

PalArch's Journal of Archaeology
of Egypt / Egyptology

AN EXPLANATION OF THE FUTURE POLARIZATION POWER IN THE
INTERNATIONAL SYSTEM

Mansour Barzegar

PhD Student in International Relations, Rafsanjan Branch, Islamic Azad, Iran, Rafsanjan

Email: mansoorbarzegar4@gmail.com

Mansour Barzegar. An Explanation of The Future Polarization Power in The International System -- PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology 18(18), 1429-1445. ISSN 1567-214x

Keywords: International System, Hegemonic Power, Unipolar Era, Return of Russia, The Emergence of China, Post-American Age.

ABSTRACT

The structural changes in the international system and the distribution of power on the international stage following the collapse of the Soviet Union of Socialist Republics (USSR) have undergone serious changes. Since the end of World War II, the United States has risen to a stronger international power and entered a period known as the "Unipolar Era" in the early 1990s. American elites attempt to legitimize their actions by actively praising their country's power over the international system. However, the US invasion of Iraq in 2003 undermined its legitimacy and credibility, as the tendency to use military force indicated a lack of legitimacy at a time when new powers such as Russia and China emerged from other parts of the world. That is why many people talk about the end of the unipolar era but are skeptical about the nature of the international system in the post-unipolar era. The question of this study is what is the structure of the international system in the coming decades? The main hypothesis of the study is, regarding the four dimensions of power related to this issue that the future international system will be in a turbulent time and no single power can have absolute control over the world.

INTRODUCTION

The collapse of the USSR and the end of the Cold War marked the beginning of a new phase in international relations. The most important indicator was the "lack of a systematic and well-established structure" that can be used as a basis for decision-making in the analysis, forecasting, and prescribing of international relations. In other words, with the separation of the bipolar system, the world is going through a period of transition, which is why we are witnessing various theories about the possible structure of the global security

system. However, while political scholars are looking for different scenarios for the future of international relations, American elites have demonstrated that the United States has complete hegemony over the world by asserting that the United States has unprecedented advantages in all dimensions of power and according to that, USA would become the only superpower in the world. The proponents of this theory believe that this power also makes it possible for the United States to act illegally in some cases. Therefore, the unilateral actions of the US government to demonstrate this hegemony in the post-Cold War era have aroused negative reactions from different actors at all levels, including some countries that have historically been regarded as allies of the United States. The Iraq War of 2003 is believed by many people to be the culmination of US power in the world, but at the same time, widespread opposition to US hegemony has begun in many parts of the world. Different nations of the world have felt threatened by their future security in a world where a great power wants to act against the law. Also because four main pillars of the world system in a hegemonic structure are "Unilateralism", "black and white thinking", "exceptionalism" and "uniformity" and none of these countries was aware of their position in this structure. Meanwhile, China and Russia, which once lived as superpowers in history, laid a strong foundation for the realization of the current status of the United States, put forward the doctrine of universalism, and defined their mission like the United States. This research aims to examine the most important doctrines of the national security institutions and foreign policies of the United States, Russia, and China, to predict the future of the distribution and transfer of power in the international system.

POWER CYCLE THEORY

Power cycle theory is basically within the framework of the theory of neorealism. Therefore, it is necessary to briefly explain the theory of neorealism. Many political experts believe that neorealism theory is an evolutionary form of modern classical theory. Robert Cohen believed that Waltz rejected many realist ideas and believed that the basis of many of their analyses by realist thinkers was based on induction, which led them to be indifferent to many variables that affect international transitions (Keohane, 1986). The first criticism of the theory of realism is its simplicity and generality. According to critics, classical realism summarized all aspects of politics into power, equated politics with power, and ignored other factors which indicate its limitations. However, international affairs are very complicated. (Naqibzadeh, 1994). The combination of these critiques led Kenneth Waltz to propose a theory of structural realism in the late 1970s and a newer model by accepting some of the assumptions of classical realism.

The theory of neo-realism does not pay attention to the internal affairs of the state, like classical realism, but only pays attention to the external behavior of the state in international politics, whereas realism pays attention to the role of power in the behavior of the state, structural realism emphasizes on the impact of the international system on foreign behavior and how power is distributed in this system (Weiner, 2010). Unlike classical realism, neo-realism is a macro-level and tertiary theory that believes that international politics can be

viewed as an integrated system (Waltz, 1979). Theoretically, the structure of the international system is a horizontal authority based on separate sovereignty in which governments have the necessary independence and are legally accountable to no higher authority for their conduct. Thus, this system is essentially anarchic and non-hierarchical (Ghavam, 2012). In this regard, Waltz believes that the structure of the international system is formed by the interaction of countries, but once it is formed, it will determine their behaviors. In terms of structure, he stated that structure is not observable and it is an abstract matter (Moshirzadeh, 2013). One of the main differences between structural realism and classical realism is that in the theory of realism, empowerment is the goal of government, while the theory of neorealism believes that power is the only necessary condition to guarantee security, not the essential objective of government (Baldwin, 1993). In general, Waltz rejects the authoritarian spirit of the theory of classical realism and believes that in the anarchic environment of the international system, the main objective of the country is survival and security. In fact, from the perspective of neorealism, due to anarchy and lack of central supremacy in the international system, countries are primarily concerned with increasing the power of other countries, and security issues have become their main targets. In this case, even if defense alliances were formed by governments, they would only revolve around an axis of security and not necessarily an increase in power. Therefore, when the joint threat disappears, so does the alliance against it (Hellmann, 1993).

