

The Progress of Russian Multipolar Politics: Pro and Cons in the International Views

Fadra Hamid

Department of American Studies, Faculty of International Relation
St. Petersburg State University, Saint Petersburg, Russia

Abstract: In 20th century, the growth of international relations turns into world-system relations. The principles and methods of International Phenomenon possibly changed/shifted, we cannot surely describe the presentation of laws/rules of international relations used in policy-making process. International politics currently led to a new system where Unipolar no longer answer to the world stability. The US leadership as the sole force since 1990 rated not provide stability to world security as predicted by many scholars. Trust the third world countries seems became lower because of US hegemony's policies. The long existence of Unipolar system, the absence of rivalry power which caused the US power syndrome. The dominated US policy in international, precisely its military alliance NATO, the US interests could be become a threat for other countries. Bilateral cooperation, regional integration and US role in world problems, certainly positioned this country as hegemony. It spreads fears to small countries, because the US national interest could be exceed the sovereignty of other countries. The choice is to ally to the US by seeking common interests or perform its own national sovereignty and interests that could be contradict with the US. To achieve its interests, each state began to set up its strategies to anticipate the threats. To anticipate the threats, the state generally increase their powers by collaborating in organization, creating the economic zone, increasing the number of their military forces, updating their technology, increasing their political and economic roles in region or international.

Key words: Multipolar politics, international views, unipolar system, pro and cons, sovereignty

INTRODUCTION

Waltz-defensive realism rated the balance of power as the outcome of the threat. Waltz insists that the main purpose of the great powers in international politics is the desires to increase their own security. The strategy of weakening of their competitors for them is natural but only when there is no or minimal risk/harm to its own security. Therefore, states are more inclined to maintain than to break the prevailing balance of power in the system (Tsygankov *et al.*, 2008). I would like to emphasize that the efforts of increasing power not always performed by great powers against their rivalries. When a state/coalition considered be a threat, then the other state started to increase their power as preparative action/anticipation before the threat turns become a real aggression. Like a law of nature, every human being will survive if threatened as well as the state in protecting its national interests in maintaining its territory and sovereignty.

John Mearsheimer defined about the Offensive Realism in 1990. He agreed with Waltz's concept that: the state behavior (polarity) and structural factors (Anarchy and Power) in International System. He emphasized that the international system stimulates the big states to be

powerful than its rivals and the big states tend to cease/crush the balance of power to weaken their rival. Mearsheimer does not agree with the fact that the state tend to be cautious amount of power (multi power is never keep long being hegemony in international system). In terms of Offensive Realism, the main trigger of war lies precisely in an effort to States to maximize their power and this is the strategy of the great powers (Tsygankov *et al.*, 2008).

Perhaps, some small countries, who has not power, will prefers to not precede/create problems, it is what called by Waltz as defensively (defensive). However, a country that has a greater power, tends to be dominant in the act, including in maintaining the status quo/balance of the international system, so it can have the opposite effect which is damaging the balance of system (offensive). The problem is, there is no clear measurement when countries actions assessed damage the balance. The understanding of the concept of balance, prioritization on the public interest, respect the sovereignty of other countries, all these values need to apply. Expecting awareness of each country is highly improbable, it needs a superpower institution in the regulatory process

by representing the function of the united nations as the most competent international organization.

THE CONCEPT OF POLARITY: MULTIPOLAR BASED ON THEORISTS VIEWS

Polarity in its revised form, refers to the number of power and decision centers in a relevant international system, global, dominant or subordinate. The concept of “power centers” is similar to the traditional notion of “major powers,” which comprise both “great powers” and “superpowers” (Brecher *et al.*, 1990).

Polarity could be assessed the same concept with the concept of Balance of Power or the hegemony of power, depending on how many existed power center. The number of power centers is formed naturally, cannot be ascertained how many but can be categorized which country has great power. The great powers of the multipolar system during First World War were France, Germany, Italy, Japan, the UK, the US and the Russian empire (Brecher *et al.*, 1990). Austro-Hungarian Empire also become part of a world power at the time.

There is no historical case of pure unipolar at the dominant (or global) system level (Brecher *et al.*, 1990). If the stability measured by military security, then no single state could guarantee security all states. US without NATO Security Alliance could not be able solely to undertake although how power the US's finance. Even though the security alliance issues are included into the realist's analysis debates, nevertheless the concept of institutional collaboration is included into liberalist's issue (distribution of financial onus to every member of organization). “Bipolar indicates a concentration of power and decision in two relatively equal actors,” (Brecher *et al.*, 1990). Waltz described that the bipolar system is more stable where two great powers were competing. In fact, the states were in fear, were no option to not to affiliate. The states faced on the dilemma where every block restrict its alliance to be associated to other rival block. The states considered which block was more profitable. However, between the two blocks there is also the existence of the Non-Aligned (Unaffiliated actors/block) in Asia (Ministry of Maritime Affairs of Indonesia, 2016). The Asian-African Conference in Bandung in 1955 was the beginning of the establishment of the Non-Aligned Block. This conference initiated by first Indonesia President Soekarno and attended 29 Head of States. This Asian-African Conference officially designated after the first Summit in Belgrade, Yugoslavia on 1-6 September 1961. The existence of this group meant that the system of the world not divided into two block (bipolar system) in other words it meant multipolar.

