
ВОПРОСЫ ВЫПУСК 10(86), 2022 ПОЛИТОЛОГИИ

Научный журнал

Журнал «Вопросы политологии» включен
в Перечень рецензируемых научных изданий
ВАК при Министерстве науки и высшего образования РФ
по политическим наукам, в которых должны быть опубликованы
основные научные результаты на соискание ученой степени
кандидата наук, на соискание ученой степени доктора наук

Журнал включен в Перечень научных изданий
рекомендованных ВАК Республики Узбекистан
для публикации основных научных результатов диссертаций
по политическим и философским наукам

МОСКВА, 2022

ВОПРОСЫ ПОЛИТОЛОГИИ

Научный журнал

ISSN 2225–8922

Журнал включен
в Перечень ВАК РФ

Учрежден

ООО «Издательство
«Наука сегодня»

Журнал зарегистрирован
Федеральной службой
по надзору в сфере массовых
коммуникаций, связи и охраны
культурного наследия

Рег. № ПИ № ФС77–46176
от 12 августа 2011 г.

Журнал издается ежемесячно

Журнал включен в базу РИНЦ
(Российский индекс
научного цитирования)

Включен в каталог
Ulrich's Periodicals Directory
Пятилетний
импакт-фактор журнала: 0, 376

Адрес редакции:
115598, г. Москва, ул. Загорьевская,
д. 10, корп. 4, цокольный этаж,
помещение 1, комната 7-1, офис 4
Тел.: (910) 463-53-42

Интернет-ресурс:
www.voprospolitolog.ru
E-mail: voprospolitolog@yandex.ru

Мнение авторов может
не совпадать с мнением редакции.
При перепечатке ссылка
на журнал обязательна.

Научные статьи, публикуемые
в журнале подлежат обязательному
рецензированию.

Ответственный редактор
Шкурина С.С.

Перевод
Чернышова Е.В.
Компьютерная верстка
Загуменов А.П.

Подписано в печать 26.10.2022
Формат 60×84/8. Объем 50,5
Печать офсетная.
Тираж – 1000 экз.
(1-й завод – 500 экз.)
Заказ № 736

Отпечатано в типографии
ООО «Белый ветер»
115054, г. Москва, ул. Щипок, 28
Тел.: (495) 651-84-56

Председатель Редакционного Совета – ПЛАТОНОВ В.М.,
к.ю.н., заведующий кафедрой политического анализа и управления РУДН,
Председатель Московской городской Думы (1994–2014 гг.)

Редакционный Совет

АВАЗОВ Камиль Халиевич	д.ф. (PhD) по полит. наукам, Региональный центр переподготовки и повышения квалификации работников народного образования Сурхандарьинской области (Узбекистан, г. Ташкент)
АСТВАЦАТУРОВА Майя Арташесовна	д.п.н., профессор, Пятигорский государственный университет (Россия, г. Пятигорск)
БЛОХИН Владимир Владимирович	д.и.н., профессор, РУДН (Россия, г. Москва)
БОЖАНОВ Владимир Александрович	д.и.н., профессор, Белорусский Национальный технический университет (Белоруссия, г. Минск)
ВАНКОВСКА Билиана	профессор политологии и международных отношений факультета философии Университета Святых Кирилла и Мефодия (Македония, г. Скопье)
ВЕЛИКАЯ Наталья Михайловна	д.п.н., профессор, ИСПИ ФНИСЦ РАН, РГТУ (Россия, г. Москва)
ГОНЧАРОВ Пётр Константинович	д.с.н., профессор, Российский университет транспорта (МИИТ) (Россия, г. Москва)
ГРАЧЁВ Михаил Николаевич	д.п.н., профессор, РГТУ (Россия, г. Москва)
ДЭМБЭРЭЛ К.	доктор (PhD), Институт международных отношений АН Монголии (Монголия, г. Улан-Батор)
ЖИЛЫЦОВ Сергей Сергеевич	д.п.н., профессор, Дипломатическая академия МИД РФ (Россия, г. Москва)
КАРАДЖЕ Татьяна Васильевна	д.ф.н., профессор, МПГУ (Россия, г. Москва)
КАССАЕ НЫГУСИЕ В. МИКАЭЛЬ	д.и.н., профессор, РУДН (Россия, г. Москва)
КОВАЛЕНКО Валерий Иванович	д.ф.н., профессор, МГУ им. М.В. Ломоносова (Россия, г. Москва)
КОМЛЕВА Валентина Вячеславовна	д.с.н., профессор, РАНХиГС при Президенте РФ (Россия, г. Москва)
КРИБОКАПИЧ Борис	д.ю.н., Унион–Никола Тесла университет (Сербия, г. Белград)
МЕДВЕДЕВ Николай Павлович	д.п.н., профессор, главный редактор журнала (Россия, г. Москва)
МИХАЙЛОВ Вячеслав Александрович	д.и.н., профессор, РАНХиГС при Президенте РФ (Россия, г. Москва)
НАЗАРОВА Елена Александровна	д.с.н., профессор, МГИМО МИД России (Россия, г. Москва)
НАЗАРОВ Александр Данилович	д.и.н., профессор, МАИ (Россия, г. Москва)
НАСИМОВА Гульнара Орденбаевна	д.п.н., профессор, Казахский Национальный университет им. Аль-Фараби (Казахстан, г. Алматы)
НИСЕНВИЧ Юлий Анатольевич	д.п.н., профессор, НИУ «Высшая школа экономики» (Россия, г. Москва)
ОРЛОВ Игорь Борисович	д.и.н., профессор, НИУ «Высшая школа экономики» (Россия, г. Москва)
ПАХРУТДИНОВ Шукритдин Ильясович	д.п.н., профессор, Институт переподготовки и повышения квалификации руководителей и специалистов системы народного образования имени А. Авлонии (Узбекистан, г. Ташкент)
ПЛЯЙС Яков Андреевич	д.и.н., д.п.н., профессор, Финансовый университет при Правительстве РФ (Россия, г. Москва)
ПРЯХИН Владимир Федорович	д.п.н., профессор, РГТУ (Россия, г. Москва)
ПУСЬКО Виталий Станиславович	д.ф.н., профессор, ВА РВСН им. Петра Великого (Россия, г. Москва)
РУБАН Лариса Семёновна	д.с.н., профессор, отдел исследования проблем международного сотрудничества Института социально-политических исследований ФНИСЦ РАН (Россия, г. Москва)
СЛИЗОВСКИЙ Дмитрий Егорович	д.и.н., профессор, РУДН (Россия, г. Москва)
СЫЗДЫКОВА Жибек Сапарбековна	д.и.н., профессор, ИСАА МГУ им. М.В. Ломоносова (Россия, г. Москва)
ХОПЕРСКАЯ Лариса Львовна	д.п.н., профессор, Киргизско-Российский славянский университет (Киргизия, г. Бишкек)
ШАРКОВ Феликс Изосимович	д.с.н., профессор, РАНХиГС при Президенте РФ (Россия, г. Москва)
ЯН ФУЛИНЬ	проректор Хэйлунцзянского института иностранных языков (КНР, г. Харбин)

