versions of the post-Cold War order were facilitated by the relative absence from the scene of Russia.

Russia is now back and the world will have to adjust. New balances will have to be struck, not just between “the West” and Russia, but equally importantly between Russia and the powers comprising her vast neighborhood. Russia’s overt desire to re-establish hegemonic control over its “near abroad” – including strategic oil reserves – will require, not only of the EU and the US, but
also of the other poles, sensitive and creative diplomatic engagement. Talk of “punishing” Moscow is as irrelevant as it is unhelpful. What is required is careful thought as to how the world, through a new and complex form of multilateralism, can bargain its way towards a more balanced and secure global future. The West and Russia need to cooperate in three major strategic areas: counter-proliferation; counter-terrorism; and energy security. Military confrontation between Russia and “the West” is unthinkable. War between the major emerging poles is on the way out, not on the way back. None would stand to gain anything by military conflict. Alas, this does not mean that small powers in the geographical proximity of one or other of the poles will be able to behave recklessly.17

So even if the US continues to be at the centre-stage in the unipolar world, it sits uneasily in practically every region of the world. How long will the US sustain this role for the world (this is not band-wagoning, as much as earlier)? There is no denying the fact that in strategic terms an alternative to it has not emerged, but it presides uneasily despite Hillary’s platter. Its current cuisines are Indo-Chinese, Russo-Chinese, Russo-German, Indo-Pakistan, Iran-Turkish, US-Israeli, Israeli- Gaza-Turkish-Iranian, Russo-Ukranian-German, Indo-Afghan-Pak, Chinese-Korean-US. Delicious, savoury but difficult to take. Even if one knows about Obama’s Indian flutter, will the metaphor of world slide, that the African slide back into darkness represents, vanish? That will pose a challenge in future apart from the ones one can see on the basis of the elite conflicts in world capitals. This is still not a multipolar world.18

In words of Sergei Lavrov Russian Foreign Minister to The Times of India, “A unipolar world has not been and cannot be created, because the available military, political, financial, economic and other resources are not sufficient to build an empire in today’s conditions of globalisation. For some time, though, the myth of a unipolar world influenced the mentality and behaviour in quite a few countries, which believed the myth and invested political capital in it. But the practice of the past six years has demonstrated convincingly that attempts to disregard the reality of a multipolar world invariably fail. The present paradigm of international relations is based on competition in the broad meaning of the
word. But competition is not synonymous with confrontation. Russia is opposed to attempts to split the planet. This is why the top issue now is to overcome the intellectual, psychological and all other residues of the Cold War. Russia will not tolerate attempts to put it at loggerheads with the Islamic world. The choice of Russia and other leading countries, including those that constitute a single civilization such as India and China, in favour of a unifying policy will become the main factor working against the division of the world. We see good opportunities for a positive evolution of Russian-American relations in joint work on the implementation of the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism, the initiatives of our Presidents on the safe development of the global nuclear power industry, and on allowing all countries wishing to make use of the benefits of nuclear generation to access those technologies on the condition that they comply with their non-proliferation commitments. One more proof of our ability to make compromises is the signing of a bilateral Russian-American protocol on Russia’s accession to the World Trade Organisation. Confrontation is avoidable in our relations with the US, which means that there cannot be a new Cold War because there are no objective prerequisites for it. Anti-Americanism is dangerous and intellectually deficient. At the same time, we should address the origins of the problem, that is, the current actions of the US in international affairs. However, the fact that the US Administration is following the lead of neo-conservatives should not influence our fundamental attitude towards the US.

The deployment of an American anti-ballistic-missile system in Europe is not acceptable to Russia and is affecting its relations with NATO. Why should we cooperate with it if the bloc is turning from a collective security organisation into a screen for unilateral measures that compromise Russian security? We are also concerned that the structures and instruments we have inherited from the past, such as NATO, the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe, and the Conventional Forces in Europe Treaty, are becoming mechanisms for reproducing bloc policy in current conditions and are being used against Russia. I am convinced that this situation will not last long. A failure to complete the reform of
the European security architecture could cause people to lose touch with reality and provoke a real split in Europe that will last decades.\textsuperscript{19}

**China-Russia Joint Statement on 21st Century World Order**

Chinese President Hu Jintao and Russian President Putin signed the Joint Statement of the People's Republic of China and the Russian Federation Regarding the International Order of the 21st Century in Moscow on 1 July, 2005. The two sides call on countries in the world to engage in extensive dialogue on the issue of the international order of the 21st century. To a great extent, the future of the world, the progress of mankind, and the ability to deal with challenges and threats depend on the outcome of this dialogue.\textsuperscript{20} Annexure-V.

**Russia’s New Foreign Policy Doctrine**

Russia’s Monroe Doctrine or in other words the new Foreign Policy Doctrine of Russia articulated by President Medvedev is a lengthy document whose full contents can be viewed on Russian Government's official websites. The five major thrusts of Russia’s new Foreign Policy Doctrine are being touched which are as follows:

- “Firstly, Russia recognizes the primacy of fundamental principles of international law, which define the relations between civilized nations. We will build our relations with other countries within the framework of these principles and the concept of international law.”