The purpose of this group is to uphold the right of self-determination, sovereignty and national independence, not affiliated with the two blocks. It means that this Non-Alliance Block has its own ideology. It clearly proved that the world was not fully bipolar system but multipolar.

Multipolar According to the Oxford Online Dictionary, the word of multipolar has two meanings, first is having many poles or extremities: regions of the gut are innervated with multipolar neurons, second is polarized in several ways or directions: today's multipolar and multicultural world.

As Noguee has noted, three broad categories existed in the literature on the structure of world politics since 1945: bipolar, multipolar and a combination of the two. In general, scholars identified multipolar with multiple power and decision centers, flexible alignments and balance of power politics. Deutsch and Singer supported Kaplan's view that multipolar is more stable, emphasized the greater uncertainty about likely outcomes of conflict in a multipolar system and, therefore, the greater caution in initiating potentially disruptive behavior (Brecher *et al.*, 1990).

Multipolar signifies diffusion of military power and political decision among three or more relatively equal units. The system as sharing the apex of the power pyramid: France, Germany, Great Britain, Italy, Japan, the Soviet Union and the United States (Brecher *et al.*, 1990). Morgenthau defined that the Multipolar is more established because the efforts are legitimated (there is “legitimation”) (Brecher *et al.*, 1990).

The failure of multipolar system in Europe caused by three things, first in 1919-1939 was no solid organization which force the powerful states to obey the international law and to act according to principles and norms of international. Second every state has different understanding in interpreting the values that exist in international legislation. The consciousness of each country/nation to live in peace and mutual respect not well understood in the same sense. Third, the divergence of historical and cultural background of each nation. The decolonization process affected to the morale of a nation, some countries feel more powerful and stronger than other countries when it comes to releasing identity and accepting an intercourse of other nation politics/power. It called by Samuel Huntington as “the clash of civilization”.

Some analyst defined the multipolar as “major state” or “power state”. Based on this definition, the concept of a multipolar could be interpreted as a new phase in which many countries began to emerge as a new force. Power state does not mean being hegemonic power.

Multipolar system/multilateralism could not be avoided, the multipolar is no longer be defined as a superpower/power block. Due to the measure of a polar not only judged by the military or politics.

THE STABILITY AND INSTABILITY

Based on Cambridge's political dictionary, the meaning of Stability is a situation in which something is not likely to move or changes: a period of political stability. Whereas, the same meaning shows in the Oxford dictionary as the state of being stable: there are fears for the political stability of the area. The political stability has two meanings, first, related to the government or public affairs of a country: a period of political and economic stability; second, chiefly derogatory done or acting in the interests of status or power within an organization rather than as a matter of principle. Deutsch and Singer defined stability as "the probability that the system retains all of its essential character, no single nation becomes dominant; that most of its members continue to survive; and that large-scale war does not occur" (Deutsch and Singer, 1964).

The indicators of turmoil; apart from the average annual number of crises in a polarity configuration; the gravity of threatened values; breakpoint (trigger); crisis management technique; intensity of violence; number of involved actors; extent/type of major power activity and its effectiveness in crisis abatement; form of outcome; extent of satisfaction with crisis outcome and crisis legacy in terms of subsequent tension level (Deutsch and Singer, 1964). Five from 11 indicators of bivariate operationalization they mentioned, Wikenfield, Brecher and James concluded that Multipolar is more unstable than Bipolar. However, the conclusion of research of Wikenfield is not fully be used as the final assessment. Because the measurement of indicators is not a legal certainty and every scholars have its own views and reasons to put the indicators of instability. The researcher concerns on the Intensity of Violence and the Effectiveness in Crisis Abatement where the conclusion shows that Multipolar is more stable 52% than bipolar 44% (Deutsch and Singer, 1964). Furthermore, these indicators show that the quantity of conflicts/violence and how effectively the actors can reduce/solve the crisis.

HOW TO MEASURE THE POLITICAL STABILITY?

Claude Ake in his published article in 1975 described the merits of the definition of political stability by some points. First, a form of behavior that is stabilizing relative

to one political structure or pattern of political exchanges may be destabilizing relative to another (Ake, 1975). Ake makes an analogy of political stability by describing an act of administration in the election. The same sample we can pull it in the context of the International relations. As an example, the stable condition of international relations which is controlled by one power/political structure can be destabilizing or cause others instability. Second, to avoid the confusion of political Instability with political changes and political stability with lack of political changes (Ake, 1975). Political stability is the regularity of the flow of political exchanges, occurs in accordance with established role expectation (does not violate another). Third in as much as this conception and measurement of political instability have determined much of our conventional beliefs about the phenomenon of political stability, we must reexamine these beliefs (Ake, 1975).