Редакционная коллегия

Главный редактор – МЕДВЕДЕВ Н.П., д.п.н., профессор

Абрамова О.Д. (д.п.н.)

Кетягин Г.В. (к.п.н. – зам. гл. редактора)

Насимова Г.О. (д.п.н.)

Шкурина С.С. (к.п.н. – ответ. редактор)

ISSN 2225-8922 (print)

12 выпусков в год и

4 выпуска в год переводной (англ.) версии

Языки: русский, английский

<http://voprosplitolog>

Входит в перечень рецензируемых научных изданий ВАК РФ

Включен в каталог периодических изданий Ульрих (Ulrich's Periodicals Directory: <http://www.ulrichsweb.com>)

Материалы журнала размещаются на платформе РИНЦ Российской научной электронной библиотеки, Electronic Journals Library Cyberleninka

Подписной индекс издания в каталоге агентства Роспечать 70035

Цели и тематика

Журнал ВОПРОСЫ ПОЛИТОЛОГИИ – периодическое международное рецензируемое научное издание в области политических исследований. Журнал является международным как по составу редакционного совета и редколлегии, так и по авторам и тематике публикаций.

Научный журнал издается с 2011 года в издательстве «Наука сегодня». С 2016 года издается переводная (англ.) версия журнала. С момента своего создания, журнал ориентировался на высокие научные и этические стандарты и сегодня является одним из ведущих политологических журналов России.

Цель журнала – способствовать научному обмену и сотрудничеству между российскими и зарубежными политологами.

Журнал предназначен для публикации результатов фундаментальных и прикладных научных исследований. Тематическая направленность журнала отражается в следующих постоянных рубриках: «История и философия политики», «Политические институты, процессы и технологии», «Политическая регионалистика и этнополитика», «Политическая культура и идеологии», «Политические проблемы международных отношений и глобализации».

Формат публикаций: научные статьи, обзорные научные материалы, материалы круглых столов, научные рецензии, научные сообщения, посвященные исследовательским проблемам в сфере политики и политологии.

В своей деятельности редакционный совет и редколлегия журнала руководствуется принципами, определяемыми ВАК России для научных журналов, в том числе: наличие института рецензирования для экспертной оценки качества научных статей; информационная открытость издания; наличие и соблюдение правил и этических стандартов представления рукописей авторами.

Целевой аудиторией журнала являются российские и зарубежные специалисты-политологи, а также аспиранты и магистры, обучающиеся по направлениям политология, государственное и муниципальное управление и международные отношения.

Журнал строго придерживается международных стандартов публикационной этики, обозначенных в документе *COPE (Committee on Publication Ethics)* <http://publicationethics.org>

Полные сведения о журнале и его редакционной политике, требования о подготовке и публикации статей, архив (выпуски с 2011 года) и дополнительная информация размещена на сайте: <http://voprosplitolog.ru>

Электронный адрес: voprosplitolog@yandex.ru

ISSN 2225-8922 (print)

12 issues a year plus

4 issues a year of the translated (eng.) version

Languages: Russian and English

<http://voprosplitolog>

Included in the list of peer-reviewed scientific publications of the Higher Attestation Commission of the Russian Federation

Included in the Ulrich's Periodicals Directory

Materials of the journal are placed on the RSCI platform of the Russian scientific electronic library – Electronic Journals Library Cyberleninka

Subscription index of the journal in the Rospechat Agency catalogue is: 70035

Objectives and themes

Academic journal “Political Science Issues” is an international peer-reviewed scientific periodical in the field of political studies. The journal has an international character because of the composition of its Editorial Board, its editors, its contributing authors and topics of its publications.