- “Secondly, the world should be multipolar. A single pole is unacceptable. Domination is something we can’t allow. We cannot accept a world order in which one country makes all the decisions, even as serious and influential country as the United States of America. Such a world is unstable and threatened with conflict.”

- “Thirdly, Russia does not want confrontation with any country. Russia has no intention of isolating itself. We will develop friendly relations with Europe, the United States of America and other countries as much as possible.”
• “Fourthly, protecting the lives and dignity of our citizens, wherever they may be is an unquestionable priority for our country. Our foreign policy decisions will be based on this need. We will also protect the interests of our business community abroad. It should be clear to all that we will respond to any aggressive acts committed against us.

• “Fifthly, as is the case with other countries, there are regions in which Russia has “privileged interests”. These regions home to countries with which we share special historical relations and are bound together as friends and good neighbours. We will pay particular attention to our work in these regions and build friendly ties with these countries, our close neighbours.

By analyzing these it reveals that Russia wants to send out to the international community in declaratory terms and in particular to the United States, the West and the countries on its perimeter specifically can be said to be as follows:

• Russia is no longer willing to accept the unipolar strategic dominance of the global power system by the United States. Russia sees a pronounced role for itself in the global power system.

• Russia is looking for a multipolar global power configuration to offset American strategic dominance.

• Russia favors an international order which operates within the framework of international institutions like the United Nations and international laws and conventions. The emphasis on “international law, which defines the relations between civilized nations” needs to be noted. It is an oblique reference to the United States.

• When it is said that Russia has no intention of isolating itself internationally, it really implies that Russia will play a pro-active role in international affairs.

• The fourth and fifth points made by President Medvedev are in essence the enunciation of Russia’s Monroe Doctrine.
The fourth point in the Russian Doctrine is seen to be picked from US national strategy doctrines. In essence it means that Russia will not hesitate to intervene even militarily should an eventuality arise where security of Russian citizens abroad or even business interests are involved? This has implications for the former Republics of the Soviet Union in which reside sizeable Russian minorities. In these former Republics lie substantial Russian business interests in the form of oil and gas resources. This has to be read as a notice for military interventions.

The last point is again a declaration of the Russian Monroe Doctrine claiming “privileged interest” in a number of regions. In immediate terms this can be construed that Russia has “privileged interests” in all former Russian Republics in Central Asia and on its Western peripheries like the Baltics, with some of them now in the fold of the United States and NATO.

The Russian Monroe Doctrine has far reaching strategic implications both at the global level and the regional level. It must therefore be seriously noted by the international community to avoid the possibilities of a second Cold War gaining momentum. For the United States and the West, the Cold War never ended. If it had then NATO would have gone extinct like its counterpart the Warsaw Pact. In fact the eastward creep of NATO along with the externally inspired “colour revolutions” on Russia’s periphery has prompted Russia’s ripostes including this new Doctrine to pre-empt further strategic neutralization of Russia’s power attributes and limiting her sphere of influence. The global implications of Russia’s Monroe Doctrine have to be viewed in this light and the patterns of the earlier Cold War would necessarily get repeated once again.

**The global implications** of Russia’s Monroe Doctrine can therefore be summarized as under:

- Russia-United States relations once again would enter a strategically competitive if not confrontational state.
- Russia and the United States consequently would harbor heightened threat perceptions of each other. Strategic mistrust would prevail.
• Russia and the United States would not enter into a direct armed conflict. Their strategic rivalries and tussles would be executed through “proxies” in strategic regions of the world.

• Russia is likely to indulge in a rapid military rearmament build-up to lessen its differentials in military balance with the United States.

• The NATO military alliance enlargement will prompt the enlargement of SCO and the Russian CSTO.

• Russia would attempt “forward military presence” deployments in regions strategically sensitive to the United States.

All in all, at the global level, the revived Cold war would generate turbulence and instability in the Middle East, East Asia and even Eastern Europe as Russia strategically challenges the United States.

The global implications of the Russian Monroe Doctrine, besides the above manifestations in Russia-US bilateral equation has also to be viewed at three other levels globally in terms of strategic impact, political impact and economic impact. The global strategic impact of the Russian Monroe Doctrine would weigh heavily on United States global image of unquestioned leadership. The United States today is in a state of “imperial overstretch” and its options to effectively deal with Russia’s revived challenge are limited. Today Russia can generate more strategic irritants globally for the United States than America can do so in response. Politically, the global impact of the Russian Monroe Doctrine can be expected to weigh heavily on the Atlantic Alliance and the new found American allies in Eastern Europe. Political ties could loosen and alliance unity frayed when country-specific challenges are posed by Russia’s resurgence to US allies. Russia today enjoys significant economic leverages in the energy sector which it can employ decisively to modulate comprehensively the policies of US allies both in Europe and the Asia Pacific. Besides in the ensuing strategic confrontation that may ensue, even with drop in oil prices, Russia would not be constrained in use of its economic leverages resting on the energy sector nor would its strategic armament plans be restricted.
American efforts to bypass Russian territory by new pipeline alignments going through Georgia etc has prompted Russia to accelerate its pipeline grid to China and Japan, both nations having pumped in billions of dollars to garner Russian oil and gas supplies. Europe has no options in this regard and hence a direct under-sea pipeline from Russia to Germany is under construction. Russia has therefore more options in the energy sector than the United States can block.