The researcher agrees with Ake's view, the state behavior could be changed and there is no guarantee the state will act in accordance with international rules/do not undermine international stability. There is no boundary when a state crosses the rules or starts to crush international stability. A state power can think that his actions is necessary to taken to maintain international stability but the result could be otherwise. The viewpoint between states also can be different, this is the result in different policies. Ake remarked that not surprisingly, if the main biases in contemporary scholarship on political stability happen to be the types of biases that political elites would have-the confusion of change with instability, the tendency to reduce politics to elite interactions, the tendency to exaggerate the "problem" of political stability.

THE US UNIPOLAR SYSTEM IN 21st CENTURIES

After collapse of Soviet Union in 1989, the world entered to the new era under one hegemony power. US became the single power in the international system. The American's goals are to promote peace, sustain freedom and encourage prosperity. US leadership premised on sustaining an international system that is respectful of the rule of law (Khoo and Smith, 2002). The Peace Process at the culmination of the Oslo Accords, negotiated by the United States President Bill Clinton on 13 September 1993. Bill Clinton started to promote the slogan of "Democracy" in the world.

European region: The disintegration of Yugoslavia as the latest socialist-communist state in Europe and the Kosovo

conflict signifies the victory of US and NATO, the only rival defense alliance against communist. The Dayton Agreement in 30 November 1995 ended the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina. It signed by the President of Serbia and Bosnia-Herzegovina and mediated by US (UN, 1995). After the appropriate decision taken in Dayton, the former Yugoslavia was introduced 60000 peacemaking grouping of NATO under American command. What is the result of Yugoslavia's disintegration into stability? On the one hand, the independence of Bosnia and 5 other republics is the right of every nation to self-determination in this case the US performed its functions under the United Nations. On the other hand, this also can be a threat to the integration of sovereign state, when foreign countries participate to decide domestic issues of other countries (by an independence). Not only with alibi of genocide but also can be a separatist movement which is supported by foreign countries and ended by an independence's referendum or UN's resolution. The independence of Bosnia Herzegovina provide stability in the region of Southern Europe as well as protection for minority ethnic groups. Whereas in the case of Kosovo in 2008, the US and NATO action is considered as intervention, unilateral decisions without involving Serbia's approval.

The Middle East: The Gulf War in 1990-1991 between Iraq and multinational coalition led by US ended by the liberation of Kuwait and Iraq's defeat in the region. The United Nations Security Council adopted Resolution 686 in 1991 which formulated the conditions for peace in the Persian Gulf. Based to this document the Iraqi leadership was unconditionally accept all twelve previous resolutions on the Gulf crisis (Popov, 2013). The Gulf War was a big loss for political position and economy of the Soviet Union. Iraq's debt to the Soviet Union reached 6 billion dollars. Speaking in September 1990 in the Supreme Soviet of the USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze stated that "only in the current year, we receive less of the Iraqi and Kuwaiti currency and oil about \$800 million" (Popov, 2013). In 2003, the US presence in Iraq became a great achievement of George W. Bush policy in the Middle East. Although the alleged possession of weapons of mass destruction is not proven. The presence of US and NATO army was not an answer of creating security and stability in Iraq. The emergence of ISIS group which also joined Saddam Hussein loyalists under the leadership of Abu Bakr Al-Baghdadi worsened domestic condition of Iraq. The group emerged after the al-Qaida control of Iraq led by Jordanian Abu Mussab Zarqawi. The war between the

groups of oil interests and the interest of foreign countries (Nakhoul, 2015). The war did not end until today (Kafanov, 2013).

The Israel-Palestinian conflict (Arab-Israel) is the longest conflict in the Middle East region which had not completing until today. This conflict never solved by the US Unipolar hegemony in the international system. Indeed, the US can provide a concept of rights and stability in the European region, then why the same thing did not realized in Palestine. With the number of civilian casualties every Israeli attacks had >15,000 people. The total population of Gaza estimated to be 1.816 million people of which the Israeli army has so far killed 627 which amounts to 0.055 percent of the total population (Dabashi, 2014). The (25%) of entire annual US foreign aid budget that goes to Israel. This amount is not as much as the number of victims of ethnic genocide of Muslims in Bosnia-Herzegovina which reached >100,000 lives. The problem is not in the number of victims but the meaning of one's life. 0.055% is a very large number of the population. How can the UN issued a tough decision over Palestine or giving sanctions against Israel, while the resolution of Kosovo in 2008 granted independence without Serbian consent. US financial assistance to Israel did not prove that the US Unipolar is the best model of international system of creating the stability.

