

International Conference on Research Paradigms Transformation in Social Sciences 2014

Russia's new engineering policy in global politics

Anna Karpova^a*, Dmitry Karpov^b, Yuriy Kruchkov^b

^a Department of Philosophy, Institute of Humanities, Social Sciences and Technologies, National Research Tomsk Polytechnic University, Lenin Avenue 30, 634050 Tomsk, Russia

^b Department of General Physics, Physical-Technical Institute, National Research Tomsk polytechnic university, Lenin Avenue 30, 634050 Tomsk, Russia

Abstract

In this study, the authors give a definition, basis and description of a new conceptual metaphor “solid power”. The main hypothesis of the authors is based on the fact that the American concepts of soft and smart power allow to build doctrines, strategies and scenarios that support for ideological formation of policy “hard power” veiled under the idea of promoting the “model” of American democracy and the justification of military intervention and economic pressure on other countries, with the voluntary consent / participation of citizens. The United States are rapidly losing their political credibility in the international arena. De facto: the impetus for this was the events in Ukraine, which exposed the weak points in the American law enforcement scenarios. The authors believe that Russia is pursuing a new script, based on “solid power” as a new form of political power, the basis of which is the: dialogue, trust, unity. The authors came to the conclusion that Russia by using such resource as “solid power” is able to withstand “hard power”, that is the power that actually became a legitimate tool of American foreign policy.

© 2015 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>).

Peer-review under responsibility of Tomsk Polytechnic University.

Keywords: Hard power, soft power, smart power, solid power, technology failures, scripts, doctrine, concept, strategy, conflict, Ukraine, Russia, USA;

1. Introduction

Political modernization of the world's state in the arena of a struggle for Ukraine creates a point of no return to the old model of existence. In the face of increasing global geopolitical fight of the leaders for their interests the dominant role played by information and psychological influence. The most important resource of government, which allows to realize the function of controlling such influence is power.

The word power itself is polysemantic as a concept and polyaspect as a phenomenon it denotes. From the point of view of physics, mechanical power is the product of an action (force) on an object and the resulting velocity of

* Anna Karpova Tel.: +7-913-850-77-90
E-mail address: belts@tpu.ru

the object. In English, the word “power” has many definitions, such as an impact, force and strength. In political discourse, the concept of force is used as a conceptual metaphor, which includes a specific set of attributes. These are the transformation occurred with the concept of force as a result of use in political discourse such phrases as “hard power”, “soft power”, “smart power”. During the evolution of meaning of power as a political form the expressions gained the meaning of conceptual metaphors (Lakoff G., Johnson M., 2003). Conceptual metaphor can be properly understood when its interpretation is simple and obvious. That is, in these phrases the emphasis is not on power literary, because, in the physical sense, the power can be neither hard nor soft, nor clever, but on expressions of power as political term, which can be described using the notation of metaphorical attributes. To fully understand the meaning of hard, soft and smart power one must take into account the specifics of the political discourse at a time, which can not be seen in isolation from the economic, political and cultural life of the country and society as a whole.

Events in Ukraine revealed the weak points in the American law enforcement scenarios. A situation in which the old scripts to justify political actions of the American administration have become unusable, and the new has not been written yet. The collision occurred as a result of inconsistent, counter-productive decisions of the Obama’s administration, which were not backed by real political actions at the time of the rapid developments of the situation in Ukraine. But since in any scenario, the collision should be resolved, a new powerful and transformative power was required.

The purpose of this paper is to provide justification of the new Russian political engineering, which may be manifested by means of the conceptual metaphor “solid power” proposed by authors.

2. Three forces of the American bluff

Conceptual metaphor hard power based on military pressure and economic coercion was introduced into the political vocabulary as opposed to soft power. The predecessor of this concept was the conceptual metaphor of “suppressing power”, better known as the “Powell Doctrine”. Colin Powell began his career in 1987 as a National Security Advisor in the Reagan administration, continued in the George H.W. Bush administration, Clinton’s administration and finished in 2005 in the position of Secretary of State under George W. Bush.

Powell predicted that the warming in the international relations between the United States and the Soviet Union began with the Strategic Offensive Reductions Treaty will inevitably lead to a reduction of the United States army, reduction of the military budget and the reformation of the “war machine”. Hence he and his team developed a project, part of which was the doctrine of “suppressing power”. The idea was to use the “large-scale military intervention in the resolution of regional conflicts” (Powell , 1990) in order to expand and strengthen the influence of the United States in various regions of the world. To the great satisfaction of the Republican administration George W.H. Bush success of military reform was clearly confirmed in the war in the Persian Gulf (1991), but has been criticized for the huge expenses for military purposes by the Democrats during the administration of Bill Clinton. One of the most ardent opponents of Powell, Defense Minister L. Espin proposed his project of fundamental changes in the military and foreign policy, part of which was the concept of “limited purpose” (1992). He suggested making the emphasis on the ideological component of foreign policy by democratic values. We can say that this idea was the impetus to the design of the new concept of “soft power”.

