

The National Union Of Political Scientists

POLITICAL ISSUE 1(25-26), 2017 SCIENCE ISSUES

Academic journal

MOSCOW, 2017

POLITICAL SCIENCE ISSUES

Academic journal

Nikolay P. MEDVEDEV,

Chairman of the Editorial Board, Doctor of Political Sciences,
Professor of Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Peoples' Friendship
University of Russia (RUDN University) (Russia, Moscow)

Editorial Board:

BOZHANOV Vladimir A.	Doctor of History Sciences, Professor, Head of the Chair of World and National Literature, Belorussia National Technical University (Belorussia, Minsk)
DONAJ Lukasz	Doctor of Political Sciences, Professor of Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań, Faculty of Political Science And Journalism, Department of International Relations (Poland, Poznań)
IRKHIN Yuri V.	Doctor of Philosophy Sciences, Professor, Chair of Politology and Political Administration, Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration (Russia, Moscow)
KARAGZE Tatiana V.	Doctor of Philosophy Sciences, Head of the Chair of Politology and Sociology of the Moscow State Pedagogical University (Russia, Moscow)
KOVALENKO Valery I.	Doctor of Philosophy Sciences, Head of the Chair of Russian Politics of the Moscow State Lomonosov University (Russia, Moscow)
KOSIKOV Igor G.	Doctor of History Sciences, Chief Researcher, Institute of Ethnology and Anthropology of the Russian Academy of Sciences (Russia, Moscow)
KRIVOKAPIC Boris	Doctor of Legal Sciences, Professor, Business and Law Faculty, University "Union – Nikola Tesla" (Serbia, Belgrade)
MIKHAILOV Vyacheslav A.	Doctor of History Sciences, Head of the Chair of National and Federative Relations of the Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration (Russia, Moscow)
NASIMOVA Gulnara O.	Doctor of Political Sciences, Professor, Head of the Chair of Politology, School of Philosophy and Politology, Kazakh National University named after El-Farabi (Kazakhstan, Almaty)
NISNEVICH Yuli A.	Doctor of Political Sciences, Professor, National Research University – Higher School of Economics (Russia, Moscow)
PAKHRUTDINOV Shukritdin I.	Doctor of Political Sciences, Professor, Head of Department "National interests and the stability of society" of the Academy of State and Social Construction under the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan (Tashkent, Uzbekistan)
PLYAYS Yakov A.	Doctor of History Sciences, Doctor of Political Sciences, Professor, Head of the Chair of Politology of the Finance University under the Government of the Russian Federation (Russia, Moscow)
PRYAKHIN Vladimir F.	Doctor of Political Sciences, Professor, Chair of World Politics and Foreign Relations, Russian State Humanitarian University (Russia, Moscow)
PUSKO Vitaliy S.	Doctor of Philosophy Sciences, Professor of the Chair of Politology, Moscow State Technical University named after N.E. Bauman (Russia, Moscow)
SALKIEWICZ- MUNNERLYN Ewa	Ph.D., MFA, Academy Andrzej Frycz Modrzewski (Poland, Krakow)
Olivier VEDRINE	Chief Editor of the Russian Edition of the French Review "Revue Défense Nationale", Speaker of the European Commission, Editor of the Franco-German Magazine on Foreign Politics "European Union Foreign Affairs Journal" and Rector of the Continental University in Kiev (France, Paris)

Editor-in Chief of the Review – Nikolay P. MEDVEDEV,
Doctor of Political Sciences, Professor of Faculty of Humanities
and Social Sciences, Peoples' Friendship University of Russia
(RUDN University) (Russia, Moscow)

ESTABLISHED BY LLC "PUBLISHING HOUSE "SCIENCE TODAY"

The Journal is published with
the participation of the Institute
of modern policy of the Peoples'
Friendship University (RUDN)

The Journal is registered
by the Federal Service
for Supervision of Mass Media,
Communications and Protection
of Cultural Heritage

Reg. Number PI No.FS77–46176
of August 12, 2011
The Journal is published quarterly

The journal is included
in the database of the Russian
Science Citation Index

The Five-year Journal's
impact factor is 0,808

The Journal is included
in Ulrich's Periodicals Directory

Academic papers published
in the journal undergo obligatory
editorial checking.

The authors' opinion not always
coincides with the opinion
of the Editorial Board.

At reprint of the article or a part
of it the reference to the Journal
is obligatory.

Address of the editorial office:
10, Zagoryevskaya street, building 4,
office 4, Moscow, Russia, 115598
Tel: (910) 463-53-42
www.voprospolitolog.ru,
www.souzpolitolog.ru
E-mail: voprospolitolog@yandex.ru,
souzpolitolog@yandex.ru

Executive Secretary
Shkurina S.S.

Computer-aided makeup by
Antsiferova A.S.

Translated by
Chernyshova E.V.