Pacific Asia: US hegemony in the Asia-Pacific based on two important things: bilateral security arrangements and sufficient forward deployment of military forces. To keep the regional stability and balance of power, this arrangements are the most possible to realize. Through this defense cooperation such as the construction of military basis in some Pacific Asia countries, the US control this region became larger as well as the political influences which inflicted by those military alliance's agreement. The following is US great role in Pacific Asia.

The North Korea break out from NPT Treaty in 1993 and begin to develop its nuclear project. After three round of talks between the US and the DPRK, finally in Geneva on July 8, 1994, the talks were recessed upon the death of North Korean President Kim Il Sung, then resumed in August. These talks concluded with the Agreed Framework (Avery *et al.*, 2016). Although there are cooperation in economic social assistance and employment but relations between two Korea did not achieve any progress. The creating of "Six party talk" in 2003 effectively limited to curb North Korea's nuclear threat and maintain the stability of the East Asian region. However the Six Party Talk is evidence that the participation of several countries (China and Russia and

Japan) in maintaining the stability of region. Can the stability implement for a long time only under the authority of the US (Unipolar)? Almost impossible to discuss with North Korea without China and Russia. Multilateralism or Multipolar concept could be a new solution that the state has a balanced position, the countries will control their behavior each other and respect other interest based on binding principles (values of cooperation such as Southeast Asia).

The referendum of East Timor from Indonesia in 30 August 1999 caused relations between Indonesian, US and Australia deteriorated. UN resolution initiated by Australia, US and Portuguese proven more than political intervention, a conspiracy to disintegrate East Timor from Indonesia. We still remember how US and Australia supported Indonesia to annex East Timor from Portuguese in 1975. The Cold War era was the reason of US and Australia policies where the communist movement was existing in Indonesia. After the collapse of USSR collapse in 1989, the map of world politics has changed. Indonesia longer was not a key point of security interest of US, no longer the ideological threat and US became the most powerful state/unipolar. The oil reserve of Timor Gap was an economic interest for Australia and US. This economic interest can realized only by independence of Timor. The UN resolution is not a new way by the United States to pursue their interests including support separatist of East Timor. This US-style political disintegration seems to be a mainstay stance in resolving issues of separatism based on human rights violations. If separatism in the country is always resolved by independence, it meant that the US administration against the sovereignty of legal power/state. Unfortunately, the US unilateral policies harmed sovereign countries.

The Taiwan issue; the US Government, through President Ronald Reagan, offered "Six assurances" to Taiwan in 1982 before the third joint communique with the PRC. One of the six assurances ensure that the United States: will not play any mediation role between Taipei and Beijing. The "six assurances" along with the TRA, laid a basis for US policy toward Taiwan, thus consolidating Taiwan's security in the following decades (TAWAN, 2016). Defense cooperation agreement has hampered China-US political relations, it can even be the cause of China-Taiwan conflict in the region. US action indirectly supporting separatism and can be considered as a form of interference in the internal affairs of China.

The US role in ASEAN. The US is not the sole authority for the Asia Pacific region where China is very strong role in balancing the US economy. The existence of the ASEAN organization regarded as a collective power

in several field. Although ASEAN seems passive as a regional organization but ASEAN is more than stable organization which characterized by Asian values. Its members have closed bilateral relations (tendencies) with certain countries in many areas but for the ASEAN regional security issues always have a way to get it done with deliberation. The most recent problems is the South China Sea issue. The US tries not directly involve and to be very careful in dealing with China. In October 2015, China warned that the US should "not act blindly or make trouble out of nothing". China's vanity will reduce China's position in the eyes of Asia by becoming a common enemy, otherwise the US role in the region will be more credible by supporting ASEAN countries. The advantages of Unipolar System (US hegemony):

No competition between two block, the world seems more stable because of the absence of one polar, no arm race, no war of ideology. Every country can build their relations with other countries without any restriction from any sides but still under US control.

No conflicts of interest between two polar. The policy making process of UN resolution on world conflict is easier under solely US administration, no greater member than US domination among members of Security Council of UN.

The deficiency of Unipolar System (US hegemony): The US foreign policies (double standard) made other states anxious in one hand, US presented itself as world sheriff but in other hand, most of US policies caused situation worse. The domination of one power can be uncontrolled. The power without limitation will changed to be a wild fireball that why in a government there needs a distribution of power. One president must controlled by parliament and vice versa. The concept of Unipolar is good as far as the leader/the hegemony behaves based on the rule, not concerns on its own interests. However, the reality is not always happened as good as normative rules. Who can control the hegemony power, if there is no one equal powerful country. Every kind of polarity concept has a good and bad consequences, the most important is looking for the most appropriate based on the current international requirement.

The political model and values adopted from the views as an ideal model. The tendency to promote and impose its own values and concepts to other countries. Every country has its own history and ideas, we cannot impose our idea and values to other countries. The definition of the concept of democracy can be the same but the implementation of that concept can be different based on the values of each countries.

Every country has its sovereignty to define its own interests, to perform its own domestic policies. Although

sometimes, the strong states beyond their authority/international institution to interfere in other countries.