The scientific journal is published since 2011 at the “Publishing House “Science Today”. Translated (eng.) version of the journal is published since 2016. Since its inception, the journal was guided by high scientific and ethical standards and today it is one of the leading political science journals in Russia.

The purpose of the journal is to promote scientific exchange and cooperation between Russian and foreign political scientists.

The journal is intended for the publication of the results of fundamental and applied scientific research. Thematic focus of the journal is reflected in the following permanent headings: “History and philosophy of politics,” “Political institutions, processes and technologies,” “Political regionalism and ethno-politics,” “Political culture and ideologies,” “Political problems of international relations and globalization.”

Format of publications: scientific articles, reviews, scientific materials, materials of round tables, scientific reviews, scientific reports devoted to research problems in the field of politics and political science.

The Editorial Board and the editors of the journal in their activities are guided by the principles defined by VAK of Russia for scientific journals, including: presence of the institute of peer review for the expert quality assessment of scientific articles; information openness of the publications; availability and compliance with the rules and ethical standards for the submission of manuscripts by the authors.

The target audience of the journal is Russian and foreign specialists-political scientists, as well as graduate students and masters in the fields of political science, state and municipal management and international relations.

The journal strictly adheres to the international publishing standards and publication ethics identified in the *COPE (Committee on Publication Ethics)* document. <http://publicationethics.org>.

Full details of the journal and its editorial policy, requirements to the preparation and publication of articles, archive (issues since 2011) and additional information are available on the website: <http://voprosplitolog.ru>

E-mail address: voprosplitolog@yandex.ru

СОДЕРЖАНИЕ

ИСТОРИЯ И ТЕОРИЯ ПОЛИТИКИ

Фурман Ф.П., Красильников С.В.

Глобализм и мультикультурность, их кризис 3208

Чемшиш Д.А. Политическая модернизация

как объект научного исследования 3220

ПОЛИТИЧЕСКАЯ СОЦИОЛОГИЯ

Рязанцев С.В., Брагин А.Д.

Трансформация мотивов и трендов эмиграции россиян 3238

Шакур Е.Н.

Зарубежные исследования молодежи и студенчества:

краткий обзор формата и содержания 3249

Мирошников В.С.

Экстремизм и терроризм в современном обществе 3260

Ахпателов Б.Р., Давыдов Д.Р.

Представительство интересов общественных групп

в Российской Федерации 3270

ПОЛИТИЧЕСКИЕ ИНСТИТУТЫ, ПРОЦЕССЫ И ТЕХНОЛОГИИ

Мадюкова С.А.

Региональные особенности института

национальной политики в Республике Тыва 3276

Галиева С.И., Галиева Г.М.

Место профилактики преступности

в российском политическом пространстве

через призму посланий Президента РФ 3287

Емельянов А.И., Белова Л.Г.

Участие высококвалифицированных специалистов

в политическом информировании через интернет-пространство

в условиях информационного противоборства 3294

Волков А.В.

Воин света: информационная война

против фигуристки Камилы Валиевой

как символа народного объединения: политический аспект 3305

ГОСУДАРСТВЕННОЕ УПРАВЛЕНИЕ И ОТРАСЛЕВЫЕ ПОЛИТИКИ

Магадиев М.Ф.

Основные вопросы государственного управления в России
в области международного сотрудничества
в контексте проведения Специальной военной операции
на Украине 3323

Чепелюк С.Г.

Цифровое правительство как фактор развития
взаимодействия государства и бизнеса 3333

Самусева О.А.

Научно-технологическое направление
как приоритетное в развитии 3341

ТЕОРИЯ И ИСТОРИЯ МЕЖДУНАРОДНЫХ ОТНОШЕНИЙ И ВНЕШНЕЙ ПОЛИТИКИ

Джуракулов Ф.Н.

Реформа на принципе разделения государственной власти
и равновесия в Республике Узбекистан 3349

Родионова М.Е., Гималиев В.Г., Назарова Н.А.

Электоральные предпочтения населения Италии
накануне парламентских выборов 2022 г. 3358

Невмержицкий А.Л., Новоселов С.В., Хачатрян Д.А.

Политические процессы: вектор
на международное сотрудничество или противостояние 3373

Гузаеров Р.И.

Дипломатические отношения Турции
и Саудовской Аравии в 2015-2022 гг. 3380

Нечай А.А.

Шанхайская организация сотрудничества:
внутренние и внешние вызовы 3392

Козырева М.С.

От НАФТА к ЮСМКА: выгоды и потери участников 3403

Капустин А.С.

Сравнительный анализ медиа центров международной
террористической организации ДАИШ (запрещена в РФ) 3413

Ван Цунюэ

Влияние четвертой промышленной революции
на конфигурацию международной системы 3422

Гао Дай

Анализ основных проблем древней
китайской антикоррупционной системы 3431

Герлиц Г.