Regionally, the major impact of the Russian Monroe Doctrine will be on the Atlantic Alliance. Europe’s major nations like Germany and France do not share American perspectives of Russia. Historically, it needs to be remembered that Russia was a very much European country, much before the United States emergence as a nation. Europe today needs Russia in more ways than one and both sides are conscious of this strategic reality. Russia’s new Monroe Doctrine and “privileged interest” in the former Soviet Republics to begin with would facilitate Russia once again weighing heavily on the regions of Central Asia, the Northern Tier of the Middle East and on Russia’s western peripheries. Russia’s next steps in enlarging her sphere of influence could extend to countries as far as Cuba, Venezuela and re-establishing Russian presence in Cam Ranh in Vietnam.

**Russia’s Military Preparedness: Major War Scenarios Exercises and Defence Doctrines**

It seems that Russia has started flexing its military muscles and making its military image globally visible in keeping with her global strategic ambitions. Russia held her first major military war exercise in the last 20 years on the borders near Kazakhstan. The exercise named Ex. MOBILITY 2008 was attended by President Medvedev and other Russian dignitaries. The notable feature of this Ex MOBILITY 2008 was the military scenario that was given as the background. The scenario was of a Local Conflict in Russia’s vicinity escalating into an all out war with land, sea and air dimensions between Russia and the West. The ultimate scenario was a global nuclear conflict between Russia and the United States.
President Medvedev referring to events in George observed that: “We have seen that an absolutely real war can erupt suddenly, and simmering local conflicts which are sometimes even called “frozen” can turn into a real military firestorm”. The fact that needs to be registered by the international community is that Russia is very serious about her intent to emerge as a superpower once again. It is even further preparing itself for a global conflict, sensing that such an eventuality could well might be possible. Needless to mention President Medvedev spelt out a new Defence Doctrine incorporating five major priorities for the Russian military, namely Russian combat formations and units to achieve “permanent readiness state” by 2020 by massive reorganization, reequipping and redeployment; Russia’s Command and Control Systems to be modernized; Modernization and upgradation of Russian military hardware; Military doctrines and training to be given high priority; Pay and allowance of Russian armed forces to be enhanced. In this way Russia seems to have embarked in real earnest on a significant upgradatation of her military capabilities which stood neglected for nearly a decade or so. One can now expect that with this sort of drive and lessons learnt from its Georgia military intervention, the Russian Armed Forces to be more combat ready and combat effective. The emphasis will be on military intervention missions in Russia's spheres of influence, global force projection and readiness for even a nuclear conflict. It needs to be remembered that Russia's strategic nuclear assets outnumber those of USA.

**China and India in Russia’s Foreign Policy Doctrine**

The new foreign policy document heavily emphasizes the following in relation to China and India:

- China and India are considered as of “strategic” value for Russia’s foreign policy. It is the first time the aspect stands so stressed.
- China and India are viewed as top priorities for Russia’s Asian policies and global policies too.

It is but natural that Russia accords top priority in its foreign policy to China and India. China and India are emerging as leading global powers, and
would provide the other “poles” of the multipolar world envisaged by Russia. Russia has a singular advantage in this direction in that it has a virtual strategic alliance with China which can be reinforced. With India, Russia enjoys a time-tested strategic partnership on which Russia can build further. More importantly between Russia and India there are no contradictory or competing strategic interests. Russia long ago acceded South Asia as India’s sphere of influence and has refrained from any strategic or military linkages with Pakistan.

A second Cold War is therefore underway now and is a distinct global strategic reality. The strategic regions of the globe like the Middle East, Central Asia and Eastern Europe would be the first to feel the pressures of the revived strategic jostling between the United States and Russia. East Asia would be the next focus. The Russian Monroe Doctrine seems to be a serious Russian attempt to re-define the existing international order which had excluded Russia from global strategic decision-making ever since 1991. On present strategic indicators, it seems that Russia could achieve her ambitions in this direction.