Signed for printing on 25.06.2017
Format 60x84/16. Offset paper.
Offset print.
Number of printed sheets
Circulation 500 copies.
Order 000.

Printed at the LLC "Bely Véter"
Str. Shchipok, 28,
Moscow, Russia, 115054
Tel.: (495) 651-84-56

CONTENTS

POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS AND PROCESSES

Slizovsky D.E., Medvedev N.P., Shulenina N.V., Kashin M.V.

Research Project: Attitude of the Youth Towards the Revolution of 1917
and its Influence on the Presidential Elections of 2018 4

Zalysin I. Yu. Problem of Violence in Studies
of Modern Russian Political Scientists 16

POST-SOVIET COOPERATION AND CONFLICTS

Kurbonova Z.M. Enclaves in Central Asia: Myths and Realities..... 22

Krut'ko A.A. Russia and Kyrgyzstan Aim to Deepen Eurasian Integration 27

POLITICAL PROBLEMS OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Mikhailenko A.N. Evolution of the Pattern of International Relations
with a Dominant Element 37

REVIEWS

Gaiduk V.V. Political crises and conflicts: theory and practice
(Review of the monograph by Medvedev N. P.
"Political crises and conflicts: theory and practice". – Moscow:
Publishing house of the journal Political science, 2017. – p. 161) 51

Slizovsky D.E. Review of the article by R. A. Suleymanov
"On the Formula of the Russian Nation in Political Agenda» 54

OUR AUTHORS..... 57

A. N. MIKHAILENKO

*Doctor of Political Sciences, Professor,
Department of international security and foreign policy of Russia,
Faculty of national security, Institute of law and national security,
Russian Presidential Academy of national economy
and public service, Moscow, Russia*

EVOLUTION OF THE PATTERN OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS WITH A DOMINANT ELEMENT

In its development, the pattern of international relations with a dominant element, which sometimes takes the form of a fragment, can go through several stages. In the course of evolution, the element consistently turns into a component, segment, moment and factor. Capabilities of such model logically disclose in the transformation of the dominant factor into the leadership factor. At the final stage of development, the productive potential of such model of international relations is exhausted and it becomes necessary to find a new model.

Key words: *pattern of international relations with the dominant element, fragment, component, segment, moment, factor; leadership.*

In a previous paper the author jointly with A. V. Kozhuhov analyzed modern Russian-Afghan relations¹. The analysis showed that there are different patterns of bilateral international relations, such as a balance of forces, bipolar relations, integration, confrontation and others. We have come to the conclusion that none of the models that existed at that time was capable of explaining relations between Russia and Afghanistan. A new model was proposed: a model with a dominant element which in this case was the anti-drug cooperation between the two countries. Other elements that were proposed included political and economic cooperation, military and technical, humanitarian and other.

The essence of proposed model was that the dominant element, as a locomotive pulls other elements of the model, which is why the development of relations between the two countries takes place. The unifying power of the “locomotive” depends on its ability to create a resonance between the dominant and other elements of such model. Subsequent reflections led to the understanding that such model is applicable not only to the Russian-Afghan relations. It was necessary to generalize similar situations in the political theory and foreign policy practice

¹ Mikhailenko A.N., Kozhuhov A.V. The dominant factor in Russian-Afghan relations // Ethnosocium and interethnic culture. – 2014. – No. 10 (76). – Pp. 134-143.

in order to reveal possible stages of development of this model. For this purpose it was necessary to get a more detailed understanding of the relationship between a part and a whole in international relations, although there is not much literature on this topic¹.

Element

In the article mentioned above, we noted that the starting point for the formation and development of a pattern of international relations with a dominant element can be a random coincidence, historical background or other circumstances. Elements included in it can thus be of a non-systematic nature. Actually, this is what the word “element” means. According to one version, it comes from a sequence of letters L, M and N in the Latin alphabet. In other words, elements may be arbitrarily taken parts of a totality, which do not necessarily have close ties. Although the term “element” is widely used in scientific analysis², explanations of its meaning are not so common.

In our opinion, identification of the totality of elements of the pattern of international relations is only the first step towards developing a system that represents the pattern of Russian-Afghan relations, since there is a significant difference between the totality and the system. No established relationships exist between the elements of a totality, functions of each element in the totality are not determined and the driving force of the model development remains a secret. Most often, it relates to the initial stage of formation of the system of international relations or to the time of its sharp reformatting. In order to move forward in understanding the essence of modern Russian-Afghan relations, it was proposed to go all the way from the totality of elements to the system³.

Transition from randomness to the necessity in the formation of the model can be carried out in various ways. When analyzing Russian-Afghan relations, it was found out that Afghan politics, economy and other sectors were already dominated by other countries. For example, the United States dominated the political sector and tried to prevent other players from entering it. At the same time, it was revealed that the greatest damage to Russia was caused by Afghan drugs, and this fact became the fulcrum in the development of the proposed model of relations between the two countries with the dominant element. The anti-drug cooperation between the two states played the role of such element.