Russian foreign policy: The Russian foreign policy concept in 2013 is restatement of The foreign policy concept asserted by Putin in 28 June 2000. The foreign policy concept of the Russian Federation is a system of views on the content and main areas in the foreign policy activities of Russia. This concept brings critical characters on International system that has taken shape by the beginning of the 21st century. The international situations has required re-evaluation of the overall situation around the Russian Federation of the priorities of Russian foreign policy and the possibilities of ensuring it with resources. What exactly meant by the concept of Russia's Multipolar is the concept of many countries in maintaining the stability of the international structure. There are several points into the direction of Russian politics in the international world that listed in the Russian Foreign Policy Concept as follows:

- General Provision was mentioned that Russia develops mutually beneficial and equal bilateral and multilateral partnership relations with foreign states, interstate associations, international organizations and forums on the basis of respect for independence and sovereignty
- In the segment 2 (Modern Era), point number 14 is "Imposing one's own hierarchy of values can only provoke a rise in xenophobia, intolerance and tensions in international relations leading eventually to chaos in world affairs"
- In the segment 2 point number 15 mentions that "Another risk to world peace and stability is presented by attempts to manage crises through unilateral sanctions and other coercive measures, including armed aggression, outside the framework of the UN Security Council." This coercive act will raise the conflict area and provoke tensions
- In the segment 3 (Priorities Russia in Global Problem: New order) point number 28 mentions that "Russia follows a policy aimed at creating a stable and sustainable system of international relations based on international law and principles of equality, mutual respect and non-interference in internal affairs of states"
- In the segment 3 (Priorities Russia in Global Problems: new order) point number 29 mention that "Russia supports the efforts aimed at strengthening the UN's central and coordinating role"

- In the segment 3 (Priorities Russia in Global Problems: rule of law in IR) point number 29 mention that "Russia consistently advocates the strengthening of the legal basis of international relations and maintain the norms of international law established in universal documents such as the UN Charter"

Russia motivated non-use of force or threat of force, peaceful settlement of international disputes, respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity of states. Russia suggests the international institutions to solve global problems by using of public diplomacy. At this point, it underlined the statement of solving problem's approach in the international affairs, Russia mentioned the public diplomacy as best way to solve the problem.

THE CONCEPT OF RUSSIA POLITICS OF MULTIPOLAR

The first and most conservative-perspective on multipolar is grounded in the balance of power approach. As a Russian scholar argues, "the multipolar system can be stable only under the condition of maintenance of some kind of balance among great powers". Multipolarity pattern possible to see clearly in geopolitics in the Middle East where Russia and China started to increase economic cooperation and political role in the region. Thirteen percent (13%) of Moscow defense trade (2008-2012) sold to Syria (Kausch, 2014). What Russia doing now is how to secure its partner in the Middle East to be not invaded (become project of invasion of foreign countries). Russia also played a major role in preventing a US airstrike on Syria and blocked other forms of intervention via the UN (Kausch, 2014). The countries such as Turkey, Qatar and Egypt, other, smaller powers across the region are also openly challenging the dominant powers on regional issues. Here is the opportunity for Russia to equate the concept of "independent state" in governing their respective countries, free of US political pressure. With the advent of new power states in each region, then multipolar system began to be realize.

As researcher mentioned in the beginning that the stability could be realized when the power states could maintain its position based on the values of coexistence. The international organization is a model of social life where the countries participate with the same rights and obligations, the rules and binding values. The composition of the UN Security Council which is consist of five people into an international authorized representative in the concept of the balance of

decision-making. This model describes a multilateralism and democracy concept where the countries expected to keep the balance in the international arena.

In Munich 2007, Russian president criticized on the inadmissibility of the unipolar model of the world: the world of one master, one sovereign. And it ultimately is pernicious not only for all those within this system but also for the sovereign itself because it destroys itself from within." The debate over the concept of sovereignty brings dilemmatic characters. Putin refuses foreign intervention in the domestic politics of other countries. Meanwhile, US positioned itself as a supporter of human rights and democratic state where the international force can go into a country to protect civilians from the tyrant or make the minority live in freedom. The different point of views between two countries lies in the way of the settlement of international issues and the stability of the international system. The US role as the world sheriff with its alliance military NATO present not only in every region but also in the countries where they interested in. In Russian view, Unipolar not reflects a democratic or multilateralism which adopted the values only from one source. Moreover, look at the Middle East conflicts are not as well finished as the US and NATO military intervention. This is a proof that foreign military intervention is not the solution to build the democracy system in a country.