Система экономических связей России и Германии
в контексте их политического обеспечения..... 3444

Гу Сяоянь

Исследование китайской помощи в вопросах развития
в Юго-Восточной Азии 3453

Лиджиева К.Н.

Стратегия «глобальной Кореи» как фундамент политики
«средней державы» 3461

Лукин А.Д.

Арктическая дипломатия как разновидность
региональной дипломатии и особый вид
государственной политики в Арктике..... 3467

Лю Цзя, Ван Чжаосюй, Юэ Сыци

Влияние СМИ на формирование имиджа государства
(сравнительный анализ Китая и России) 3482

Матяшова Д.О., Михалевич Е.А.

Внутри- и межгосударственные конфликты и агрессивные
негосударственные акторы в Северо-Восточной Азии 3493

Телегин Д.С.

Роль арктического региона
в формировании проекта «Большая Евразия»..... 3503

Хорбаладзе Э.К.

US Indo-Pacific Strategy: Main Dimesnsions and Implications
for Russia/Индо-Тихоокеанская стратегия США:
основные положения и последствия для России 3509

Чу Чэнчэн

Гуманитарная политика КНР и США
в Центральной Азии в сфере образования 3519

Тимахов К.В.

NEOM: Transformation Project of Kingdom of Saudi Arabia/NEOM:
проект преобразования Королевства Саудовская Аравия 3530

Омонов Р.Р.

Опыт применения информационных технологий
в государственном управлении США и стран Западной Европы
и их влияние на модернизацию системы власти..... 3536

Аман С.

Современные вызовы и угрозы безопасности
для стран Центральной Азии 3544

СТУДЕНЧЕСКАЯ НАУКА

Мясников Д.С., Манапов С.Ш., Симакова В.К.

Сущность либеральной олигархии как проекта
эффективного политического устройства государства..... 3554

Костина А.Д., Ильинская К.Р., Пахмутов Н.Д.

Благоприятные прогнозы и «проблемные»
аспекты инициативы КНР «Один пояс – один путь» 3561

Баканина Д.А., Баранова Ю.В., Леонова А.А.

Экологическая повестка как средство реализации
научной дипломатии стран Запада и Российской Федерации
в арктическом регионе..... 3568

Никитина А.А.

Роль массовой коммуникации
в динамике взаимоотношений США и России 3577

НАШИ АВТОРЫ 3584

ТРЕБОВАНИЯ К ОФОРМЛЕНИЮ РУКОПИСЕЙ 3593

РЕДАКЦИОННЫЙ СОВЕТ 3595

Э.Л. ХОРБАЛАДЗЕ

аспирант факультета политологии
Московского государственного университета
им. М.В. Ломоносова; исследователь Центра Макмиллана
Йельского университета, Россия, г. Москва

ИНДО-ТИХООКЕАНСКАЯ СТРАТЕГИЯ США: ОСНОВНЫЕ ПОЛОЖЕНИЯ И ПОСЛЕДСТВИЯ ДЛЯ РОССИИ

На сегодняшний день глобальные интересы США полностью проецируются на Индо-Тихоокеанский регион и концепция Индо-Тихоокеанского региона становится основой для распространения американской стратегии «разворота и ребалансировки» на Индийский океан. Цель статьи – выявить как Индо-Тихоокеанская стратегия (ИТС) меняет стратегический баланс сил в регионе. Автор задает три основных вопроса: В чем суть Индо-Тихоокеанской стратегии? Как менялся подход к Индо-Тихоокеанскому региону при разных президентах США, начиная с Дж. Буша? Как ИТС влияет на интересы России в Индо-Тихоокеанском регионе? Для ответа на эти вопросы автор использовал многометодный характер исследования, в частности следующие методы: анализ документов, контент-анализ, структурированное, целенаправленное сравнение, системный анализ. Автор приходит к выводу, что, создавая практически с нуля архитектуру реализации своих интересов в Индо-Тихоокеанском регионе, США придерживаются гибкого подхода «нового регионализма». Это лучше всего скомпилировано через Индо-Тихоокеанскую стратегию США. Администрация Джорджа Буша-младшего понимала растущее значение Азии и тесно взаимодействовала с Китайской Народной Республикой (КНР), Японией и Индией. Администрация Обамы значительно ускорила приоритизацию Америки Азией, вложив туда новые дипломатические, экономические и военные ресурсы. Администрация Трампа также признала Индо-Тихоокеанский регион мировым центром притяжения. При президенте Байдене Соединенные Штаты полны решимости укреплять долгосрочные позиции и приверженность Индо-Тихоокеанскому региону. При этом Россия явно не приветствует Индо-Тихоокеанский регион как новую геополитическую конструкцию с военной составляющей, рассматривает QUAD как «азиатское НАТО», а АСЕАН считает предпочтительным азиатским региональным форматом. Однако будущее российской позиции будет

определяться развитием этого конструкта. Если возобладают региональные интерпретации Индо-Тихоокеанского региона, менее геополитические и конфронтационные, реакция России может быть гораздо менее согласованной.

Ключевые слова: Индо-Тихоокеанская стратегия, Азиатско-Тихоокеанский регион, трансрегиональная интеграция, концепция, США, Россия, QUAD.