¹ See for example: Kireeva N. V. Functional relations of parts in the integrated whole and definition of subjects of international integration processes // *Politics and society*. – 2013. – No. 12. – Pp. 1505-1517.

² Yegorova A. G. National law and foreign element // *Bulletin of Polotsk state University. Series D: Economics and law: scientific and theoretical journal*. – Novopolotsk: PGU, 2013. – No. 6. – Pp. 176-178; Kotova N. E. The elements of unfair competition, the United States and Ukraine against Russian companies // *Vestnik of Financial University*. – 2014. – No. 6. – Pp. 128-132.

³ Mikhailenko A. N., Kozuhov A. V. See above.

The dominant element in the system of international relations sometimes arises not in an instant, but gradually. A lack of understanding of the significance of the dominant element can lead to a reformatting of international relations, as well as significant changes in the domestic political situation in the country. Refugees and migrants who flooded Europe as a result of integration processes in the EU and the rampant terrorism in North Africa can be considered as such element. The inability to link it with other elements of international relations resulted in a sharp drop in the popularity of the German Chancellor Angela Merkel in 2016 and, to a large extent, to the UK decision to withdraw from the European Union.

Such uneven development of various elements of international relations leads to a decrease in the effectiveness of the entire system. It is quite common in international practice. Thus, it was repeatedly stated that the development of Russian-Chinese economic relations significantly lags behind the high level of political relations between the two countries. It is proved by the data on China's foreign trade. In 2015, China's trade with Russia amounted to about US\$68 billion, while with the US to US\$560 billion, with the EU countries to 521 billion euros and with Japan and South Korea to US\$280 billion each. The closeness of economic relations can affect the priority of other areas in the international relations of a country.

Fragment

A fragment of international relations can be a kind of element. Fragment is a piece, a splinter, from the Latin verb *frangere* "to break, fracture, smash." A fragment can be a splinter of the past or a bunch of previously unrealized possibilities. In foreign policy, a fragment can be an element that is separated from the whole artificially or under the pressure of circumstances and continues to play a significant role in international relations. As a part of such approach, the natural way for the fragment could be integration into the system of international relations of the country in the subsequent development in order to ensure its integrity. In the process of "reintegration," such a return should be filled with a new meaning.

The situation in Georgia today can serve as an example of a model of international relations with a dominant fragment. A few years ago, due to the internal situation and determined efforts of the West, it was artificially cut off from Russia, but cannot exist like this, so the country has to work out options for the reconstruction of immanent relations. We agree with the opinion of G. B. Karasin, Russian Deputy Foreign Minister, who said that "during the last four years we have succeeded in considerably improving bilateral relations, in bringing them out of a deadlock in which they appeared due to the fault of M. Saakashvili's regime. Russia has again become one of the Georgia's key economic partners, the two countries have normalized transport communications and are rapidly developing traditional humanitarian contacts and cultural exchanges. In other words, we have

achieved tangible results that fully meet the interests of the citizens of our two countries”¹.

Similar processes are taking place now in Moldova. I. Dodon, Chairman of the Party of socialists, who advocates the restoration of ties with Russia, won the presidential elections held in November 2016 in that country. Such relations were brought to a minimum by the previous Moldovan political leadership with the blessing of the European Union. However, it can be assumed that in connection with the events in Ukraine, European politicians are becoming increasingly aware that such attempts of fragmentation of the post-Soviet space for the selfish geopolitical purposes are fraught with negative consequences. They can see it from the moods of the Moldavian people. Therefore, the Moldovan leadership is encouraged to develop ties with Russia, if possible, without prejudice to the Association Agreement with the European Union.

These examples are no exception in international relations. Fragments are easily formed at the turns of history, for example, during the collapse of the colonial system. At that moment, the countries liberated from the colonial oppression succumbed to the euphoria of independence, establishing ties with various states on all continents. However, after a short period of time, political, economic and other realities forced many of them to restore in new forms vital relations with former metropolitan areas. Defragmentation has taken various forms, such as the Commonwealth of Nations, which today includes 52 countries. Another similar example is Francophonie with 57 member states.

Component

According to our approach, the next stage in the development of the model of international relations with the dominant element involves transformation of the element (fragment) into a component. The term “component” is widely used in political science². For example, O. A. Seliverstova highlights such components of “soft power” as economy, humanitarian capital, instruments of cultural influence, politics, diplomatic reputation of the country, as well as the potential of the language³. A. N. Vylegzhanin analyzes components of the global interstate system, including its legal component⁴. This term is actively used by other authors.

¹ Interview with G. B. Karasin, State Secretary and Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of Russia to Rossiya Segodnya news agency, November 03, 2016. Address – URL: http://www.mid.ru/ru/foreign_policy/news/asset_publisher/cKNonkJE02Bw/content/id/2513205 (date: 02.02.2017).