In 2015, Putin repeated the thesis about the crucial role of the UN, "UN is a structure that has no equal in terms of legitimacy, representativeness, globally" (Tatarinov, 2015). At the same time, Putin said about "a certain center of power" in the world after the Cold War, "the United Nations hinders get underfoot." According to the president, the attempts of undermining the foundations of the legitimacy of the UN disastrous and unacceptable (Tatarinov, 2015). Putin's speech at the jubilee 70th session of the UN General Assembly was a sensation long before its utterance (General Assembly Security Council, 1995; General Assembly, 1992). In his speech, Putin stressed in three points, first, the essence of UN organization. "The veto is always applied: it was used and the United States of America and the United Kingdom, France and China and the Soviet Union and later Russia. It is quite natural for such a diverse and representative organization. At the founding of the UN and was not supposed to be here reign unanimity. The essence of the organization in fact is to find and develop compromises and its strength-Registered in different opinions and points of view," said Putin. Second, the concept of national sovereignty-Russia is not willing to limit his interests in favor of third, Russia unfriendly countries. Putin mentioned the sovereignty is a matter of

freedom, free choice of their own destiny for each person, for the people, for the state. Third, the Russian president offered the world seriously to fight the ISIS group, recognized in Russia as a terrorist organization (Mirzayan, 2016). Putin criticized the UN in carrying out the functions of international organizations which since the 1990s rated no maximum or less independent in solving the international issues. US influence is very great in the UN decision-making. Certainly, it related to the amount of annual financial assessment provided by the US to UN that strongly affect the essence of the UN organization. Total net contribution of the state to the United Nations for 2015 amounted to 654 778 938 USD (22% of all assessment of members of UN).

RUSSIAN MODEL OF MULTIPOLAR WORLD

Tsygankov gave his analytical statement based on long history of Russia since Alexander I until post-Soviet era. First, he mentioned some historical events and conflicts where Russia refused to be hegemonic power and preferred to settle it through international institutions. It proved that Russia has not desires to be hegemonic state or to impose its own values to other countries, even the chances were. Second, what exactly mentioned by Tsygankov is response to West's misperceptions of Multipolar concept. The exaggerated acts of western polities in interpretation of appointment of Primakov. The Russia Multipolar concept is just a concept of multilateralism, to be equal in international system, to have the balance relations in multi-vector of relation, participates/joins in regional and international organizations. Despite it regarded as a fear for West. Third, the foreign policy under Putin brings a strong caution on facing US policies (Tsygankov, 2009).

The main factors of changing political strategies of Russia is the absence of Western efforts and unwillingness to engage Russia into multilateral institution. Any country would feel disturbed if there is military alliance activity near its territory, because this is part of the national security of a country. Thus, it is normal if a state will carry out preventive measures to raise awareness around the border to secure its territory. It is reasonable and virtually did by any State based on their concept of national security. NATO activities by expanding its membership after the collapse of the Soviet Union also less precise, because the condition of the World had completed out from the period of danger of course, the concept of threat changed. If the days of the Cold War there are two forces block competing and mutually enhance the strength of the military alliance,

then the post-cold war intensity should be minimized. If NATO enlarges its membership in the aftermath of the cold war, then the question is who is the target of an expansion of NATO that remains to be? Interestingly, all former Soviet countries that joined NATO have the political sentiment towards Russia.

In 1994 in an agreement between the Russia-NATO states that Russia is ready to cooperate with NATO, provided that no extension of NATO in Eastern Europe. However, this agreement is not fulfilled, it proved by NATO membership's enlargement by joining Poland, the Czech Republic and Slovakia in 1999 followed by the membership of the Baltic States in 2004 (NATO, 2012). This certainly proved that there is no seriousness of NATO in improving relations with Russia. Even this attested that the intention of NATO's enlargement is to surround Russia by military alliance. It is equal to create a new conflict with Russia.

Blank (2012) mentioned in his article about the statement of Andrei Tsygankov "Russia is a regional power masquerading as a global one, apparently a highly conscious strategy given its shrunken post-Soviet state". Blank criticized the concept of Russia multipolar as a new way to reach the powerful position toward hegemony and in his view, it is just impossible to realize. Russia tries to return his historical power as in Cold War Era. He described that Unipolar after 1990's is the most stable period along international history.

President, talking about the sanctions policy of Washington, talked about the "epidemic of penalty against including European companies from the United States. In the course are flimsy pretexts, are punished severely those who dared to break the unilateral US sanctions" (Mirzayan, 2016). On 20 December 2015 in his speech Putin described the Dependency of European partner's policy on US politics. "The problem of Europe is that it does not carry out an independent foreign policy. At all, in fact, the Europe refused to be independent" said Putin. Putin described it by what was happening in Libya and Syria. President Putin addressed the critics to the US unilateral decision and ballistic anti-missile system (RIAnovosti, 2015). Looking at the history of Russia's relations with the countries of the Middle East, NATO and US military invasion to some Russian partner countries such as Iraq and Libya in this time Russia is no longer silent with international political conspiracy against Iran and Syria. Western countries assess the Russian intend to balance US power and perceive it as an indicator of Putin's ambition to become the new power center. As mentioned in the concept of Russian foreign policy, the goal is to create balance through multipolar international system.