By defining the theory of neorealism, now, we can better analyze the power cycle theory. In this theory, power is still at the heart of the understanding of the international system. Therefore, power is the motive for choice and the reason for action. International politics is also a place of the power struggle between its protagonists, and such characteristics of power are the fundamental cause of all war and peace (Kissane, 2005). Power in power cycle theory is the same as relative neorealism and is defined concerning other actors. If the growth rate of state power is higher than the total average growth of government in the system, then that state can be said to have relative power to grow in the international system (Akhavan Zanjani, 1995). On the other hand, the power cycle theory, like neorealism, focuses more on the material and quantitative aspects of power. From this perspective, power refers to a set of material capabilities that encompasses a wide range of military, economic, and industrial power, but what is interesting about the power cycle theory is that, unlike the theory of neorealism, in this theory, a superior hegemony is needed to order and balance the international system. Since Organsky asserts that complete peace will be achieved when a hegemon and its allies have dominant power over their rivals, so war is possible as the rivals' power with superior capabilities to support the status quo increases (Organski, 1969). The power cycle theory was first proposed by Charles Doran in the early 1990s, and the main focus of this theory is the balance between power and role. Accordingly, the role of each international actor depends on its role. If a government can increase its power, it will engage with the power of the hegemon and can even take its place (Gholizadeh and Shafiee, 2012). In current international politics, the United States claims to be a hegemonic

power and believes that it is the only world leader. On the other hand, many countries are trying to change the cycle of power, in this case, they have defined the doctrine for themselves, and Russia and China have more opportunities in this regard.

THE POWER OF HEGEMONY

The issue of being powerful in the international arena, in general, is important for many countries. The power of the international system is the most important differentiating factor for countries. Accordingly, the international system is organized into a hierarchy of powers. Power and distribution mechanisms change the positions of the actors and, as a result, the international system.

Hegemony comes from the Greek word *hēgemonía*, which means leadership and rule. In international relations, hegemony refers to the ability of an actor with an overwhelming capability to shape the international system through both coercive and non-coercive means (Ikenberry, 2008). There are various opinions about the concept of hegemony. Applying two theories of structural realism and neoliberal institutionalism, Robert Catgus also uses the concept of hegemony to refer to an international order that has stability in the role of guidance and regulation of world superpowers. In defining hegemony, Mill Haimer also wrote that hegemony is a country that is strong enough to dominate others, and no government or alliance can challenge it. Therefore, hegemony is the only great power of the system, and it uses military power to impose its will on the world. History has always witnessed the emergence of great empires, but only the United States has been mentioned as a hegemon in the history of international politics.

The United States: From Dream to Reality

The rise of the United States was accompanied by its exceptionalism. The American leaders believe that in any case, the United States is one of the most influential nations in the international arena. Richard Nixon in his diary wrote "A strong, growing, and United States can build the next century, the century of peace and freedom; whereas, a broken and backward America can also pave the way for a century filled with oppression and war (Nixon, 1998). America is the biggest and most successful social test that has taken place in human history so far.

Now the question is why is America an exception?

A. Economic Hegemony

Political scholars believe that the main cause of the collapse of the Soviet Union was economic weakness and problems. For this reason, the experience of its fall has shown how important economic dynamics are to the power and security of developing countries. Especially during this period, security concerns subsided and economic problems became the main topic of international relations. But the situation in the United States in this regard is

very different from that of other countries. After World War II, the United States began to open the economic doors of other countries to the capitalist market to expand its power. For decades, most American academics and economists have been talking about the global system dedicated to capitalism and led by the United States. It seems that the most prominent characteristics of the United States were monopoly and capitalism and this country can be called the "Republic of the Capitalists" (Zarshenas, 2012). The first loopholes in US economic leadership emerged after World War II as a benevolent hegemony for the European and Japanese economies. The US economy has suffered from a huge trade deficit from the beginning, but the dollar domination in the world economy allowed the US to continue to operate despite these large deficits. The dominance of the dollar began in 1944 when the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank were established. This year, the US dollar was established as an international reserve currency and it was backed by gold at \$35 per ounce and any country could exchange dollars for gold (Saif, 2010). US economic hegemony and dollar sovereignty have been globally recognized with Washington's post-war aid to repair damage to Europe and Japan. However, the 1990s were a period of great economic prosperity in the United States. While the United States has been known as a major free trade center from the beginning, its hegemony in international trade was delayed primarily due to its weak position before World War II and also due to a powerful anti-capitalist enemy after World War II. But by the 1990s, the biggest challenge facing capitalism had disappeared, and most European and Asian governments announced their readiness to integrate into the capitalist system. At that time, the main policy of the United States in the economic field was based on the principle of supporting liberalization. The economic management of the United States in the world arena is often carried out through institutions. The World Trade Organization is one of the most famous institutions. It replaced the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade in the mid-1990s. Since then, the United States has been committed to its actions, and this commitment is in line with the liberalization of the global economy (Shirkhani, 2008) Institutions such as the World Trade Organization and the International Monetary Fund in this period to model the American free economy to other countries. Although their motto was based on economic growth and development, all of these efforts eventually led to American economic prosperity and, of course, political influence.