E.L. KHORBALADZE

PhD student, Faculty of Political Science,
Moscow State University; Fox International Fellow (researcher),
MacMillan Center, Yale University,
Moscow, Russia

US INDO-PACIFIC STRATEGY: MAIN DIMENSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR RUSSIA

As for today the global interests of the United States are fully projected into the Indo-Pacific region, and the concept of the Indo-Pacific region becomes the basis for extending the American strategy of “reversal and rebalancing” to the Indian Ocean. The aim of the article is to detect how Indo-Pacific strategy (IPS) changes the strategic balance of power in the region. The author asks 3 main questions: What is the essence of Indo-Pacific strategy? How the approach towards Indo-Pacific region has changed during different US presidents since G.W. Bush? How IPS affects the interests of Russia in the Indo-Pacific region? To answer these questions author used the multimethod research design, particularly following methods: document analysis, content analysis, structured, focused comparison, system analysis. Author concludes that creating virtually from scratch an architecture for the realization of its interests in the Indo-Pacific region, the United States is adopting a flexible approach of “new regionalism”. This is best compiled through the US Indo-Pacific strategy. The George W. Bush Administration understood Asia’s growing importance and engaged closely with the People’s Republic of China (PRC), Japan, and India. The Obama Administration significantly accelerated American prioritization of Asia, investing new diplomatic, economic, and military resources there. The Trump Administration also recognized the Indo-Pacific as the world’s center of gravity. Under President Biden, the United States is determined to strengthen long-term position in and commitment to the Indo-Pacific. Meanwhile, Russia clearly unwelcomes the Indo-Pacific as a new geopolitical construct with military component, considers QUAD as “Asian NATO”, and sees ASEAN as the preferable Asian regional format. However, the

future of Russian position will be determined by the development of this construct. If regional interpretations of the Indo-Pacific prevail, less geopolitical and confrontational, Russia's reaction can be far less concerted.

Key words: *Indo-Pacific strategy, Asia-Pacific region, trans-regional integration, concept, US, Russia, QUAD.*

Introduction. The term “Indo-Pacific” itself has more than a century and a half history. In the middle of the 19th century the British scientist J. Logan suggested calling the Malay Archipelago the Indo-Pacific Islands [11]. The geopolitical meaning of the term was given by the famous German scientist, geopolitician Karl Haushofer [4]. However, after the defeat of Germany and Japan in the World War II, “Indo-Pacific” survived only in Australian foreign policy discourse. At the same time, Indo-Pacific region has firmly entered in the lexicon of oceanographers and marine biologists who discovered that many species of fish and marine animals live in both the Indian and Pacific oceans, while not meeting in the Atlantic, and historians who used the term “Indo-Pacific” to designate a specific type of early medieval beads. But what caused the revival of using the term in global affairs? To answer this question firstly it's necessary to reveal why the region attracts so big attention nowadays.

Importance of the Indo-Pacific region. Today a new arena of trade and economic competition is emerging in the vast Indo-Pacific region, the development of which will increasingly determine the path of the global economy. The Indian Ocean is the largest trade route connecting East Asian energy consumers with their suppliers in the Middle East. It is through the Indian Ocean that China, India, South Korea and Japan receive a significant part of their energy and other raw materials from the Near and Middle East and East Africa. It is through the Southern Sea Route, which runs through the Strait of Malacca, the Indian Ocean and the Suez Canal, that caravans pass ships from East Asia to Europe.

Another significant trend is the expansion of the area of security problems facing the countries of Pacific Asia to the states of the Indian Ocean basin. The region is becoming an object of military, political and economic rivalry between the world's major powers. What can be seen today – is beginning of great power competition in the region, of course, first of all between United States and China. The reason for US concern is the increase in China's activity in the Indian Ocean basin and creation in 2013 Belt and Road initiative. A significant part of the infrastructure projects within the framework of this initiative is again directed to the countries of the Indian Ocean.

Moreover, it's worth mentioning that of ten largest armies in the world, seven are located in this region, and six have nuclear weapons. Also, the role of regional powers and associations increase in the region, for example, ASEAN, and new

ones are created, for example, Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership (RCEP).

Emerging the Indo-Pacific framework. Since the mid-2000s, the idea of the Indo-Pacific Region (IPR) has been discussed in the world political discourse. This is due to the fact that at the turn of the 20th and 21st centuries the geopolitical connection between the Indian Ocean and the Western Pacific became more tangible both in the geo-economic aspect and in the sphere of security. As American geopolitician Robert Kaplan stated, in fact, the Indian Ocean region has become the central scene of the 21st century [6].