² Botasheva A. K. Goals and main components of antiterrorist strategy in international politics // Science and today. – 2014. – № 32-1. – Pp. 116-120.

³ Seliverstova O. A. Foreign language policy as an integral component of the concept of soft power: comparative aspect // Bulletin of Moscow state regional University. Series: linguistics. – 2015. – No. 4. – Pp. 232-240.

⁴ Vylegzhanin A. N. Formation of the global legal space in the XXI century // International processes. – 2010. – Vol. 8. – No. 2 (23). May-August.

The word “component” came from the Latin words “*com*” and “*ponere*”, that is “put together”. This term already contains goal-setting based on the interaction of components, their necessity to each other. In science, there is a certain difference between the element and the component. As part and whole, the element is more related to the set (or aggregation), while the component is related to the system¹. In the general systems theory, an element is often regarded as a basic unit, simple and indivisible. A component is a more complex part, which can consist of several elements, most often combined on a functional basis. Components are often represented as subsystems of higher-level systems.

However, this understanding of the component is not generally recognized, in the literature there are other positions in this regard. Yu. Soldatova, for example, writes that “only states are elements of international relations as a system, as the system of international relations can exist without the rest. Without the states, the very system of international relations is meaningless and unthinkable. Non-state actors and actors of the modern system of international relations are only components of its content”². In this interpretation, elements appear to be more significant parts of international relations than components.

In accordance with our approach, in the model of international relations elements change into components by purification from accidental, insignificant connections. This nuance in the close meanings of these words is felt not only by scientists, but also by politicians. Thus, at the end of October 2016, Crimean archaeologist A. Herzen speaking at the interregional forum of the All-Russian popular front about the composition of the Crimean population said: “they were descendants of the Goths, the Alans and other ethnic components of the medieval population of the Crimea exposed to Greek and Byzantine influences.” Russian President Vladimir Putin responded to this statement as follows: “You talk about “other components.” Actually, they were our ancestors”³.

The most important feature of the component is its focus. The situation in modern Russian-American relations can serve as an illustration. In a telephone conversation between Russian President Vladimir Putin and President-elect of the United States D. Trump on November 14, 2016 both parties stressed “the importance of creating a reliable basis for bilateral relations through the development of their trade and economic component”⁴. In the first half of 2016, the United States ranked only fifth among Russia’s major trading partners, large-

¹ Radbil T. B. On some types of language conceptualization of such models as: part/whole, element / set and component/system in Russian proposed-case combinations // *Vestnik Nizhegorodskogo universiteta named after H. A. Lobachevsky*. – 2015. – No. 2-2. – Pp. 508-512.

² Soldatova Yu. Internal factors of perception in the system of bilateral relations on the example of Russia and Italy // *Science and World*. – 2015. – Vol. 3. – No. 11 (27). – P. 75.

³ Interregional forum of the All-Russian popular front on October 26, 2016 года. Электронный ресурс. – URL: <http://kremlin.ru/events/president/news/53148> (date: 03.02.2017).

⁴ Telephone conversation with President-elect of the United States of America Donald Trump November 14, 2016. – URL: <http://kremlin.ru/events/president/news/53255> (date: 03.02.2017).

ly due to sanctions that severely affected the interests of our European partners. Russia is not even among the top twenty of the main trading partners of the United States. Therefore, both countries will need to work hard to turn trade and economic ties between the two countries from the current not very significant element into an essential component of their system of relations.

Another important feature of the component is that its presence is essential for the model. Without it the system will not function and in this way it differs from the element. There are plenty of examples of such situation in modern political practice. Thus, for a long time it was believed that Britain is an integral component of the European Union. Who would have thought otherwise, bearing in mind that this country is the second in the EU in terms of economic power after Germany. However, the referendum held in 2016 showed that this opinion was wrong, ordinary British citizens see the situation differently. Currently, the EU is discussing “hard” and “soft” options for withdrawal of the UK from the Union. British politicians are also considering it. Such a serious error in the diagnosis of the state of the EU on the “element – component” axis gives reason to predict a further crisis of this integration organization.

The difference between the element and the component is clearly seen on the example of modern Ukraine. The current leadership of the country almost every minute declares that it is a part of Europe and protects Europe from Russian “aggression.” According to many politicians and researchers, what we witness in Ukraine is a civil war in which Europe would not like to participate. The EU considers Ukraine a corrupt country, far from the European principles. Kiev leaders are afraid that the Ukrainian issues will no longer interest Europeans and will become a secondary element. If the current events in the country were indeed a component of European politics, such fears would not arise. In this case, you can see attempts to represent the element as a component. But only the desire to be a component is not enough, for the existence of the component you need materiality.