During the Cold War, the United States had only extensive economic cooperation with the industrial democracies of Europe, North America, and the Pacific. In the post-Cold War era, however, most countries around the world accepted American leadership in the hope of reaping the benefits of a free trade market.

In a general view, economic power was divided into two categories: 1. Direct power - Indirect power. Direct power refers to the use of economic resources by one country to influence the behavior of another, in the case in these circumstances the government agrees to take actions that it would not normally accept. In contrast, indirect power refers to the ability to shape the economic environment through the establishment of regimes and institutions

which control and limit the political approach of other governments (Saif, 2010). According to these explanations, it does not matter in the 1990s or the new century, only the United States has the economic power in these two areas. For decades, the economic growth rate of the United States has not been less than 2% and despite its huge debts and continuous financial crises, the U.S. economy continues to grow. The International Monetary Fund (IMF) stated in a report that although the economic growth of Japan and even China has slowed down, the United States is still the engine of the world economy. The United States experienced an economic growth rate of 8.2% in 2013 and increased its GDP to 9.1% (Asr-e-Khabar, 2015). Experts on the economic situation in the country in 2016 continued to forecast economic growth of 3% and announced that the kingdom of the dollar will continue (Online News, 2013)

B. Military Hegemony

Michel Sullivan, a researcher at the Credit Suisse Research Institute in Switzerland, presented a report entitled "The End of Globalization or a Multipolar World" in which it ranked the world's most powerful armies in 2015. According to this ranking, despite the reduction in its defense budget and the number of troops, the U.S. military is still the most powerful in the world. While the gap between the strength of the US military and other military powers such as Russia and China is significant. The United States with a military budget of \$610 billion, 1.4 million troops, 8,848 tanks, 13,892 aircraft, and 72 submarines benefits from the largest conventional military force in the world. The military budget of this country is more than the total military budgets of the nine countries ranking second to tenth (Sullivan, 2015). Interestingly, the U.S. military has experienced the most interventions in the world. In 1898, Spain relinquished Cuba and ceded to the United States the Philippines, Puerto Rico, and Guam. The USA army was present in Europe during World War I. Subsequently, the navy set sail for Nicaragua, Honduras, Panama, and Haiti for military intervention. The climax of the country's military intervention in the 20th century was its triumphant participation in World War II, defeating German and Japanese armies during the Cold War, and then defending Europe and even Asia from the threat of communism for decades (Rajabi Nia, 2010). The first decade after the Cold War was also a relatively good time to strengthen US military hegemony. It is worth noting that all US military interventions are carried out in the form of humanitarian slogans such as defending human rights and advancing democracy. The foreign policy of the United States has been described as interventionism after the Cold War. After the collapse of the Soviet Union, many people believe that the most vulnerable period of the United States, that is the period when the United States is facing the danger of a nuclear attack, has ended. But the U.S. military continues its campaign and intervention. The intervention has paved the way for the USA to study in-depth the problems of different regions. For example, the Iraqi army invaded Kuwait in 1991 under the pretext of invading Iraq. After this attack, the United States began to build military bases in the Middle East (Henderson, 2005). Washington also has military bases in other parts of the world. It can be said that this country has surrounded the

world through its large-scale network of military bases. At present, the USA has about 800 military bases around the world (Fars News Agency, 2016). The unparalleled military power of the United States, especially after the Cold War, prompted the famous international relations expert Charles Klasa to put forward the theory of unipolar moments. Klasa acquiesced that the United States is a traditional power in the unconventional era. (Dehshiar, 2010). However, American military superiority is achieved through the following partnerships: unity, joint efforts, competitive arms sales, and provision of supplies. The United States government is helping other countries buy American weapons and participating in the promotion of arms sales abroad (Rajbinia, 2010). In the 1990s, the Clinton administration cut the US military budget as the global threat of communism disappeared, but during the Bush-era there were efforts to institutionalize US militarism on a global scale. Obama, despite emphasizing the use of diplomatic technology rather than war, encouraged the concept of the military in the 21st century and maintained US hegemony in support of the United States forming the largest army in human history, still a strong presence in the strategic regions of the world. (Rahnavard, 2009)

C. Cultural Hegemony

"The world is your oyster" is a saying that has mysteriously evolved from its original appearance in Shakespeare's comedy, while the American believe that the USA is the pearl of this oyster (Mollana, 2011). Since the American military took power in the 18th century and drove British colonialism out of the motherland, the ideals and culture of liberalism and democracy have been established in this country. Today, a "democratic" country is one whose government came to power through competitive elections and has a responsibility to hold its people accountable. Adults of that country have the right to vote and to be voted (Bethham and Boyle, 1997). By this definition, there was no culture of liberal democracy in the United States. The land of the United States, where American Indians and blacks had no basic rights for many years, was called an interesting part of the culture and ideals of liberal democracy, and the path that the United States had taken to achieve liberal democracy, Unlike Europeans dominated by feudalism for centuries, was realized through the exile of British colonial forces. As the French writer, Alexis de Tocqueville wrote in 1831 during his time in the United States, "The great advantage of the United States is that they have achieved democracy without having to endure a democratic revolution. They are born equal and do not need to be equal." (Zakaria, 2005). In any case, the roots of liberal democratic ideas and culture lie in the United States, and the country's political and economic systems have been based on this for more than two centuries. The United States is the epitome of an ideal society. American writers in the 18th century talked about a paradise on earth and according to their writings, present modern America is that paradise on earth. (Zarshenas, 2012). From that time on, the United States was considered an exception, and characteristics such as pride and a sense of difference were associated with its liberal-democratic culture. Perhaps this is why no place in the world uses the national flag in daily political, economic, cultural, and social life as the United