**Role of Economic Alliances in World Order**

**G8+5**

G8 nations (Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Russia, United Kingdom and United States) plus five leading emerging economies (Brazil, China, India, Mexico and South Africa) The G8+5 group was formed in 2005 when Tony Blair, then Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, in his role as host of the 31st G8 summit at Gleneagles, Scotland, invited the leading emerging countries to join the talks. The hope was that this would form a stronger and more representative group that would inject fresh impetus into the trade talks at Doha, and the need to achieve a deeper cooperation on climate change. On February 16, 2007, The Global Legislators Organisation (GLOBE International) held a meeting of the **G8+5 Climate Change Dialogue** at the GLOBE Washington Legislators Forum in Washington DC, where a non-binding agreement was reached to cooperate on tackling global warming. The group accepted that the existence of man-made climate change was beyond doubt, and that there should be a global
system of emission caps and carbon emissions trading applying to both industrialized nations and developing countries. The group hopes that this will supersede the Kyoto Protocol, the first phase of which expires in 2012.21

G-20

G-20 was formed in 1999 for a purpose to bring together systemically important industrialized and developing economies to discuss key issues in the global economy. G-20 is a group of finance ministers and central bank governors from 20 economies: 19 countries plus the European Union. Recently summits meeting at level of Heads of state have been introduced. The 2010 chair country of the G-20 is South Korea. Collectively, the G-20 economies comprise 85% of global Gross National Product (GNP), 80% of world trade (including EU intra-trade) and two-thirds of the world population. The G-20 is a forum for cooperation and consultation on matters pertaining to the international financial system. It studies, reviews, and promotes discussion among key industrial and emerging market countries of policy issues pertaining to the promotion of international financial stability, and seeks to address issues that go beyond the responsibilities of any one organization. With the G-20 growing in stature since the 2008 Washington summit, its leaders announced on September 25, 2009, that the group will replace the G8 as the main economic council of wealthy nations. Heads of states of G-20 members meet biannually at the G-20 Summit. In addition to these 20 members, the following forums and institutions, as represented by their respective chief executive officers, participated in meetings of the G-20:

- the Managing Director of the International Monetary Fund
- the Chairman of the International Monetary Fund
- the President of the World Bank
- International Monetary and Financial Committee
- the Chairman of the Development Committee
New World Order emerging at G20 Summit-Sep.2009

A new world order has emerged at the G-20 Summit in Pittsburgh with a decision by the group to become the premier coordinating body on economic issues. A joint communiqué was expected to show that emerging countries like China and India will be given more of a voice in how the global economy is run. G-20 leaders were also pledging to leave in place for now emergency measures taken last spring that have brought signs of global economic recovery, and to act as one to prevent a repeat of the financial meltdown. A copy of the draft document, which was obtained by Reuters, said in part: "We pledge to avoid destabilizing booms and busts in asset and credit prices and adopt macro-economic policies, consistent with price stability that will promote adequate and balanced global demand." The draft also contains a promise to "make decisive progress on structural reforms that foster private demand and strengthen long-run growth potential." Briefing reporters, U.S. Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner said the group would not leave the status quo unchanged. "We are not going to walk away from the greatest economic crisis since the Great Depression and leave unchanged and leave in place the tragic vulnerabilities that caused this crisis," Geithner said. "And we have worked very hard at a very early stage in this process, in this administration, to build consensus on a very strong set of international standards for reform." He added that the United States aims to preserve confidence in the U.S. financial system and keep the dollar strong. "We have a special responsibility here in the United States to make sure that we are doing the things in this country to preserve confidence in the U.S. financial system," Geithner said, "confidence that is important to sustain the dollar's role as the principle reserve currency in the international financial system and we expect, as I think countries around the world expect, the dollar to retain that position for a very long time."

Range of Issues

Environment advocates were likely to come away from the summit empty handed, as a U.S.-led effort to get leaders to stop giving subsidies to fossil-fuel industries failed to translate into a deadline for action. Leaders only agreed to do
something in the "medium term." The G-20 has also agreed to make the International Monetary Fund (IMF) a more representative body by increasing the voting power of countries that have long been underrepresented. The decisions reflect the recognition by the United States and Europe of a new global economic reality in which emerging market economies play a bigger role, especially in the aftermath of the global financial crisis that hurt developed economies more than developing ones. On international trade, the agreement includes a plan to ask the World Bank to create a "multilateral trust fund" aimed at increasing the agricultural investment in poor countries. The joint statement read: "Over 4 billion people remain under-educated, ill-equipped with capital and technology and insufficiently integrated into the global economy. We need to work together to make the policy and institutional changes needed to accelerate the convergence of living standards and productivity in developing and emerging economies to the levels of the advanced economies."

**Brazil, Russia, India and China form bloc to challenge US dominance**

With public hugs and backslaps among its leaders, a new political bloc was formed on 16th June, 2009 to challenge the global dominance of the United States. The first summit of heads of state of the BRIC countries — **Brazil, Russia, India and China** — ended with a declaration calling for a “multipolar world order”, diplomatic code for a rejection of America’s position as the sole global superpower. President Medvedev of Russia went further in a statement with his fellow leaders after the summit, saying that the BRIC countries wanted to “create the conditions for a fairer world order”. He described the meeting with President Lula da Silva of Brazil, the Indian Prime Minister, Manmohan Singh, and the Chinese President, Hu Jintao, as “an historic event”. The BRIC bloc brings together four of the world’s largest emerging economies, representing 40 per cent of the world’s population and 15 per cent of global GDP. The leaders set out plans to co-operate on policies for tackling the global economic crisis.23