Contrary to what is often said, the Indo-Pacific concept is not an American invention. According to the Australian expert Rory Medcalf, the term “Indo-Pacific” goes back to the 1960s and even to the period of the colonial past. In Australia the reintroduction of the geostrategic term “Indo-Pacific” represented a rebirth of sorts. It was a descriptive term that has come full circle within the ranks of its foreign policy practitioners. The term “Indo-Pacific” was first uttered publicly at a seminar organized by the Defense Studies Project at The Australian National University (ANU) in 1964. But more actively in political discourse it is used since 2007. Similarly, as the term “Asia-Pacific” was introduced to wide audience by Japanese Foreign Minister Miki Takeo in 1967 (who thus tried to establish the idea that Japan belongs to two worlds - Asian, which meant Southeast and East Asia, and the Pacific, and substantiate the idea that Tokyo should play an important (primarily economic) role in both) [8], in 2007 Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe, speaking in the Indian Parliament, mentioned in his speech “Merging the Two Oceans” the “Dynamic Connection” of the Indian and Pacific Oceans and called for the creation of an “Arc of Freedom and Prosperity”, including in it not only countries of the East and Southeast, but also South Asia. In the same year Indian political scientist Gurpreet Khurana used the term in his article in the journal Strategic Analysis [7]. He wrote about the importance of security of sea routes for India, stressing that Japan is in the same position as India.

Starting around 2004, the George W. Bush Administration began to consider strengthening relations with allies in Asia and potentially revising U.S. doctrine and force posture in the region to improve U.S. capabilities.

In November 2011, US Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton wrote the article in Foreign Policy magazine, titled, “Amerika’s Pacific Century”, which announced and defined the new US strategic thinking toward the Asia-Pacific region [2]. However, upon closer reading, Secretary Clinton actually informs the reader that the Indian Ocean and the Pacific Ocean are inextricably linked economically and geopolitically.

Specifically, Secretary Clinton explains why America was refocusing its energies toward Asia-Pacific, but she also inadvertently describes the future importance of the Indo-Pacific region.

So, since 2010s, the concept of the “Indo-Pacific region” has become quite firmly entrenched in official documents, as well as in public speeches of the US and Australian government officials. In 2013 the term “Indo-Pacific” was included in the Defense White Paper published by the Australian government. In the United States the concept of “Indo-Pacific” (Indo-Pacific region) has been used since 2008 by the Obama administration, but quite rarely – American ex-president preferred to use the term Indo-Asia-Pacific region. But Obama administration's policy of “rebalancing towards the Asia-Pacific region” was, in fact, the prototype of the Indo-Pacific strategy. It included three pillars: security cooperation (military component), trade and finance (economic sphere) and diplomacy.

However, after Donald Trump came to office in 2016, the concept of the “Indo-Pacific region” became firmly established in the official documents, as it was the need of an ideological justification for the US policy in the Asian direction.

Thus, in Trump's administration's December 2017 National Security Strategy is stated, “A geopolitical competition between free and repressive visions of world order is taking place in the Indo-Pacific region” [12].

In June 2019, the Department of Defense published Indo-Pacific Strategy Report: Preparedness, Partnerships and Promoting a Networked Region [5]. There is mentioned that “The Indo-Pacific is the Department of Defense's priority theater.” The reason for this was described as, “the People's Republic of China, under the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party, seeks to reorder the region to its advantage by leveraging military modernization, influence operations, and predatory economics to coerce other nations.” The document underlined the importance to work more closely with “allies and partners” to counter the challenges.

In November 2019, the Department of State published the third foundational document, Free and Open Indo-Pacific: Advancing a Shared Vision. It emphasized working together with partners, highlighting “strategic partnership with India” to “address shared challenges and advance a shared vision”. Going further, it acknowledged that many countries in the region needed infrastructure development, a sector that China dominated with its BRI. Accordingly, the document described a series of infrastructure programs designed to offer partners alternatives. Compared to the Obama administration's policy, Trump administration's “Indo-Pacific” strategy focused more on the policy areas of security and defense.

In May 2021 was published “US Strategic Framework for the Indo-Pacific”, previously classified “secret” till 2042 [15]. It is assessed by experts as a kind of guarantee of the continuity of Washington's foreign policy line in the Asian direction. The document, as specified in the publication, was prepared in early 2018. It was used as main guidance by the US government in the region during the presidency of Trump. His National Security Adviser Robert O'Brien said the decision to declassify the strategy was intended to demonstrate the “strategic commitment” of the United States to a presence in the region and to the security

of Washington's allies and partners in Indo-Pacific region. The document provides for a tougher confrontation with China in the military and economic spheres. This might be negatively perceived by some Indo-Pacific region states and complicate their relations with the United States. The strategy outlines ways to expand military, intelligence and diplomatic assistance to India as the main counterbalance to China in the region.

Position of Russia and implications for it. In Russian political and academic discourse, various names of the new strategic construct for Indo-Pacific are used. High-level official statements use the terms “Indo-Pacific region”, “Indo-Pacific strategy”. Experts of think tanks (Valdai Club, Russian International Affairs Council, Council on Foreign and Defense Policy, etc.) prefer to designate the entire range of events related to the promotion of ideas about a new mega-region on the global agenda with the term “Indo-Pacific”.