Undoubtedly, a huge role in the formulation of a new scenario has played a major foreign geostrategist of the United States Zbigniew Brzezinski and his idea of a rigid unipolarity dressed in “democratic clothing”. The doctrine of “world leadership” created by Brzezinski in 1990s was used to mask tough actions of the United States and was ideologically framed by the spread of democratic values. As a support he highlighted the dominant factors which will ensure the promotion of American world domination: military, economic, technological, cultural. Since political power based on the “hard power” needed an “update” therefore a new attractive power based on moral authority was required. Proof of this is the words of Brzezinski: “The superpower is a country that is in a position to influence or control events anywhere in the world, that is, on a

global scale. This influence or control is carried out by military means where necessary and by economic, diplomatic and political means where this is possible” (Bzhezinskij , 2014).

Purely practical concept of “soft power” proposed by the American political scientist, expert in the field of international relations Joseph Nye was perfected for nearly 15 years, from the late 1980s, when it was introduced in the political text as the term “soft power”, and until the issue of the book “Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics” in 2004 (Nye, Joseph, 2004).

The concept of soft power in general is based on three components: cultural, values, political. The ability to combine all these achievements allows you to build doctrines, strategies and scenarios for the maintenance of American power with voluntary consent / participation of citizens.

According to Nye “soft power” has unlimited possibilities in the field of information and psychological techniques. By focusing on the fact that “soft power” is significantly different from the instruments of economic and military power he proposes to consider it as the ability to shape the preferences of others. Moreover, the concept of soft dominant influence to change people's behaviour in accordance to own interests is based on the manipulation of information and the transformation of meaning. Nye writes: “in the information age, the state (or the nonstate actor) with the best story may sometimes win” (Joseph S. Nye Jr. Essay, 2010).

The American policy of “spreading democracy” around the world went through insignificant transformation at the end of XX, beginning of the XXI century: the Clinton doctrine “expansion of democracy”, the radical doctrine of George W. Bush based on the principle of the priority of power over law (author’s note: policy of preemptive action / right to preventing strikes), and now the policy of Obama, sharpened to a tough defence of national interests, reflects a continuation of the fundamental principles and conceptual foundations of the foreign policy of the United States. Strong ideological foundation of this course, the base of which is the use of hard power, which found justification in the soft power and “has created a temptation to remake the world in the American way and likeness” (Kissinger , 1994).

The scenario of soft power was not convincing justification of the United States foreign policy, because, as Nye himself says “many of the traditional tools of soft power, such as public participation and diplomacy, has been neglected, and so they fell into disrepair” (Joseph S. Nye Jr., 2014). Not finding the necessary support in American society the interventionist policy pursued by George W. Bush has required a new justification for the maintenance of military intervention in Iraq (2003), the initiation and support of the conflict between Georgia and South Ossetia / Abkhazia, expanding missile defence system in Europe and other aggressive activities. During this time, the contours of a new scenario about which Nye said, “to succeed it requires a new strategy and new tools, one of which could become a “smart power” (Joseph S. Nye Jr., 2014).

Concept of “smart power” includes hard power of coercion and soft power of voluntary participation (Joseph S. Nye Jr., 2006). It is closer to the realms of the foreign policy of the United States and brings together two powers seemingly incompatible up to this point: the hard and the soft power.

Conceptual metaphor of “smart power” has become firmly established in the political speech much later than it was stated by Nye (2007). It was brought to wider public thanks to Hillary Clinton in 2009. During the Senate hearings of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the essence of a new form of political power was clearly formulated by her: “With smart power, diplomacy will be the vanguard of foreign policy” (Clinton , 2006). According to her, choosing the right combination of tools of smart power: diplomatic, economic, military, political, legal and cultural would allow “to revitalize the mission of diplomacy in American foreign policy” (Clinton , 2006).

In itself, the formation of a new concept of smart power can be regarded as a positive factor, which verbally indicates a change in the form of foreign authorities in the United States. Indicative of this is Nye’s quote: “A smart-power narrative for the twenty-first century is not about maximizing power or preserving hegemony. It is about finding ways to combine resources in successful strategies in the new context of power diffusion and “the rise of the rest” (Joseph S. Nye Jr. Essay, 2010). But, in fact the power scenario and ways to implement it by Barack Obama’s administration is not substantially different from its predecessors. In his book “The Audacity of

Hope: Thoughts on the revival of the American dream,” he said the United States does not intend to abandon “the role of sheriff” and retain the right of the world leader. In principle Obama is talking about the formation of the same military scenario, “we need to review the basis of foreign policy, which is comparable to the courage and coverage with the postwar political concepts of Truman and opportunities of the new millennium, such a framework that will direct the use of power and express our most daring and deepest ideals and beliefs” (Obama , 2008).