“We are committed to advance the reform of international financial institutions so as to reflect changes in the world economy. The emerging and
developing economies must have a greater voice,” they said. The BRIC states also pledged to work together on political and economic issues such as energy and food security. Co-operation in science and education would promote “fundamental research and the development of advanced technologies”. The declaration also satisfied a key Kremlin demand by calling for a “more diversified international monetary system”. President Medvedev is seeking to break the dominance of the US dollar in financial markets as the world’s leading reserve currency. He favours the establishment of more regional reserve currencies, including the Russian rouble and the Chinese yuan, to prevent economic shocks. Mr Medvedev said: “The existing set of reserve currencies, including the US dollar, have failed to perform their functions.” The declaration made no specific mention of the dollar, an indication of China’s reservations about the Russian idea. Beijing holds almost $2 trillion in foreign currency reserves and a large portion of US debt.

**Shanghai Co-operation Organisation (SCO)**

The BRIC summit coincided with a two-day meeting of the Shanghai Co-operation Organisation (SCO) in Yekaterinburg, which further underlined the determination of Moscow and Beijing to assert themselves against the West. The SCO comprises Russia, China and the Central Asian states of Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan. Iran, Pakistan, India and Mongolia have observer status and President Karzai of Afghanistan attended the summit as a guest. Iran’s embattled President, Mahmoud Amadinejad, defied protests at home to attend the conference, where he hit out at the US and declared that the “international capitalist order is retreating”. But he beat a swift retreat from the summit just hours after arriving, cancelling a planned press conference to return to the crisis in his country. China pledged $10 billion in loans to Central Asian countries struggling in the economic crisis, adding financial muscle to its leading role in the SCO. Russia and China regard the organisation as a means to restrict US influence in their Central Asian “back yard”. Mr Medvedev held separate meetings about the situation in Afghanistan with President Karzai and President
Zardari of Pakistan, a clear signal to President Obama not to ignore Russian interests as he presses US policy in the region in the fight against the Taleban.

**Russia, India and China - Strategic Triangle**

Russia, India and China are pursuing common goals in their international policies and economic development. In what is the latest step to promote trilateral cooperation in a variety of fields, the foreign ministers of China, Russia and India met for two days last week (Nov. 2010) in Wuhan, capital of central Hubei province. Tenth of its kind, the meeting was shown as being conducive to deepening trilateral ties between Beijing, Moscow and New Delhi. Due to the increasing influence of these three countries in regional and world affairs, cooperation opens up opportunities for increased development. "The three emerging giants share close or similar views on various international and regional issues and the cooperation is solidly grounded," said Foreign Minister Yang Jiechi, the host of the meeting. The discussion between Yang, Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov and Indian External Affairs Minister S. M. Krishna on developments in Iran, Afghanistan and the Korean Peninsula brought out their common approach on these issues. Besides the strategic issues, RIC also focused on issues relating to disaster relief, agriculture and public health, and deepening communication among academic, industrial and business circles.

These three members of what has been called BRIC (Brazil, Russia, India and China), cover an entire 40 percent of the world population, with a combined GDP of more than 15 percent of the world total. The three also enjoy a particularly advantageous geopolitical position, along with an abundance of labor, natural resources and scientific and technological advantages. The geographic location of the three countries also facilitates the deepening of triangular trade. The three are emerging economies, locked into raising their international status, while they share many views on international issues. The three countries also call for reforms to the current world order. They also face common pressing tasks, such as the fight against religious extremism, ethnic separatism and international terrorism. For all, economic and trade cooperation is an important platform for
their trilateral strategic partnership to take root. China, Russia and India have a common strategic need to strengthen their ties. In today's world where international relations are undergoing profound changes and multi-polarization continues to accelerate, the three nations are on similar positions in a multitude of international issues. All advocate the democratization of international relations and the establishment of a new international order based on universally recognized international laws.25

Analysts viewed the trilateral cooperation as having far-reaching significance.

The three are all new emerging economies and the current international order is no longer suitable for their rapid development, so they have the desire to adjust it to make it favorable for their own growth," said Sun Shihai, a senior scholar on South Asia studies with the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences. But Sun added that disputes within the three countries are inevitable - and likely to be long lasting. "That is the obstacle for their further cooperation and the three countries should increase their mutual trust first," Sun said.