To describe the pattern of US international relations with other power state and the third world not fully concluded as repressive policy of the United States. Because the proximity between Europe and United States is mutually beneficial in many sectors, they have a common economic and security interests. We remember how great the US contribution to Europe after World War II through its financial aids - Marshall Plan. The European countries beaten by wars and conflicts which brought Europe to the war losses and economic crisis. This crisis underlying the formation of the European community called by the ECSC (European Coal and Steel Community) which evolved into the European Union at this time. To realize the concept of a multipolar politics (multilateral), Russia began to run policies as follows:

Promoting the concept of multipolar in every chances, presidential speech, both in the annual press conferences or international summits. Putin illustrates the ineffectiveness of the US and NATO presence in the regional conflicts that does not resolve conflict.

Russia actively increase its politics in the Middle East, especially related to its partner countries such as Iran and Syria. Russia obviously will not allow the US and NATO to repeat the same political intervention as happened in Iraq, Egypt and Libya. Russia not only veto UN resolution on Iran but also sent its military forces to Hormuz Gulf for supporting Iran. Likewise, Basar Al-Asaad administration which considered as non-democratic state. Russia repeatedly suggested the international community to use diplomatic way with Al-Assad to resolve the domestic conflict, not by invasion. Russia actively seek new alternative collaborations through the organization such as Eurasia, the SCO and BRICS. These organizations are most conducive organization for Russia where the sector of cooperation is not only the economy but also as a media for dialogue in equating the concept of thought and interest.

POTENTIAL POWER IN ASEAN COUNTRIES

Russia-ASEAN Summit is currently being the newest media cooperation with high prospective economic and politics in Southeast Asia. The economic potential of this region is very meaningful for the Russian military market. Russia seeks new possibilities to develop its bilateral cooperation with each country of Southeast Asia, both in defense cooperation and technology. Russian nuclear technology not only means economic value for Russia but also one of Russia's efforts to help the region to be self-sufficient as well as new polar countries.

Although the Chinese hegemony in Asia Pacific was very strong but it would be more stable when more new power states (independent and sovereign) in international politics. The more the state power the faster creation of a balance of power in which every country will control each other, respect the presence and interests of other countries. Look at the politics of Southeast Asia, there are some countries that have great potential to be a new power such as Vietnam, Singapore, Malaysia and Indonesia. Singapore has strong economy and political and defense system are adopted from US system.

Taking the philosophy of statehood of first Indonesian President Sukarno that called by "Trisakti". Three points is a sovereign policy, sovereign and prosperous economy and a sovereign identity in culture. This concept reaffirmed by Ki Hadjar Dewantara (Indonesian educational thinker) who mentioned that sovereign state when it has three aspects. First independently exercise their own powers. This means that rejects all forms of colonialism and intervention. Second, the sovereign state refuses to intervene in other countries. Third, sovereign state refuses to dependence. Indonesia became one of targets interest amid power countries including the US. Indonesia politics is very influence in the ASEAN organization. Indonesia has the potential of power elements: nature, population, industry and outstanding marine sources. Extensive sea and the waters reached the 2/3 region of Indonesia which amounted to 5.8 million km² and a coastline of about 97,000 km (Ministry of Maritime Affairs and Fisheries of the Republic of Indonesia, 2015). Based on data Food and Agriculture Organization in 2012, Indonesia currently ranks third in the world's largest fisheries production after China and India. Indonesian waters to save 70% of the oil potential because there are approximately 40 of oil basin located in the waters of Indonesia and only 10% utilized (Hardiana and Benedicta, 2014). Indonesia has tremendous gas reserves in amount 335 trillion cubic feet, equivalent to 59.6 billion barrels of oil. With this potential, Indonesia can become new power in the Southeast Asian region. Australia and Malaysia has realized this Indonesian potential and considered Indonesia as real threat. Not surprisingly, if the US is very interested in Indonesia sources, not only in the mining companies such as Freeport, Newmont, Chevron and Exxon but also in the financial sector such as Citi Group, Bank of America, JP Morgan Chase (since 1920), General Electric and Merican International Group.

CONCLUSION

Many factors cause a system is not conducive, both, behavior of actors in power (hegemony) or external

(natural conditions cannot be predicted or the behavior of a third actor). Many researchers/scholars who provide analysis of different perspectives and different approaches. Pros and cons analysis and group thinking realist, liberal, traditional and radical does not give guarantees which system is better. Each of them provides an analysis using indicators to measure the stability and instability. In researcher's view, any system cannot survive long without a correction/update. Each system has a polarity achievement (surplus), the level of stability and cons of each. The author agrees with the statement of Wayman regarding cluster multipolar for "combination of power/joint actions". The concept of Universal values which used in UN in Habermas's view that applied for global recognition, it is impossible to buy, distribute or export all over the world. The only way their adoption in a variety of social and cultural spheres is a long process of dialogue and discussion. No single country can impose the values of his country to others countries, each country has a different history and culture.