States (Mollana, 2011). Noble human values such as freedom, respect for human rights, and democracy have always been at the core of America's foreign policy. For decades, the United States has been considered the most successful country in protecting human rights and human dignity. The extraordinary freedom and charity of the American people constitute the core of American political culture (Aghaei, 2009). In any case, modern American culture seems to be one of the most popular and attractive countries thanks to its successes in the Cold War and the path of progress from the day after World War II among other cultures and civilizations. Not only does the United States have the largest economy in the world, but half of the world's 500 largest companies are US companies. There are 60 US brands from the world's 100 largest brands. A potential feature of the United States is that it can realize its potential power. American culture, with concepts such as freedom, change, life force, liberty, and youthfulness, can give new energy and youth to other cultures. By the end of the 21st century, it will be the only superpower in the world (Nye, 2010). Nye believes the United States will be the only superpower in the world by the end of the 21st century due to the forerunner of the information revolution and past military investment. In general, the United States claims to be the world's first hegemon in its capacity. As the former French Foreign minister Uber Vedrine pointed out, America's great thinkers and leaders have never doubted that the United States has chosen divine providence as a "vigorous nation" and that it prevailed over mankind and should continue (Kagan, 2010)

However, not only the views of the United States and the world demanding acceptance of leadership but also several other nations have chosen their doctrines and strategies to achieve an acceptable degree of power in international politics. Russia and China are among these countries, and their most important international doctrines are reviewed below.

Return of Russia

In the modern world, the great political unit known as the nation-state has essentially defined its identity in three ways: geographically, historically, and culturally. Russia is a unique country in all three categories. After the collapse of the USSR, Russia is the largest country in the world. It also has the world's largest pristine reserves. Meanwhile, Russia has always been dominated by a huge bureaucracy and a strong ideology (Orthodox Communism). That claim has always taken on an international dimension, beyond Russian borders. This has always plagued Russia. It established its status as a traditional, totalitarian empire in the times of the emperors and the Soviet Union. Since the Russians were able to overthrow the greatest emperor (Napoleon) at that time in 1812, they felt that they could be recognized as a major player internationally. Emperor Tsar and his Soviet heirs followed the same idea. The new Russian Federation in the 1990s, despite its efforts, failed to play the role of a worthy successor to the former Soviet Union. To the extent that for a decade it was always regarded as a secondary power, but its political elites have never been able to forget their historical past, so despite Russia's structural-political and economic weakness, some developers of this country have different theories in

Russia's foreign policy to fulfill their desire to restore Russian identity and turn Russia into a great independent power.

According to Beom-Shik (2007), the foreign policy of the Russian Federation after the collapse of the Soviet Union was based on the views of Kozyrev (Westernist), Primakov, (nationalist), and Putin (pragmatist), each led Russia's foreign policy at any time. Therefore, it can be said that the three perspectives of Westernism, nationalism-traditionalism and pragmatism form the three general approaches of Russia in the post-Soviet era. Russia's foreign policy is historically defined in terms of how it interacts with the West. Western opposition and cooperation identify Russia's foreign policy. Twain sees the historical tradition of Russia's suspicion of Europe in the heritage of Byzantine civilization. Shani Nof, on the other hand, believes that alienation from Western culture and civilization is primarily the result of Mongolian aggression and domination. However, Russia has never been recognized as a European state by other countries on the continent (Karami, 2005). Anti-Western sentiment has always existed in Russia. Russian hatred of the Western world dates back to the Roman Empire and the isolation of the Empire from the Orthodox Church. Western Rome claims to be the successor to the Catholic Church, and the Pope is God's representative on earth and is considered the main enemy of the Russians. The Russians, supporters of the Church of Constantinople, fought many times with the Western Roman Empire, and it was from here that anti-Western ideas arose in Russia. During the period of Tsarist Russia, especially during the reign of Peter the Great in the last quarter of the 18th century, due to the reform policies of Peter the Great, foreigners appeared in Russian state institutions, and this spirit was strengthened. Of course, at that time the whole of Europe was called the West by Russia (Zadokhin, 2005). But after the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia and the establishment of the communist system in 1917, especially after World War II, the United States was introduced as a symbol of capitalism, and its expansionist worldview was a new West and symbol of a full-fledged enemy. Although Soviet Russia was identified as a defeated bloc and disintegrated at the end of the Cold War, not only was anti-Western sentiment prevailing in Russia, it was also accompanied by a sense of humiliation and sometimes even jealousy. Therefore, Moscow needs to revive a new doctrine to return to the realm of international politics. Among the various theories, the theory of Eurasianism is most popular among Russian political leaders, and it is taken into account below.