But since Russia has recently joined the East Asia Summit mechanism and the Asia-Europe Meeting forum, whose participants also include China and India, analysts say the three countries now have an opportunity to more closely interact at those venues for further dialogue. Li Lifan, a researcher at the Institute of Eurasian Studies of the Shanghai Academy of Social Sciences, said that Asia is getting more and more important in Moscow's development strategy. "Russia is eyeing the Asia-Pacific markets to export its weapons and the products of heavy industry and aviation industry," Li said.26

**Russia’s Role in the New World Order**

**A new world order is in the process**

The present world order is undergoing a complex and contradictory process of development, caused on the one hand by dramatic political and geopolitical changes due to the downfall of the so-called systems of “real Socialism” in Eastern Europe after Germany’s reunification. On the other hand the increasing role that Asian states are playing, in particular China and India, as well as US efforts to secure its global predominance are also impacting this
development. Moreover, there also exists an order of International Law embodied by the United Nations, which is dominated by the Security Council’s five permanent members and nuclear powers (USA, Great Britain, France, Russia and China) with their right of veto. This order of International Law remains valid to date, despite various attempts on the part of the US to alter it to its own advantage through illegal interpretations or by force in carrying out military operations that contradict International Law. Recent developments even show that the diminishing political, military and politico-economic power of the USA is forcing it to submit itself to UN rules from time to time in order to achieve a consensus among the other Security Council members on certain issues (Iraq, Afghanistan, Iran and Lebanon). This is where Russia’s role in the world order becomes particularly evident.

Although this development should not be overrated, as it does not truly reflect the US’ general position, it should not be ignored, either. In his book “Hegemony or Survival: America’s Quest for Global Dominance”27 Chomsky, while emphasizing the US quest for dominance, concludes that this development may still be stopped. In addition, history has shown that there has always been a time where a great power has had a sustained influence on the international order, or has undertaken efforts to create a unipolar world order. Yet these efforts have at no time been truly successful 28, and they will not succeed today. See also Putin’s speech held at the 2007 Munich Security Conference29. The usual objections against a stronger UN role in global affairs – that it is too weak and is of diminishing influence – ignore the fact that the UN is the only worldwide organization legitimized to guarantee peace and security and to vote on taking appropriate measures to meet threats of war or the breakdown of peaceful relationships. These measures include the deployment of forces, to which the member states have been bound to contribute with members of their own forces, once the Security Council has established this as necessary30.

As a consequence, the role of the UN deserves to be reinforced as a priority over all other international organizations, including NATO. If all UN member states were to observe their obligations as laid down in the UN Charter a
multipolar world would exist that all could accept. This should be the goal upon which all political efforts should be concentrated, since this goal seems to be a realistic one. It is within this context that Russia’s role in today’s world order may be analyzed as following:

**Russia as a factor in Global Power System**

Russia is still undergoing a process of transformation from a Communist party system to a state of law, to democracy and a market economy. Much has been achieved, although Russia has also experienced certain setbacks. Despite all warranted as well as unwarranted critique of its internal development or foreign-political positions, it has (once again) become a major power factor, it is a nuclear power, a permanent member of the Security Council with power of veto, and besides the US it is the only other state to maintain a continuous presence in space. It exports oil, diamonds and other natural and mineral resources. It has a developing economy and agricultural industry. The major national problems it faces today are certainly poverty, corruption, crime and a rapidly diminishing Russian population. Yet due to its great amount of currency reserves (amounting to 182 billion dollars), and budget surplus of 83.2 billion dollars (amounting to 7.7% of its GNP), as well as to its almost complete repayment of foreign debts, Russia is not to be expected to experience an economic crisis, even if oil prices were to drop (which is not to be expected either.) In the year 2005, its real GNP growth rate amounted to 6.4%, its real wage increase averaged 12.6%, and its investments added up to 10.5%.

According to the Russian Central Bank, more foreign currency flowed into Russia in 2006 than Russian currency left the country. The Russian Central Bank’s net capital movement registered a net accrual of 14.5 billion US dollars in 2006. On July 1, 2006 Russia established the ruble’s complete convertibility; the official currency rate was set at 26 rubles for 1 US dollar, 34 rubles for 1 euro, which is valid for all banks and exchange offices throughout Europe. Although socio-political difficulties cannot be avoided, Russia’s economic stability will continue to increase and make social improvements possible. Russia’s constitution, established in 1993, affirms human rights, a state of law, private
property and democracy\textsuperscript{33}. It mandates a constitutional law system based on the German model\textsuperscript{34}. Russia is member of the European Council and allocates one of its judges to the European Court of Human Rights in Strasbourg, to which every citizen of the Russian Federation may appeal. In elections and votes the majority of Russians have affirmed their constitution and governing political system. This affirmation does not necessarily mean direct identification, but the predominant trend to look to the West and to take advantage of the freedom to travel to the West, which was evident immediately after the political transition in 1990/1991, has diminished considerably.