In other cases, the situation may be quite opposite, initially a component, that is still in the bud, may pass unnoticed or treated as an element. “Trump phenomenon” and his unexpected victory in the presidential elections in the United States in November 2016 may be considered as such. If at the beginning no one, even the Republican Party took it seriously, then they began to examine his attractiveness for the voters. A week before the vote, the vast majority of American and world media, as well as the public opinion polls favored the Democratic candidate Hillary Clinton. Nevertheless, D. Trump won the elections. He became not an accidental, secondary element of American policy, but its dominant component – President of the United States.

Segment

The development of a model with a dominant component implies the involvement of other components of the system in the circle of its influence. An interme-

diating stage in this development of the model may be formation of a segment in the model of international relations. Segment (from the Latin *segmentum* means a segment) in geometry is defined as a part of the circle bounded by the segment of the circle and the chord tightening its ends. According to another definition, a segment in anatomy is one of many homogeneous areas (segments) that make up the body of animals or individual organs. The term “segment” is used in other sciences, including political science. A segment is sometimes referred to as a part of an international organization. Thus, a high-level segment of the IAEA international conference on nuclear security was held in Vienna in early December 2016.

In the literature on international issues, the term “segment” is used, but the authors rarely define it in relation to foreign policy issues¹. L. S. Voronkov concludes that “the role of international organizations in international relations has undergone qualitative changes. From auxiliary tools for solving individual problems of interaction of sovereign states they have become a segment of international life, deeply integrated into the system”². Such transformation is the path from the element to the component and then to the segment. The above author got it right and highlighted the essence of such transformation, which consists in integration, that is, in connecting parts into a whole.

In the considered model of international relations, the segment could appear quite significant phase of development. For example, in Russian-Afghan relations, the effective development of the anti-drug component could, with proper resonance, contribute to the strengthening of the security segment, which, in addition to this component, would include countering terrorism, military-technical cooperation and other “power” components. By their nature and functional load, these components are most closely related to each other. As a result, at a certain stage in the development of this model, the segment could play the role of the “locomotive” for the development of the entire system of Russian-Afghan relations.

Creation of the segment, however, doesn’t necessarily mean inclusion of components of one function, there are various options for uniting them. An example of a “multifunctional” segment is the recent dynamic development of relations between Japan and India. Tokyo is trying to “enter” Indian economy through the construction of high-speed railways³. The first contract for US\$15 billion

¹ Khalanskiy, I. V. China’s policy in the post-Soviet segment of Central Asia: solving the border issue // Bulletin of BIST (Bashkir Institute of social technologies). – 2015. – No. 3 (28). – Pp. 16-20; Ryazantsev S. V., Pismennaya E. E., Tkachenko M. F. Formation of the Central Asian segment of the Eurasian migration subsystem // International processes. – 2013. – Vol. 11. – No. 34. – Pp. 45-62; Kuznetsov A. V. Place of the Baltic States in the geographical segments of the largest TNCs in Europe // Baltic region. – 2015. – No. 1 (23). – Pp. 36-48.

² Voronkov L. S. International organizations: the main reasons for their emergence and development // MGIMO University Bulletin. – 2015. – No. 4 (43). – Pp. 108, 102-110.

³ Manukov S. Tokyo is trying to break into India on high-speed trains // Expert. 2016. November 12. See – URL: <http://expert.ru/2016/11/12/zheleznodorozhnyie-vojnyni/> (date: 06.02.2017).

was signed in 2016 and New Delhi plans to build five more lines. Such huge investments (they will amount to US\$287 billion by 2020) will allow Japan to significantly expand its economic presence in India. In order to win in the high-speed economic competition with traditional rivals from China, the Japanese took advantage of the political component, the existing political contradictions between the two Asian giants. The high-tech locomotive (literally and figuratively) in conjunction with the policy of strategic partnership should overtake Chinese competitors and pull relations between India and Japan to new heights.

Moment

When discussing the above terms, we emphasized the ratio of the part and the whole in international relations, but paid little attention to the driving force of these models. A new step towards the development of the model can be made through the use of the term “moment”, which is also quite common in political texts. Thus, V. G. Baranovsky talks about a number of important points (moments) that globalization brings to international relations¹. He reveals new aspects in international development, in particular, the renaissance of economic determinism. K. Borishpolets, discussing the impact of religion on international relations, suggests taking into account a number of points (moments)². Among them-religious dynamics in the context of globalization, religious organizations in the context of international cooperation and others. The term “moment” is found in the texts of other authors.

Most often, the term “moment” refers to the time, moment, stage in the development of a process. In this sense, it is used not only in the scientific apparatus, but also in the everyday language, and in this meaning it is used in most cases. However, its etymology suggests one more meaning. Moment (from Latin *momentum*) is the driving force, an important circumstance, the engine of development. In philosophy, this notion was introduced by Hegel to denote a constituent part of the whole. We are interested in both meanings of this term.