At the official level, Russia has largely oscillated between expressing cautious concern and outright denying the emerging concept. Russia prefers the term “Asia-Pacific”, despite the fact that this term is just as “a made-up concept” as a new one (Indo-Pacific). For instance, Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov said, “Washington is trying to replace the Asia-Pacific region. It is done to explicitly “exclude” from the regional context Russia and China” [10]. Deputy Chairman of the Security Council of Russia Dmitry Medvedev noticed, “The United States, by promoting the concept of a “free and open Indo-Pacific region”, is trying to replace the “usual” format of Asia-Pacific cooperation, while Russia is for maintaining an effective system of interstate relations, which was formed on the basis of ASEAN and has proven itself over many years” [3]. The Secretary of the Russian Security Council Nikolai Patrushev pointed out, “QUAD is a prototype of the Asian analogue of NATO, a new military-political bloc with a pronounced pro-American character. And Washington will try to draw other countries into this organization, mainly to carry out anti-Chinese and anti-Russian policies” [13]. Minister of Defense of the Russian Federation Sergey Shoigu stressed, “The only way to ensure security in the Asia-Pacific is to take the interests of all the players in the region into account. We believe that the artificial expansion of the sphere of cooperation to the so-called Indo-Pacific region is aimed at creating dividing lines, creating tension among Asia-Pacific countries, and, ultimately, at restraining regional development” [14].

Based on statements Russia's official position on the Indo-Pacific region might be presented as follows:

- It is an artificially imposed concept;
- It is aimed at containing China;
- The concept of the Indo-Pacific region involves its division into blocks;
- The Indo-Pacific region is undermining the role of ASEAN.

The caution about the idea of Indo-Pacific region stems in large part from the specific formulation of the concept proposed by the United States, which

characterized China as a revisionist power and Moscow as a “resurgent hostile power” in 2019 Indo-Pacific Strategy Report. The US also sees itself engaged in “long-term strategic competition” with Russia and China. This raised concerns that the Indo-Pacific concept is a “multilateral” format, again aimed at containing China and Russia. Therefore, President Putin called for focusing on efforts to integrate existing mechanisms and concepts under the framework of the Greater Eurasian Partnership.

It's worth mentioning that Russia sees the main aim of Quad to counter China. Situation is complemented by creation of a new military bloc – AUKUS, the main result of which, as it is believed in Russia, is the actual withdrawal of the United States from the nuclear nonproliferation regime. However, it is not the eight nuclear submarines that Australia will receive, but most important is the technological possibility of their actions against Chinese and Russian submarines, as Russian experts view the main aim of this alliance.

To summarize why Moscow voiced such a harsh assessment towards Indo-Pacific strategy, could be distinguished at least two reasons. Firstly, the AUKUS-QUAD link Russia sees as a military threat to country, both directly to the territory of Russia and its Central Asian underbelly close to India, and to the Russian Navy in the waters attributed by Pentagon strategists to the Indo-Pacific region. Secondly, the special nature of Russian-Chinese relations, including in the sphere of security, requires Moscow to jointly take into account mutual concerns and, accordingly, take countermeasures. And just as in the case of European theater of operations, where the hypothetical admission of Ukraine and Georgia to NATO is considered a “red line”, so in the Indo-Pacific (Asia-Pacific) region, the mentioned expansion of QUAD to ASEAN will become the same “red line” to Russia.

Russia concerns about the America-centrism of the Indo-Pacific strategy. In broader terms, Russia does not want to face in Asia realities of economic and political opportunities being compromised by geopolitical arrangements disciplined by the United States. Thus, Russia has a negative attitude towards the processes of legalizing the Indo-Pacific construct in its American version at the international level, considering what is happening as attempts to break the previous balance of power in the region, undermine the central role of ASEAN, establish US military dominance and threaten regional security due to the confrontational nature of the project.

However, while Russia had argued that the concept of the Indo-Pacific region undermines the central role of ASEAN, the regional organization in June 2019 adopted its own vision of this concept, which is contrary to the understanding of Russia [1]. Such a position prevents Moscow from becoming an active participant in the extremely important ongoing regional debate, which increases its likelihood of missing the train and the subsequent need to “adapt to someone else's concept”. Russia's reservations may also stem from its limited influence as a maritime power, a traditional area to which it has paid little attention in the

post-Soviet period. This is due both to geography and to the perceived nature of the ground threats that Russia considers the most serious for its security. For example, on the issue of containing China, it is undeniable that regional states are increasingly questioning the peaceful nature of China's rise. But apart from the US, a number of other participants in the Indo-Pacific debate have carefully distanced themselves from attempts to confront China. In fact, two members of Quad (Japan, Australia) and ten ASEAN states decided to join the RCEP in November 2019, thus creating a close bond through a free trade agreement with each other and China. Japan expressed its willingness to join the Belt and Road Initiative, while India sought multilateral participation in the JAI (Japan, America, India) and RIC (Russia, India, China) formats at the same time.

As it was mentioned, political scientists express concern about the reactive position of Russia, which, in their opinion, may miss the chance to form and promote its own strategy in the new mega-region and will have to “adapt other concepts, hardly finding a place for Russia in an already structured picture of a region” [9].