Sonja Margolina – a Russian journalist living in Berlin – analyzed the developments and concluded as follows: “Russians have never been as optimistic about their future as they are now. A majority of the population has been able to improve their living standards. Ivan Consumer is not too concerned about democracy and human rights and agrees with the Kremlin’s self-confident policies. The West must drop the illusion that it can foist its values on the country. Transformation must come from within.” In her analysis she makes reference to the committed human rights activist Igor Averkin, who declared the following at a conference in Berlin: “When I come to Germany I feel as if I have arrived from a fascist state as a victim. Russia, however, is not a fascist state, and I am not a victim. I am doing well, and I do what I feel is right. In fact: stop giving us money. We will do fine on our own.”\textsuperscript{35} Russia’s view towards itself – “Russia for Russians” – is manifested in various ways and is increasing and pushing Russia to play an appropriate role in today’s world order. This trend – which should not be discredited as “nationalist” but considered to be a new form of self-confidence – was recently put to words by the author Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn in a brochure published on the 90th anniversary of the 1917 Revolution, 500,000 copies of which were distributed throughout the country. Solzhenitsyn thereby supported Putin’s policies by describing him as a new Russian absolute ruler who must avoid the mistakes made by the last Czar, Nicholas II\textsuperscript{36}. The faction of Russia’s political elite in support of Putin is currently facing the question of how Russia should shape its future while taking into consideration the entirety of all factors
mentioned above. The substantial revenues from the export of its natural and mineral resources and from its weapons industry will be applied towards raising the living standards of its population (even if not enough), in a smaller and insufficient degree towards promoting its own industry, and – as a visible sign – towards tying the former Soviet Republics closer to Russia. Yet in the middle to long term this will not be enough and eminent Russian economists have outlined three options open to Russia while emphasizing that the choice between these options will not be made. According to the renowned economist Vladimir Gutnik, Russia must either choose to align itself completely with the EU or Asia (China), or choose a uniquely Russian solution that would adopt much of what has proved of value in Western Europe yet remain independent of it. Some hope that this will enable Russia to escape the constraints of globalization, which others however doubt. Still, Russia’s successful integration as an independent factor within the international currency system, caused by the ruble’s convertibility, is seen by many as the first step in the direction of following a uniquely Russian path.

All of the factors mentioned above have led me to conclude that the political system established under Putin and Dmitry is a stable and permanent one, a system that will also continue. It is an irony of history that it has been precisely Russia’s policy of the last few years which has contributed towards making the country rely on its own interests, potentials and unique path more than ever before.

What it finally comes down to is that Russia will be an important power in the developing world order, working in direction of international security, peace and international law, but handling its own potential with great care and taking no risk.

**NATO-Russia relations: a new beginning?**

A summit meeting of the *NATO-Russia Council (NRC)* took place in Lisbon on 19 November 2010. It was held in the backdrop of President Medvedev’s long standing proposal for a common security space in the Euro-Atlantic area and NATO’s invitation to Russia to participate in the joint
development of a European Missile Defence programme. The Summit sought to put Russia-NATO relations on a cooperative path while ending the cold war antagonism which lay at the heart of NATO’s creation. Is it the beginning of a new chapter in Russia-NATO relations?

The joint statement issued at the conclusion of the summit contained some important decisions including the undertaking of the “first ever Joint Review of 21st Century Common Security Challenges …and ways to address them through practical cooperation,” a joint “ballistic missile threat assessment and … the future framework for broader missile defence cooperation,” “broadened transit arrangements through Russian territory for non-lethal ISAF goods, “and counter-narcotics training and an NRC Helicopter Maintenance Trust Fund in 2011.”

In NATO Secretary General’s words, NATO and Russia have agreed in writing that they “pose no threat to each other. That, alone, draws a clear line between the past and the future of NATO-Russia relations.”

Thus, the new concept makes a bold departure in so far as Russia is concerned. It emphasizes cooperation rather than confrontation with Russia. This is a marked change in NATO’s approach although it must be said that NATO has not given up the core principle of collective defence. Nor has it closed its doors to admitting new members. Russia is unlikely to be totally convinced that NATO would cease further encroachment on its strategic space.

Russian President Dmitry Medvedev also gave a positive assessment of the NRC summit. Addressing a press conference after the summit, he spoke of a conducive atmosphere for cooperation between NATO and Russia. While acknowledging that there remained differences of perception on a number of important issues, he said, “Now we are starting to build up our cooperation, and so I would agree overall that this is indeed an important stage in building a full and productive partnership between Russia and NATO.” Medvedev also said that Russia was willing to discuss with NATO all issues which cause concern to both sides. In particular, these relate to the European missile defence plans of NATO and the differences over the Caucasus crisis of 2008 which resulted in Russia
recognising Abkhazia and South Ossetia following a brief military operation, much to NATO’s chagrin.

On European missile defence, Medvedev categorically stated that in its present shape NATO’s ballistic missile defence plan was targeted at Russia and that this was unacceptable. Russia will participate in a missile defence plan as an equal and as a partner on the basis of complete reciprocity and transparency. Thus, Russia wants an equal participation in NATO’s decision making process in so far as European ballistic missile defence plan is concerned. Russia is sceptical that NATO’s missile defence plan will change the nuclear deterrence equation which it finds unacceptable. Medvedev also warned that if the US senate failed to ratify the new START treaty, that will be counterproductive for peace.

Russia has decided to step up cooperation with NATO on Afghanistan. It has signed several agreements with NATO on the supply of non-lethal materials to Afghanistan and also agreed to discuss the transit of military equipment. In an important development, Russia will also allow reverse transit from Afghanistan to other countries. These arrangements will help NATO maintain its supplies to Afghanistan which have come under repeated attacks in Pakistan.