Eurasianism

The theory of Eurasianism was first proposed in the 1920s by some scholars like Vernadsky, Savitsky, Florovsky, and Sawinsky who were prominent Russian economists, geographers, and philosophers at the time in the Soviet Union. In this theory, Russia is considered an independent country with different cultures, national geography, and economy, and it can become a point of connection between Europe and Asia. After World War I and II, Russia's nationalist tendencies increased. Following the Cold War, some Russians proposed the establishment of a "genetic species" department in the

1990s to help maintain the ethnic purity of the Russian Federation, and the theory of Eurasianism was also proposed by the same patriots and nationalists. However, this theory in the USSR was obscured by communist ideology and was not very popular among the leaders of the group. That is, while nationalism advocated support for the Russian race everywhere, Soviet leaders supported the theory of exporting a revolution and supporting a country or individual that embraced communism. It is perhaps the most important idea that emerged among the first nationalisms of Eurasianism and returned to the field from Russia after communism. Among the various Russian elites, Alexander Dugin is known as the leading theorist of modern Eurasianism. For people like Dugin and Primakohu, Eurasia is a place of Russian heritage and civilization. Alexander Dugin believes that the Eurasian region is known as Russia's traditional environment, and emphasizes that the new Russia will focus its foreign policy on restoring control of the region and supporting the Russians living there. The space in which Dugin believes Russia should seize sovereignty ranges from the west, from southern Europe to Central Asia, and from the east to China and even the Pacific Ocean. (Basin, 2008). During the period of Primacop's State Department administration from 1996 to 1999, the theory of Eurasianism called Euro-Asianism had a great influence on Russia's foreign policy. But the theory failed because of Primacop's excessive anti-Western propensity and subsequent internal problems in Russia. At the same time, the United States moved closer to Russia's haven through NATO and Many Eastern European countries hoped to join the European Union, reducing Moscow's influence in these countries. However, after Putin's reign in 2000, the theory of independence and Eurasianism in Russia became even more serious with a foreign policy that combined realism and pragmatism (understanding the reality of the world and acting accordingly). Putin sought to avoid anti-Western policies by emphasizing Eurasian policies during the Primacop era. As far as Putin was concerned, he managed to accept American hegemony. At the same time, Alexander Dugin stated that "many people mock the idea of a great Russia and do not believe in the identity of an independent Russia". On the other hand, Eurasian offers Moscow an ideal opportunity to restore Russia's geopolitical power, and this is facilitated by the help of ethnic Russian minorities in other countries. Dugin went on to say that it was time for the theory of Eurasianism to move from public and academic theory to formal and practical state policy. Political history has repeatedly shown that most Russians will perish when they move away from their traditions and national identity. So now is the time to regain a sense of national pride in Russia (Aynehvand and Ali Hosseini, 2015). Sergei Karaganov (an important ally of Primakov and later Putin) and other thinkers like Dugin put forward the theory of "patriotic ideology", emphasizing that the new Russia must also support the Russian race abroad, as the Russians outside the borders of this country are also part of this great nation (Mileski, 2015) Dugin and Karaganohu theory emphasizes Russian identity and support for this race even outside its borders, and while this is thought to be natural nationalism, the problem with this plan, and indeed, the ultimate goal of this plan is to allow Russia to intervene in other countries affairs. In other words, according to this doctrine, Moscow reserves the right to interfere in the internal affairs of the state in the name of supporting the Russian race, and some Russian live there like what happened

in Ukraine and Georgia. Since Russia's neo-Eurasianism also includes Islamic countries like the Islamic Republic of Iran, some people believe that the main proponents of Eurasianism are not the regions that belonged to Russia before the Tsarist Empire or the communist period, rather, its main purpose is supporting the regions and people opposing America's unipolar system (Basin, 2008). However, the new theory of Eurasianism has the greatest impact on the foreign policy of the Russian Federation, especially in the Putin era, and guides the actions of its leaders in the field of international politics. Theories like Neo-Eurasianism gave Russia confidence and somehow required it to play an active role in international politics. Russia is currently seeking a balance of power with the United States. A larger and more independent Russia is considered one of the main pillars of this order. According to the new theory of Eurasianism, Russia must not only consolidate its position in its immediate neighbors but also strengthen its relations with countries that do not tolerate US hegemony including modern China as a new international power.

The Rise of China

Regarding different countries, China has experienced an interesting and admirable process in terms of development and progress. It took almost three centuries for Europe, almost a century and a half for the United States, and almost a century for Japan to achieve its current development. But China managed to grow and develop its current economy for almost three decades since 1970. China in 2000 was never comparable to China in the 1970s. China was facing problems at the time of Mao's death that the ideology of communism could not solve. At the same time, the world, especially China's traditional rival, Japan, is embarking on the path of development at a fairly fast pace. Since Deng Xiaoping came to power in 1987, Chinese leaders have concluded that China's development and progress in the international system requires economic growth, and its plans must be rebuilt to succeed. This is why Beijing has been revising its ideology since the early 1980s to emphasize peaceful relations with other countries (Rezaei, 2007). This was an issue that received little attention during Mao's time. Mao's only goal was to compete with the capitalist world as a colonial world. In his speech, he said, "America is a Straw Man (Kissinger, 2013). The history of the People's Republic of China can be divided into two periods: 1. Independence and Isolation in the Western World (1978-1949) 2. Reform and opening up (since 1978). The efforts of the two countries in world politics were completely different. In the 1950s, China and the Soviet Union were recognized as two allies. But in the 1960s, the two leaders of communism kept their distance. From the late 1970s to the early 1980s, China-US relations normalized and even became "Quasi-united" (A. Milichova et al., 2014). China intensified Western efforts which lasted for more than 200 years and achieved modernization in about 30 years, and this country was recognized as one of the world's new powers in 2000. What is interesting and perhaps surprising about China is that, in addition to its extraordinary pace of progress, it has been moving forward without challenging the international system. Perhaps this is why Farid Zakaria named China as "the most successful development story in the history of the world" (Zakaria, 2014). Chinese leaders believe that national progress can only be