This is what Russia wants to demonstrate to the world that the US is not entitled to impose democratic values or policy of his country to other countries. In performing its foreign policy, each country should be able to appreciate the presence of other countries with non-interference in domestic affairs of other countries. Russian presence in some regions through economic cooperation and political role in solving world issues is the progress of Russia's foreign policy after 2000. While the progress of Russia's multipolar concept could recent by the number of countries began to emerge and play in the geopolitical region. Russia's presence in the Middle East means two things: first, Russia maximizes its role of the UN Security Council in resolving world problems. Second, Syria is one of Russia's economic and military partners which need to be support. Third, Russia was well aware that every Arab state is an economic value for western and potential to be a new power state, therefore the presence of these countries will bring new effects to the region and the world system. Russia not presents in the Middle East to against the US unipolar but concerns to protect any foreign intervention in Syria by promoting dialogue as way of diplomacy. Russia is indirectly trying to maintain the stability of power in the Middle East, keeping the formation of new power states. This means the prospect of Russian cooperation with these countries is increasing, because the Russian military technology is still being a mainstay for developing countries. Having defense cooperation with Russia is more stable than with the US, Russia does not interfere in the domestic affairs to others countries, it guarantees a long benefit military cooperation. Of course the stability of the Middle East is not a hope for some countries, the Middle East oil fields

is still a project US economic interests and its allies. To rival the US power is not easy, moreover to form new polarity, nevertheless the multipolar pattern could mapped by the emergence of several new power state in the middle east.

REFERENCES

- Ake, C., 1975. A definition of political stability. *Comp. Politics*, 7: 271-283.
- Avery, C.E., I.E. Rinehart and M.B.D. Nikitin, 2016. North Korea: US. Relations, nuclear diplomacy and internal situation. Congressional Research Service, New York, USA., <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/nuke/R41259.pdf>
- Blank, S., 2012. A (multi) polar bear? Russia's bid for influence in Asia. *Global Asia*, 7: 23-27.
- Brecher, M., P. James and J. Wilkenfeld, 1990. Polarity and stability: New concepts, indicators and evidence. *Intl. Interact.*, 16: 49-80.
- Dabashi, H., 2014. How Many Palestinians have Killed in Gaza? Aljazeera, Doha, Qatar,.
- Deutsch, K.W. and J.D. Singer, 1964. Multipolar power systems and international stability. *World Politics Q. J. Intl. Relati.*, 16: 390-406.
- General Assembly Security Council, 1995. UN Security Council Resolution A/50/79C S/1995/999: The situation in Bosnia Herzegovina. United Nation, Geneva, Switzerland. http://peacemaker.un.org/sites/peacemaker.un.org/files/BA_951121_DaytonAgreement.pdf
- General Assembly, 1992. UN Resolution A/RES/47/121: The situation in Bosnia Herzegovina. United Nation, Geneva, Switzerland. <http://www.un.org/documents/ga/res/47/a47r121.htm>
- Hardiana, I. and T. Benedicta, 2014. The potential of Indonesia as the State Maritime. Metro TV News, <http://ekonomi.metrotvnews.com/read/2014/10/22/308561/potensi-indonesia-sebagai-negara-maritim>.
- Kausch, K., 2014. Competitive Multipolarity in the Middle East. IAI, Washington, <http://www.iai.it/sites/default/files/iaiwp1410.pdf>
- Khoo, N. and M.L. Smith, 2002. The future of American hegemony in the Asia-Pacific: A concert of Asia or a clear pecking order?. *Aust. J. Intl. Affairs*, 56: 65-81.
- Ministry of Maritime Affairs and Fisheries of the Republic of Indonesia, 2015. Promising potential marine sector Indonesia. Press Publication, Indonesia. <http://kkp.go.id/pers/potensi-sektor-kelautan-indonesia-menjanjikan/>.
- Mirzayan, G., 2016. Three Answers of Vladimir Putin. Moscow Public Library, Moscow,.
- NATO., 2012. Structure and Tasks. RIA Novosti, Moscow, Russia,.
- Nakhoul, S., 2015. Participation of Saddam Hussein's loyalists in enlarging ISIS in Iraq. CNN Indonesia, Indonesia,.
- TAWAN, 2016. Taiwan Embassy-Republic of China. Taiwanese Publishers, Taipei, Taiwan,.
- Tatarinov, A., 2015. Putin has Already Warned the World in 2007. VZGLYAD, Moscow, Russia,.
- Tsygankov, A.P., 2009. Russia in Global Governance: Multipolarity or Multilateralism?. In: *Contemporary Global Governance: Multipolarity vs New Discourses on Global Governance*, Dries, L. and P. Vercauteren (Eds.). Peter Lang Publisher, Bern, Switzerland, pp: 51-62.
- Tsygankov, P.A., G.A. Drobot and M.M. Lebedeva, 2008. *International Relations: Theories, Conflicts, Movements, Organizations*. Moscow Public Library, Moscow, Russia,.