There is a constant search for drivers of development in various countries. The domestic and foreign policy of the country largely depends on how they are defined. As an illustration of this thesis, we can take the current situation in Ukraine. After almost a quarter of a century of independence, the country remains fragmented and divided into poorly connected regions³. This was stated by the first President of Ukraine L. Kravchuk. According to him, “the elite has no re-

¹ Baranovsky V. G. Transformation of the world system in the 2000s // International processes. – 2010. – Vol. 8. – No. 22. – Pp. 4-13.

² Borishpolets K. The religious factor in international relations: an amalgam of values, interests and political priorities // Vestnik MGU. Series 17. – 2012. – No. 3.

³ More on the issue see: Mikhailenko A.N. Federalization of Ukraine as a means to overcome its deep regional differentiation // Almanac Crimea. – 2013. – No. 1. – Pp. 90-98.

sponsibility to the threat that is already hanging over Ukraine... the state is beginning to fall apart”¹. V.M. Litvin, former Chairman of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine and now MP, repeated this thought: “We are very well tailored in territorial terms, as a state, but poorly sewn, and in conditions of instability we have centrifugal trends”². To get out of this situation, it was necessary to find a unifying moment, a driving force for the further development of the country.

To get out of this situation, it was necessary to find a unifying moment, a driving force for the further development of the country. It consists in the use of extreme radical nationalism in the form of Bandera-style thinking. It's a simple, but a very dangerous tool of uniting people. Initially, Europeans ignored such danger, satisfied with their geopolitical interest in breaking Ukraine away from Russia. Today, however, given the strengthening of nationalist parties and a noticeable right trend in the electorate's moods in a number of European countries, they have become much more cautious in their relations with Ukrainian politicians. The use of the above nationalist trend led to the civil war in the country, sharp deterioration of its relations with Russia that affected the interests of both Russia and Europe, economic sanctions and other negative consequences.

In this regard, the policy of Russia and Europe should, in our view, be aimed at translating the Bandera-style moment of Ukrainian foreign and domestic policy from today's dominant into tomorrow's secondary moment. As a part of such trend, Ukrainian politicians should try to exclude radicalism threatening the society from the Ukrainian political spectrum. In case of such development of events, the term “moment” could be used in describing the current Ukrainian political model only in its first meaning as a tragic moment in the history of Ukraine. As for the second meaning of this term, Ukraine is rich in various talents and is able to find other driving forces that will enable it to emerge from the current crisis. If we go back to the terminology, the term “factor” is used much more often in describing the spring, the driving force of development in political texts in this sense.

Factor

In accordance with our approach, at the next stage of the model development the moment should be transformed into a factor of international relations. The word “factor” comes from the Latin “facere” meaning “to do.” Factor is the active reason, the driving force of activity. Such is the goal realized by the subject, finding appropriate means and methods of activity. If the previous terms to a greater extent reflected the characteristics of the object of international relations, the factor is directly related to their subject. It stresses the principle of

¹ Leonid Kravchuk: Ukraine begins to fall apart. See – URL: <http://russian.rt.com/article/70244> (date: 07.02.2017).

² Litvin: We are well tailored, but poorly sewn. May 20, 2011. See – URL: http://24tv.ua/ru/litvin_myi_horosho_skroenyi_no_ploho_sshityi_n95897 (date: 07.02.2017).

subjectivity, according to which the actor bears full responsibility for the success of the activity it carries out. It depends on a well-defined goal, well-defined tasks, skillfully selected tools and methods, full account of objective conditions of activity and other factors.

The concept of factor is often used in politological discourse¹. Available definitions, however, are often not sufficiently meaningful. Yu.Soldatova, for instance, writes that “the internal factors of states, which are complex systems within an even more complex system of international relations, affect the process and the result of perception in international relations”². Complexity is one of the attributes of modern systems in international relations, but it does not reveal their specificity. The uncertainty of the term “factor” leads to the uncertainty as to how it affects international processes, what exactly its driving force for development is.

The transition to a model with a dominant factor as a driving force for development is another step on the path from a casual, waiting policy to informed action in international relations. Thus, Russian scientists have developed a Global rating of the integrated power of 100 countries³. The integral power of the state is assessed in this rating in accordance with nine basic factors, including the system of state and public administration, territory, natural resources, population, economy, culture and religion, science and education, the armed forces and foreign policy (geopolitical positioning).

It is noted in the Global rating that “an excessive development of some factors with a significant lag of others creates the risks of destabilization for the system. The ideal model of a viable state is a polyhedron inscribed in a circle with a uniform and maximum possible level of development of its power factors”⁴. The authors of the Global rating believe that the states periodically face a need for accelerated development and finding new development impulses. In such situations, there is a need to “develop an effective strategy of activating factors that ensure the implementation of the accelerated development scenario.” In our view, the model of international relations with the dominant factor embodies such a strategy.