achieved in the context of regional and international stability and it is not necessary, like other countries did, to increase the sensitivity of other large countries towards China. The Communist theorist Zheng Beijing clarified this issue very well and stated that China would not do this, but it would go beyond the traditional methods of emerging powers and work with countries around the world to strive for peace, development, and cooperation (Kagan, 2011). In the field of foreign policy, for the past 30 years, China has always followed the pattern of "promoting peace and development together" and has chosen the motto of peaceful development as its foreign policy.

Foreign Policy: Peaceful Development

The death of Mao Zedong on September 9, 1976, marked the beginning of a new era in the People's Republic of China. For 30 years, Mao has shaped China according to Marxist theory, a theory that has seriously rejected capitalism, and the pursuit of self-interest. The man who ruled China after Mao Zedong was completely against the views of the founding of the People's Republic of China. Deng Xiaoping considered it an honor to be rich. Deng Xiaoping has since been prouder of having saved people from poverty and misery than any other leader in China's history (Azkan, 2009). The world needs it. The Chinese experienced the humiliation of 100 years of history, so there was no positive view of connecting to the outside world before Deng Xiaoping took power.

From 1840 to 1949, China overcame a barrier known as the Century of Humiliation. The barriers that began with the Opium War were that Britain, which caused the war, actually colonized China. During this period, exchanges between China and other nations were completely influenced by the equations of the mighty nations, and the Chinese once experienced the meaning of colonies.

If China wants to continue the Mao era, knowing that it will go through a century of humiliation, in 1978 it began reforming foreign policy, especially in the area of foreign policy (Varrall, 2015). Deng Xiaoping advocated an "Open Door Policy", emphasizing the need to borrow technology and science from abroad as a means of strengthening China's power base. The Deng doctrine, entitled "The Search for Truth through Facts Based on Open Door Policy" was put on the agenda of the Communist Party in late 1978.

According to Deng Xiaoping, economic development was a priority, considering that national welfare and the economy were more important than philosophical issues. What Deng Xiaoping did later became known in Chinese politics for Chinese socialism, including market-style reforms and the welcome of foreign investment. According to Deng, any country's power and influence depended on its economic power and technology, and that progress was the absolute truth (Verdinejad and Olamayifar, 2011).

Deng can surpass economic power over ideological power. Of course, he didn't want the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to be overthrown but only believed that its existence was only possible if China was economically

viable. Connecting with the outside world is a daunting task for China, which has chosen nearly thirty years of international isolation as its main policy. But according to his doctrine, Deng only thought of China's role on the world stage, and thus normalized Beijing's relations with other countries. The transformation of China's relations with the outside world can be seen as the most important part of Deng's reforms. Making trust and accepting the rules of the international system to attract capital, technology, and knowledge to run the world is the most important thing pursued by Deng Xiaoping's Open Door Policy. Deng pursued a policy of expanding relations with the West, and at the regional level, he also improved China's relations with countries dominated by capitalism. Supporting world peace against war and arms is an example of one of the main slogans of Chinese diplomacy during Deng's time. Deng needed at least twenty years of calm and ideological tension to implement his policies. Overall, the impact of Deng's reformist stance on foreign policy was as following: a) renewed focus on China's national interests; b) penetration of nationalist ethics into foreign policy; c) new understanding of strong events in the international system; d) clarification of China's foreign policy concerning the Mao era and China's independent foreign policy against the Soviet Union which called for alliances against the capitalist world (Mousavi Shafaei, Nazifkar, 2001).

Beijing's normalization of foreign relations was most evident in relations with the United States. At first, no one might have thought that the domination of the Chinese Communist Party could exacerbate and expand relations with the leaders of the capitalist system. On January 28, 1979, Deng met Jimmy Carter in Washington, D.C., and he visited the United States as the first Chinese leader in 30 years. During this trip, the smile and friendly demeanor of Deng made the new China very different from the past, promising to use only peaceful means to protect national interests (Azkan, 2009). Relationships with the major leaders of the capitalist system, many political scholars believed that communism was rejected in China long before the Soviet Union since Deng's Open-Door Policy was implemented in China seven years before Gorbachev's Glasnost and Los Troika plans in the Soviet Union (Sanberry, 2007). The result that Deng and his successors obtained following the de-escalation and expansionism under the shadow of peace and stability was surprising. The economy of China has been growing at about 9% annually for 30 years, making it the fastest-growing economy in history. Also, during these thirty years, the leaders of this country have saved about four hundred million people from poverty, which is the most poverty alleviation achieved in history (Zakaria, 2013). In Xiaoping's view, the international system was an opportunity rather than a threat. He once declared that he was seeking 50 years of peace with the international system (Rezaei, 2008).