But Russia's involvement in the Indo-Pacific is critical for the country. It's important because Russia's Indo-Pacific vision will have an impact on Eurasia, a piece of land that is central to Russia's positioning in a multipolar world. Russia understands the strategic importance of the region, in the direction of which the geopolitical and geo-economic development of the world is shifting. The vast maritime expanses of the Indo-Pacific region, any development in which will affect the Russian Far East and the Arctic, ensure that Russia cannot distance itself from such developments. The future of its economic growth is connected with developments in that region. The Arctic is geographically connected to the Indo-Pacific region by the Bering Strait. This means that ensuring the security of the Arctic should begin in the Pacific Ocean, directly in its northern part which is the area of responsibility of the Pacific Fleet, the development and strengthening of which should be given priority. In Greater Eurasia Arctic is destined the role of the eastern gate of Russia; in the Indo-Pacific region – the northern gate of the entire Indo-Pacific region through which the resources of the Arctic will go to Asia. The unique geopolitical position at the junction of sea and land, Greater Eurasia and the Indo-Pacific is something that can give a new impetus to the development of the Russian Far East. Under these conditions Russia needs its own concept of the Indo-Pacific region, connected with the concepts of ASEAN and India, in which the Far East would be considered as a special region.

How the situation with the Indo-Pacific region will turn out is still unclear and will depend on how various stakeholders react to the ongoing changes. Russia may decide to participate in the formation of the concept or stay away, but its actions will have an impact on its position in the Indo-Pacific region.

Conclusion. The concept of “Indo-Pacific” shows a trend towards the formation of a new regional architecture which is the result of an increase in trade flows,

industrial and investment ties in the area between the Indian and Pacific oceans. Today the term “Asia-Pacific” region is not able to reflect and cover the geopolitical and foreign policy goals of all main actors. The construct of the Asia-Pacific Region has become no longer entirely adequate to the processes that are taking place in Asia as a whole, especially in its southern and southeastern parts. The term is too vague (there is still debate about which countries should be included there), and it does not reflect the role that India has come to play in this region. And as in the second decade of the XXI century the geopolitical, geo-economic and military-strategic relationship between the Indian Ocean and the western part of the Pacific became obvious, the term “Indo-Pacific” is a relevant concept in modern strategic and geopolitical discourse.

In general, Indo-Pacific is not so much a new geopolitical idea, but a new geo-economic order. In fact, what is happening is the American response to the promise of Chinese leader Xi Jinping to become the guarantor of a new global economic order where the United States loses the status of a world leader.

What should the concept mean to Russia? As emphasized in the Foreign Policy Concept of the Russian Federation, global competition for the first time in modern history acquires a civilizational dimension, which implies competition between various value orientations and development models. So, Russia needs to develop its own vision on Indo-Pacific strategy with a strengthening geo-economic component of its foreign policy. But further development of Russia’s position toward the Indo-Pacific will very much be determined which – American-centered or regional – interpretations of the concept will prevail.

REFERENCES:

1. ASEAN Outlook on the Indo-Pacific. ASEAN official website // <https://asean.org/speechandstatement/asean-outlook-on-the-indo-pacific/>.
2. Clinton H. America’s Pacific Century. Foreign Affairs // <https://foreignpolicy.com/2011/10/11/americas-pacific-century/>.
3. Dmitry Medvedev's interview with the Bangkok Post newspaper. Russian Government // <http://government.ru/news/38265/>.
4. Hauser F. Karl Haushofer and the Rise of the Monsoon Countries, The Diplomat, 2015 // <https://thediplomat.com/2015/03/karl-haushofer-and-the-rise-of-the-monsoon-countries/>.
5. Indo-Pacific Strategy Report: Preparedness, Partnerships and Promoting a Networked Region. Department of Defense // <https://media.defense.gov/2019/Jul/01/2002152311/-1/-1/1/DEPARTMENT-OF-DEFENSE-INDO-PACIFIC-STRATEGY-REPORT-2019.PDF>.
6. Kaplan R. Center Stage for the Twenty-first Century. Power Plays in the Indian Ocean. Foreign Affairs // <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/east-asia/2009-03-01/center-stage-twenty-first-century>.

7. *Khurana G.* Security of Sea Lines: Prospects for India–Japan Cooperation. Strategic Analysis, 2007. Vol. 31, No. 1.

8. *Korhonen P.* The Pacific Age in World History. Journal of World History. 1996. Vol. 7. № 1.

9. *Kupriyanov A.* Indo-Pacific and Russia: do not miss your chance. Valdai club // <https://ru.valdaiclub.com/a/highlights/indo-patsifika-rossiya/>.

10. Lavrov: the concept of the Indo-Pacific region does not imply openness and equality. TASS // https://tass.ru/politika/11050135?utm_source=google.com&utm_medium=organic&utm_campaign=google.com&utm_referrer=-google.com.

11. *Logan J.* The Ethnology of the Indian Archipelago: Embracing Enquiries into the Continental Relations of the Indo-Pacific Islanders. Singapore, 1850.

12. National Security Strategy of the United States of America. The White House // <https://trumpwhitehouse.archives.gov/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/NSS-Final-12-18-2017-0905.pdf>.

13. Patrushev: QUAD and AUKUS are pro-American blocks directed against Russia and China. rg.ru // <https://www.dailyadvent.com/ru/news/809fb6d2ebdb896cebdba31abd24aebf>.

14. Shoigu commented on the US-led Indo-Pacific Initiative. RIA News // <https://ria.ru/20191021/1560009347.html>.

15. US Strategic Framework for the Indo-Pacific. The White House // <https://trumpwhitehouse.archives.gov/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/IPS-Final-Declass.pdf>.