The development of modern Russian-Chinese relations can serve as an illustration of this step. In recent decades, China was making a breakthrough aspiring to become one of the world’s economic leaders. “It would be a mistake not to take advantage of this Asian-Pacific dominant,” V.V. Putin wrote in one of his election

¹ Troitsky M. A. The China factor in Russian-American relations / Comparative politics – 2014. – No. 1. – Pp. 96-101; Abzhaparova L. Zh., Sarsembaeva A. B. Public diplomacy as a factor in international relations: historical experience of Kazakhstan // Fundamental research. – 2013. – No. 11-7. – Pp. 1520-1523.

² Soldatova Yu. Internal factors of perception in the system of bilateral relations on the example of Russia and Italy // Science and World. – 2015. – Vol. 3. – No. 11 (27). – P. 78.

³ Global rating of the integrated power of 100 countries. Report – 2012 for discussion. 3rd revised edition. – Moscow: International Academy of future studies, Institute of economic strategies, 2012.

⁴ See also – P. 5.

articles in 2012. In his opinion, Russia needs to catch the “Chinese wind” in the “sails” of its economy. “We must actively build new cooperation ties, matching the technological and production capabilities of our countries, using – of course, wisely-Chinese potential for the economic recovery of Siberia and the Far East”¹.

The understanding of this situation showed that the economic cooperation of the two countries lags far behind the dominant factor – the unprecedentedly high level of political interaction². The answer to this challenge of the dominant factor consists in determination of political objectives of the economic cooperation between the two countries. This response was the course aimed at connecting the Eurasian integration with the Chinese program of the Silk Road Economic Belt. Currently, the practical elaboration of this idea is under way, a program for its implementation is being drawn up and priority economic projects included in it are being determined.

Leadership

Thus, we have gone from a pattern with a dominant element (fragment) through a component, segment and moment to a model with a dominant factor. The final stage of this path we see in the transformation of the dominant factor in the leading one. In one of the previous works, we have already focused on the difference between hegemony, domination and leadership³. Hegemony and dominance are based on coercion to fulfill their demands, while leadership is based on attracting to its position because of its validity and creativity. Analyzing the recent dominance-based policy of the United States, the well-known American political scientist Ch. Krauthammer states: “Obama ordered a retreat, because he always felt that America is not perfect enough for world domination, too vicious to have the moral right to act as a global hegemon”⁴. If domination is possible at the first stages of the formation and development of the model of international relations with the dominant element, then at the next stages it must go into the past, freeing up space for leadership.

The distinction between these two paradigms in world affairs is particularly evident in American politics. Authoritative American newspaper *The Wall Street Journal* cites the opinion of French President F. Hollande that “Americans, whatever they undertake, behave arrogantly”⁵. The party, Alternative for Germany, opposed to American domination, may well get into the Bundestag and become

¹ Putin V. V. Russia and the changing world // Moscow News. February 27, 2012.

² Bordachev T. China and Russia seek answers to common challenges 06.04.2016. See – URL: <http://ru.valdaiclub.com/a/highlights/kitay-i-rossiya-ishchut-otvety-na-obshchie-vyzovy/> (date: 07.02.2017).

³ Mikhailenko A. N. Leadership in contemporary international relations // Obosrevatel – Observer. – 2012. – No. 5. – Pp. 72-87.

⁴ Krauthammer Ch. After a mere 25 years, the triumph of the West is over // The Washington Post. December 1, 2016.

⁵ Vinocur J. Anti-Americanism across the continent // The Wall Street Journal. Nov. 7, 2016.

the third largest party there, gaining 13% of the vote. The author of the article considers the decision of the Netherlands against the strengthening of relations between the European Union and Ukraine to be anti-American. The above newspaper article offers not a leadership, but a hegemonic solution to the problem of European anti-Americanism. According to its author, in accordance with the idea that the United States is an indispensable nation, the new us President should take a clear position on the new political circles in France after the 2017 elections. What this “clear position” should be, guess yourself. I would hope that President D. Trump elected in 2016 will change this position, rejecting the domination in favor of leadership.

Our analysis shows that the terms “element”, “fragment”, “component”, “segment”, “moment”, “factor”, “dominance “ and” leadership” can be used to characterize the state of international relations within the framework of the proposed model. Their precise use will show the state of the particular system of international relations at each moment. The appropriate use of a term may indicate which aspects of the policy development are emphasized. It is obvious that the model of international relations with the dominant element in the development process, as Chronos, eats itself, gradually realizing its potential. In implementing this model, politicians should look for new models of international relations that would replace it in a timely manner.