By 2000, China's diplomacy had been promoting peaceful coexistence and beneficial cooperation with the outside world for over 20 years. Since the 1980s, China's positive view of the state of the international system is probably most apparent in Deng Xiaoping's famous writings. Deng Xiaoping, who believed that a country that closed the door to the world could never develop, accepted the conditions of the international system and said, "We are

in the river and we need to choose between advance and retreat” (Mousavi Shafaei, Nazifkar, 2001). The issue of peaceful coexistence with other countries has been guiding China's foreign policy until the early 2000s, and finally, in 2003, "peaceful rise" was adopted as China's future grand diplomatic strategy and the goal to long term to eliminate "perceived threats". The document "Path to Peaceful Development" published in 2005 presented China's activities in the new millennium (Sazmand and Arghavani, 2012). It is known as the most important document era for China's development after the Cold War. China's development strategy is as follows: "China will work hard to create a peaceful international environment, promote its development on the one hand and maintain world peace on the other. It will accompany the process of economic globalization and strive to benefit the common development interests of all countries" (ShariatNia, 2009). Since the 1980s, all the efforts of Chinese leaders have been used on concepts such as peace and peaceful coexistence, and also development and new power to present themselves as a great country without challenges. They expressed concern about its growing power and demanded that it need to be controlled. Since the 1990s, the issue of China's rise and fall from third-world countries has cast a shadow on China-US relations. However, there are huge contradictions between a country that has been on the development path for 30 years and a country that has been paying attention to the development path for 300 years. One of the main differences between the two is that the former requires neat and precise strategies, while the latter only requires one shot. China can be included in the first group of countries, a country recognized as an exception in a developing and progressive world.

The United States is in front of them, and it is more about the awe of greatness than beauty. Europeans like complexity, Japanese like rejection, but Americans like greatness, especially super-greatness. This is why China is so occupying American minds (Zakaria, 2014). Among political theorists, some oppose the pacifist rhetoric of Chinese officials and have a negative attitude towards increasing their power. Among them was John Mir Schaimer, who regarded the domination of the East Asian region as threatening and wrote: "If this hegemony is achieved, the region will become a dangerous place." (Kang, 2005).

Despite the pessimistic theories and views of the American elite, the slogan of Chinese rejuvenation, first enunciated by Dr. Sun Yatsun, is being pursued more seriously by today's Chinese leaders. . China's rejuvenation slogan addresses two issues: 1. China's power today and its efforts to strengthen it are primarily aimed at regaining the international status lost in the past, and therefore is nothing new. 2. China's rise to power has the sole purpose of protecting and realizing national interests, based on justice and equity, so it does not seek interests superior to those of other countries (Xuetong, 2001).). Overall, the scale of change in China is unimaginable, making it a new power at the international level could bring new developments in the future, and especially as China itself seems to have chosen this path and is gradually moving away from its peaceful shell.

The Future of Hegemony in the International System

Achieving hegemony has been the dream of every great power throughout history. It may be that only the United States has achieved this. The United States has had the strongest military power and the richest developed economy since the 1990s. The combination of thought and materialism worked well in this country and made America among others the most attractive superpower in history. The general view at the time was that the United States would become the dominant power for a long time to come. As Bill Clinton said in his 1997 presidential inaugural address, "This last inauguration of the twentieth century, let's look at the challenges ahead for the next century... At the beginning of the twenty-first century... the nation of the United States is the only country without an alternative (Brzezinski, 2013) However, in addition to American claims that they are exceptional, the outbreak of the war in Iraq and Afghanistan and the subsequent financial crisis of 2007 were ending the golden age of the United States, and its power was waning. There are factors involved. 1. The center of the world economy is moving from Euro-Atlantic to Asia. 2. Changes in economic impact have significant geopolitical implications. Because it creates great new powers like China or India. 3. The United States is now at the expense of more empire burdens, 4. The prospects for America's economic future are vague These factors indicate the emergence of a world in the future in which the United States will no longer be the only superpower (Clark and Hogg, 2014).

However, there is much analysis of the post-American world, and many governments have begun to achieve the position of the United States. Meanwhile, Russia and China have a better chance of gaining a leading position in the international system. Currently, the United States does not have the prestige required to become a newcomer to the international system and needs to share the trophies with other countries. This is very obvious in the Iran nuclear case. The issue is that Obama seeks the cooperation of all permanent members of the Security Council and Germany, while if the United States benefited from its post-war power in Afghanistan, it would act alone to solve this problem.