Russia also needs NATO’s help. A confrontation with NATO could result in an expensive arms race which Russia, battered by the global economic crisis, can ill afford. Cooperation with NATO gives it a chance to play an important role in Afghanistan and to stem the unceasing flow of drugs from there. Russia is also considering selling arms to Afghanistan, which will help the Russian economy.

The NRC summit meeting marks a promising beginning for both sides but it is too early to be complacent about the outcome of the engagement. Future cooperation will depend on what transpires during the difficult negotiations on European missile defence that lie ahead.39

**Potential Superpowers**

The present day governments that have been claimed to become (or to remain) a superpower within the 21st century. Academics and other qualified commentators sometimes identify potential superpowers thought to have a strong likelihood of being recognized as superpowers in the 21st century. The record of
such predictions has not been perfect. For example in the 1980s some commentators thought Japan would become a superpower, due to its large GDP and high economic growth at the time.\(^\text{40}\) however the prediction has not come to fruition.

The United States of America is current super power.\(^\text{41}\) Due to their large markets, growing military strength, and economic potential and influence in international affairs, the Federative Republic of Brazil,\(^\text{42}\) the People’s Republic of China,\(^\text{43}\) the European Union,\(^\text{44}\) the Republic of India\(^\text{45}\) and the Russian Federation\(^\text{46}\) are among the powers which are most often cited as having the ability to influence future world politics and reach the status of superpower in the 21st century. While some believe one (or more) of these countries will replace the United States as a superpower, others believe they will rise to rival, but not replace, the United States.\(^\text{47}\)

Table 5.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>Share of world nominal GDP (%)</th>
<th>Share of world military spending (%)</th>
<th>Share of world population (%)</th>
<th>Share of world landmass (%)</th>
<th>Average share (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Together</strong></td>
<td><strong>66.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>75.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>53.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>33.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>57.3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Others have argued that the notion of a "superpower" is increasingly anachronistic in the 21st century as increased global integration and interdependence makes the projection of a superpower hard. (Aberkane 2010)\(^\text{48}\)

More fundamentally, the world has quickly become multipolar, with the European Union a larger economic player than the United States while China rises quickly on all measures of hard and soft power. Obama couldn't give the "New
World Order” speech today; he’d have to negotiate it first with his peers in Brussels and Beijing.⁴⁹

U.S. President Barack Obama placed particular importance on his country’s future relationship with China, India and Russia in a 52-page National Security Strategy report released on 28th May, 2010. In the report, Obama identifies the four countries as future partners in a new international order that will define the 21st Century. Although the United States undoubtedly claims India as its closest ally out of the three, the president hopes to deepen strategic ties with both China and Russia as the group works towards an amicable future.

“If you take a nation like India in particular, too, that’s only enhanced by the fact that India is a democracy, and that they’re a nation that we share democratic values with as well, which I think informs the depth of the strategic partnership that we’re pursuing with them, both in the region and around the world,” said Ben Rhodes, deputy national security adviser to the president. “We think it’s critical that if you look at China, if you look at India, as nations that, of course, have had a dramatic economic growth in recent years, play an increasingly important role in the regions that they’re in but also on global issues, that we see expanded and deepened cooperation between the United States and those nations as essential to addressing our priorities,” Rhodes continued, addressing the press in Washington. “I think that, again, if you stack up the issues, they’re going to define the trajectory of the next 10 or 20 years, whether it’s terrorism, global economy, climate change, non-proliferation, that we need to be enlisting the cooperation of India, of China, to address those issues. So, you know, I think we do put an important focus on that, as part of our engagement.”⁵⁰

Poles of Power: futuristic thinking

According to Smita Purushottam, “There is near unanimity that the world is evolving towards a multipolar order and there are many theories regarding the candidates, or the “Poles”. As early as 1997, Henry Kissinger had predicted the decline of the unipolar order and the rise of Russia, Japan, China and even India. More recently Parag Khanna felt that there would be three power
blocs – the US, China and the EU. Chinese experts in the year 2000 debated the role of the US, China, Russia, Japan and India in a future order. The Goldman Sachs BRIC report predicted that the BRIC economies (Brazil, Russia, India and China) would be bigger than the G8’s in 2050.

Several questions arise. Are the criteria for being defined a “Major Power/Pole” purely economic, or economic, technological and military? How could “Black Swan” events - unanticipated developments such as major wars, climate change related disasters, and technological breakthroughs [clean energy such as fusion energy, artificial intelligence, robotics and biotechnology - which could increase life spans engendering massive societal changes (George Bernard Shaw’s “Back to Methuselah” provides an inkling of what is in store!)] - transform future scenarios? Will they upset all calculations regarding futuristic power configurations (remembering that these breakthroughs are more likely to occur in advanced economies anyway)?

The economic factor is the most reliable clue for predicting power quotients and has been so throughout history. Nations which have quietly built up economic strength outlast their rivals through War and other calamities. The other historically revolutionary force is Technology. The major “Poles” in the future will thus most probably be growing and innovative powers such as China, US, India, Japan, Germany, Russia, Brazil and South Africa.
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