The model of international relations with the dominant element can be quite widely used in political practice and political analysis. The above examples show that it is applicable in the study of Russia’s bilateral relations with different countries. The strength of this model is in the vision of its development prospects, in the certainty of the stairs to be passed on the way. The evolution of the proposed model from a dominant element to a leadership factor can be seen as a process of maturity in international relations.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

1. *Abzhaparova L. Zh., Sarsembaeva A. B.* Public diplomacy as a factor in international relations: historical experience of Kazakhstan // Fundamental research. – 2013. – No. 11-7.
2. *Baranovsky V.G.* Transformation of the world system in the 2000s // International processes. – 2010. – Vol. 8. – No. 22.
3. *Bordachev T.* China and Russia seek answers to common challenges 06.04.2016. See: – URL: <http://ru.valdaiclub.com/a/highlights/kitay-i-rossiya-ishchut-otvety-na-obshchie-vyzovy/>
4. *Borishpolets K.* The religious factor in international relations: an amalgam of values, interests and political priorities // Vestnik MGU. Series 17. – 2012. – No. 3.
5. *Botasheva A.K.* Goals and main components of antiterrorist strategy in international politics // Science and today. – 2014. – No. 32-1.
6. *Voronkov L. S.* International organizations: the main reasons for their emergence and development // MGIMO University Bulletin. – 2015. – No. 4 (43).

7. *Vylegzhanin A.N.* Formation of the global legal space in the XXI century // International processes. – 2010. – Vol. 8. – No. 2 (23). May-August.

8. Global rating of the integrated power of 100 countries. Report – 2012 for discussion. 3rd revised edition. – Moscow: International Academy of future studies, Institute of economic strategies, 2012.

9. *Yegorova A.G.* National law and foreign element // Bulletin of Polotsk state University. Series D: Economics and law: scientific and theoretical journal. – Novopolotsk: PGU, 2013. – No. 6.

10. Interview with G. B. Karasin, State Secretary and Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of Russia to Rossiya Segodnya news agency, November 03, 2016. Address – URL: http://www.mid.ru/ru/foreign_policy/news/asset_publisher/cKNonkJE02Bw/content/id/2513205

11. *Kireeva N.V.* Functional relations of parts in the integrated whole and definition of subjects of international integration processes // Politics and society. – 2013. – No. 12.

12. *Kotova N.E.* The elements of unfair competition, the United States and Ukraine against Russian companies // Vestnik of Financial University. – 2014. – No. 6.

13. *Kuznetsov A.V.* Place of the Baltic States in the geographical segments of the largest TNCs in Europe // Baltic region. – 2015. – No. 1 (23).

14. *Leonid Kravchuk:* Ukraine begins to fall apart. See: – URL: <http://russian.rt.com/article/70244>

15. Litvin: We are well tailored, but poorly sewn. May 20, 2011. See: – URL: http://24tv.ua/ru/litvin_myi_horosho_skroenyi_no_ploho_sshityi_n95897

16. *Manukov S.* Tokyo is trying to break into India on high-speed trains // Expert. 2016. November 12. See: – URL: <http://expert.ru/2016/11/12/zheleznodorozhnyie-vojnji/>

17. Interregional forum of the All-Russian popular front on October 26, 2016. See: – URL: <http://kremlin.ru/events/president/news/53148>

18. *Mikhailenko A.N.* Leadership in contemporary international relations // Obosrevatel – Observer. – 2012. – No. 5.

19. *Mikhailenko A.N.* Federalization of Ukraine as a means to overcome its deep regional differentiation // Almanac *Crimea*. – 2013. – No. 1.

20. *Mikhailenko A.N., Kozhuhov A.V.* The dominant factor in Russian-Afghan relations // Ethno-socium and interethnic culture. – 2014. – No. 10 (76).

21. *Putin V.V.* Russia and the changing world // Moscow News. February 27, 2012.

22. *Radbil T. B.* On some types of language conceptualization of such models as: part/ whole, element / set and component/system in Russian proposed-case combinations // Vestnik Nizhegorodskogo universiteta named after H. A. Lobachevsky. – 2015. – No. 2-2.

23. *Ryazantsev S. V., Pismennaya E. E., Tkachenko M. F.* Formation of the Central Asian segment of the Eurasian migration subsystem // International processes. – 2013. – Vol. 11. – No. 34.

24. *Seliverstova O.A.* Foreign language policy as an integral component of the concept of soft power: comparative aspect // Bulletin of Moscow state regional University. Series: linguistics. – 2015. – No. 4.

25. *Soldatova Yu.* Internal factors of perception in the system of bilateral relations on the example of Russia and Italy // Science and World. – 2015. – Vol. 3. – No. 11 (27).

26. Telephone conversation with President-elect of the United States of America Donald trump November 14, 2016. See – URL: <http://kremlin.ru/events/president/news/53255>

27. *Troitsky M.A.* The China factor in Russian-American relations/ Comparative politics. – 2014. – No. 1.

28. *Khalanskiy, I. V.* China's policy in the post-Soviet segment of Central Asia: solving the border issue // Bulletin of BIST (Bashkir Institute of social technologies). – 2015. – No. 3 (28).

29. *Krauthammer Ch.* After a mere 25 years, the triumph of the West is over // The Washington Post. December 1, 2016.

30. *Vinocur J.* Anti-Americanism across the continent // The Wall Street Journal. November 7, 2016.