In our view it is no exaggeration to say that the essence of the continuity of American foreign policy, regardless of what the president at a particular time is in power (Republican or Democrat) became the concepts of hard, soft and smart power. Great American bluff of promotion of concepts of nonexistent powers was created to mask the current position of authorities at the end of XX century. It started during the reign of George H.W. Bush (1989-1993) with the policy of building a new world order, in which “various nations are drawn together in common cause to achieve the universal aspirations of mankind - peace and security, freedom and the rule of law”(Bush , 1991).

In fact, foreign policy strategy at that time was a new militaristic scenario that began with the direct use of armed forces: military intervention in Panama, the suppression of the revolution in the Philippines (1989), the “Desert Storm” (1990-1991) and others military operations under the slogan of “spreading democracy”. The statement by George H.W. Bush that the United States “is the only country in the world that can gather strength in the world. This is the burden of leadership and power that made America a lighthouse of freedom in the search for peace” (Bush , 1991) has formed the basis of a new foreign policy doctrine.

The described above leads to the conclusion that the scenario of soft and smart power are the tricks of the American politicians that are created by “converting power resources in the desired results” (Joseph S. Nye Jr. Essay, 2010). By relying on the instruments of soft and smart power under the cover of democratic role of the arbitrator the United States invade the affairs of other countries, using “hard power”. We can say that the lack of convincing policy targeted application of soft and smart power led the United States to gradually descending its potential.

3. Russia’s new engineering policy

We believe that the formation of a new political engineering occurred due to the crisis of political power in the United States, and due to the lack of adequate and effective strategic resource power in current realities. No exaggeration to say that over the past 20 years, the United States policy of force led to the crash in international relations and in particular to a new Cold War between America and Russia. In a statement, the Russian Foreign Ministry on July 17, 2014 emphasized: “If Washington is trying to bring down the Russian-American relations, it will be on his conscience. We have been and remain open to constructive cooperation with all countries, including the United States, on the principles of equality, non-interference in internal affairs and real consideration of the interests of each other” (Russian MID, 2014).

The outlines of a new concept of Russian foreign policy, in our opinion most accurately described by the Russian philosopher, sociologist, political scientist Alexander Dugin. “This is a strategy that explains the past and captures the course for the future. Russia embarked on the establishment of a multipolar world ... in the global geopolitical, strategic, ideological, cultural, civilizational sense” (Dugin , 2014). The essence of this strategy is detailed in the Putin’s “Valdai doctrine” (Putin , 2013). We only emphasize that the Russian President outlined a new vector of foreign policy in which the “key decisions should be worked out on a collective basis, rather than at the discretion of and in the interests of individual countries or groups of countries ... international law should be applied, not the law of the strong” (Putin , 2013).

Almost half a century ago, a prominent thinker of the XX century, Arnold Toynbee said the prophetic words that are now a priory confirming the solid power of Russia in the new world order: “Russia was the first non-

Western country who dared to bravely confront the modern West, and do not miss the opportunity to beat him at his own game having mastered Western arms and learn to use it better than its Western inventors”.

Just a decade ago, Russia was engaged in defense policy, which was limited only to reactions on incoming “challenges” from the West and the United States. Since the end of the Russo-Georgian war, it became clear that Russia is returning to “big politics” as strong, independent and ready to defend its interests country. Putin has proved that Russia is restoring its influence in the world and made the world community to deal with its position. But ignore of the American administration of quite convincing and reasonable demands from Russia to present Kiev authorities, the lack of interest in the diplomatic agreements on terms of mutual concessions and compromises actually brought Ukraine closer to civil war. It is clear that in the foreseeable future Obama's policies aimed at confrontation will only worsen the chaos, social and economic crisis in Ukraine and in the end, will lead to a new social riots, and possibly a new “Maidan”. It should be emphasized that in this situation, Russia has refused to play by the rules imposed around the world by the United States demonstrated the power that can dramatically change the entire system of international relations. Indicator of this new, solid power is the growing reluctance of the international community to line up in order of size in the “world barracks” of the United States. In fact, this is confirmed by the fact that the attempt made by the United States to impose to the European Community the power scenario directed against Russia did not lead to any serious consequences because there are no real levers of influence of America to achieve full economic and political isolation of Russia. Unipolar world model is no longer acknowledged.

We believe that Russia is pursuing a new scenario which is defined as “solid power”. We use the definition of solid as a metaphorical attribute of power, as in Russian and English this concept has a similar interpretation: credible, compelling, significant, influential.

In its most general form, by “solid power” we mean a new form of political power, the basis of which is the: dialogue, trust, unity. Let us briefly explain what we mean by these terms.

- Dialogue, as a form of communication in which the participants come to a consensus of communication (understanding and coherence of actions) as a result of discussions with the help of strong, justified, compelling arguments, and not by military or economic strength. The main principles of this dialogue are the equality and respect for any of the parties.
- Trust as a form of influence on the world community, which implies openness to cooperation, willingness to follow international laws, the desire to take into account the interests of the partners.
- Unity as a form of communication aimed at uniting, strengthening ties, rapprochement between participants in the dialogue, based on mutual trust.

Solid power aimed at creating a positive image of Russia in the international arena, relying not on pressure, but on conviction. In our opinion the indicator of solid power is the ability of the President of the Russian Federation to respond to the demand of the time and expand its policy to reflect changes in reality.

4. Conclusion

“There is only one measure of power is the people's trust. No other measure exists. Everything else is an illusion of power, and it is a very dangerous illusion” (Putin , 2007). By this quote from an interview with Putin for Time magazine in December 2007 we would like to identify a resource by which he gained recognition in the international arena. XX century went by the scenario, which the United States has imposed over the world: political expansion of the “model” of American democracy through a policy of hard power. Its destructive power is fully experienced by most people on the planet. The only force that tried to resist it was the policy of “peaceful coexistence” pursued by the Soviet Union. Along with the collapse of the Soviet Union the possibility to balance the expansion of the power of the United States has disappeared. As a result, at the end of XX and beginning of XXI century, the world was on the edge of a humanitarian catastrophe. Concepts of soft and smart power became

the cover of the hard power scenario of the United States, but were not able to provide American policy credibility in the international arena. “Rocket-bomb democracy” (a term of Vladimir Putin) has lost its power in today's multipolar world. We believe an objective tendency that a new power emerged in Russia.

References

- Lakoff G., Johnson M. (2003) *Metaphors We Live By*. London: University of Chicago Press, 276 p.
- Powell C. (1991) Statement of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Crisis in the Persian Gulf. U.S. Policy Options and Implications. Hearings bef. the Senate Comm. On the Armed Services. 101st Congr. 2nd Sess., Sept., Nov.-Dec. 1990. Wash., 1991. P. 663.
- Bzhezinskij Z. (2014) URL: http://www.e-reading.ws/chapter.php/1020487/29/Polikarpov_-_Bzhezinskiy_Sdelat_Rossiyu_peshkoy.html (accessed 23/05/2014).
- Nye, Jr., Joseph S. (2004) *Soft power: the means to success in world politics*. Publik Affairs. New York. Political Science, 191 p.
- Joseph S. Nye Jr. (2010) Essay. The Future of American Power. Foreign Affairs, No 6, 2010. Council on Foreign Relations, Inc. URL: <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/issues/2010/89/6> (accessed 21/05/2014).
- Kissinger H. (1994) *Diplomacy*. Simon & Schuster INC, New York, 1994. 912 p.
- Joseph S. Nye Jr. How America can become a smarter power. Smart Power Initiative. Center for Strategic and International Studies. CSIS (Commission on Smart Power). New York. URL: http://csis.org/files/media/csis/pubs/071106_csissmartpowerreport.pdf (accessed 05/06/2014).
- Joseph S. Nye Jr. (2006) In Mideast, the goal is 'smart power'. American daily newspaper Boston Globe. Published 19/08/2006.
- Clinton H. (2009) Use “Smart Power” In Diplomacy. CBSNEWS. 13.01.2009. URL: <http://www.cbsnews.com/news/clinton-use-smart-power-in-diplomacy/> (accessed 7/05/2014).
- Obama B. (2008) Audacity of hope: the myth of the rebirth of the American Dream. SPb.: “Azbuka-klassika”, 416 p.
- Bush G. (1991) Address bef. the Joint Sess. of the Congress on the State of the Union. 29.01.1991. URL: <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=19253> (accessed 10/05/2014).
- Russian MID. URL: http://www.mid.ru/brp_4.nsf/newsline/25A2BD25E3B202BD44257D1800253CCB (accessed 17/07/2014).
- Dugin A. URL: http://ruskline.ru/opp/2014/04/24/my_uvideli_nastoyawego_putina_kotoryj_prishel_k_russkoj_istine/ (accessed 25/04/2014).
- Putin V.V. (2013). URL: <http://www.rg.ru/2013/09/26/valdai.html> (accessed 27/09/2013).
- Putin Q&A: Full Transcript. Time. URL: http://content.time.com/time/specials/2007/personoftheyear/article/0,28804,1690753_1690757_1695787-10,00.html (accessed 11/07/2014).