But now that the world of the future will no longer be America's world, where will the international system go? Farid Zakaria believes that a change in the international distribution of power does not mean that the future world will turn against the Americans. Rather, the future world should be seen as a post-American world (Zakaria, 2014). Some believe that the future direction of power will change from West to East in the future and that China is the country that overthrew the United States and became a global superpower. The twenty-first century will therefore be the century of Asia. Although the benefits of China's opening up to the outside world are not militaristic, other countries hope to benefit from China's economic growth, which will provide it with influence and, ultimately, power and dominance over other regions. The West realizes that it cannot contain China and seeks to strike a deal with China. As such, the West must accept China's hegemony and at the same time agree and appreciate the rise of China and call it peaceful. The growth of

China and its neighbors turned the next century into the Asian century. Asia is now on the path of changing Western values. Attitudes toward Western society, organized in terms of civil liberties and democracy, etc., have been challenged by Asia. Last but not least, Asia needs to say a lot in the 21st century (Nizbit, 2006).

On the other hand, Russia today is very different from Russia in the past. Russia is currently more centralized, politically stable, and less democratic. But it has made great progress economically, and now Russia is becoming more militant and decisive in international relations. The elites of this country also dream of winning global management (Amelichova et al., 2014). But considering the four dimensions of power and the situation of each country, Brzezinski's analysis seems to be more plausible and credible than the future world. Brzezinski believes that with the decline of US power, it seems unlikely that a country like China can only dominate the world as an alternative solution, at least it is unlikely to replace the United States before 2025. Russia cannot play the same role as the United States has done since 1991. The future world is more likely to be a world full of political uncertainties and turbulent times (Brzezinski, 2013). Although today China has made great strides in the economic field and Russia has made great strides in the military field, they do not have all the capabilities to obtain global management rights. For example, none of them have a pervasive ideology to replace liberal democracy, which will plunge the future world into an unprecedented abyss. Of course, neither the Russian Orthodox Church nor the Confucian ideological system in China can achieve the same acceptance that liberal democracy has achieved worldwide. Based on this interpretation, it can be argued that the future world is polarized or there will be nothing new that governments are offering to the world for at least the next 50 years.

CONCLUSION

Every day more signs of changes in the geometric structure of world power emerge. The decline of American hegemony based on the application of theories related to the power cycle in the science of international relations to the observation of world developments shows that in the coming years one should think of a powerful America along with other poles in the world in which nowhere is a hegemon.

The international system has shifted from the era of US hegemony and unipolar system to a system that can be called a polar system. The increasing number of crises that have not reached the foot of silence, no matter how much the United States intervenes, is a sign of these changes. This transitional stage which some people call the post-polar world system, is distinguished from other forms of the world system through some features as some of them are the result of the weakened ability to control the great powers, which may affect what is ultimately left behind in the transitioning world. The post-polar system is transitioning to a more stable state. During this period, the elements that constitute the old order collapse, and the elements that constitute the new order emerge.

Under such circumstances, no country among the big powers can control the world completely and unconditionally. In this control crisis, the problems that could have been solved by the will of the big powers and institutional mechanisms challenged the world order and the will of the government. In addition, since no country can control everything that happens in the political and economic spheres, the uncertainty of results has become so common that it will change to a universal feature of the world system. As the uncertainty expands, countries adopt a more cautious attitude in pursuing interests; because they cannot guarantee the usefulness of their choices in the absence of control over disturbance variables. We will face a chaotic and unpredictable world in the future, in which government chaos will be the most obvious feature.

REFERENCES

- Baldwin, D. A. (1993). Neoliberalism, neorealism, and world politics. *Neorealism and neoliberalism: The contemporary debate*, 3.
- Bassin, M. (2008). Eurasianism “Classical” and “Neo”: the lines of continuity. na.
- Beom-Shik, S. H. I. N. (1994). Russia’s perspectives on international politics: A comparison of liberalist, realist and geopolitical paradigms. *Mirovaia ekonomika i mezhdunarodnye otnosheniia* (hereafter MEiMO), 2.
- Hellmann, G., & Wolf, R. (1993). Neorealism, neoliberal institutionalism, and the future of NATO. *Security Studies*, vol, Vol 3.No. 1.
- Ikenberry, Jhon(2008)”The Futuer Of power”,*Foreign Affairs*.March/April.
- Kang, D. C. (2005). Why China's rise will be peaceful: Hierarchy and stability in the East Asian region. *Perspectives on Politics*, Vol. 3.No. 3.
- Keohane, R. O. (1986). *Neorealism and its Critics*. Columbia University Press.
- Kissane, D. (2005). 2015 and the Rise of China: power Cycle Analysis and the Implications for Australia. *Security Challenges*, Vol. 1.No. 1.
- Mileski, T. (2015). Identifying the new Eurasian orientation in modern Russian geopolitical thought. *Eastern Journal of European Studies*, Vol.6.No. 2.
- Sullivan, Michael(2015)” The End of Globalization or a more Multipolar World?”, Research Institute
- Thought leadership from Credit Suisse Research and the world’s foremost experts. Available at: <https://www.credit-suisse.com/ch/en/about-us/research/research-institute/publications.html>.
- Varrall, Merriden. (2015). Chinese worldviews and China’s foreign policy, Lowy Institute for International Policy. Available at: <http://www.lowyinstitute.org/publications/chinese-worldviews-chinas-foreign-policy>.
- Waltz, Kenneth H. (1979), *Theory of International Politics*, New York: Random House.
- Weiner, robert. (2010). *Neorealism*, university of massachusetts boston. Available at: https://www.umb.edu/academics/cla/faculty/robert_weiner.
- Xuetong, Y. (2001). The rise of China in Chinese eyes. *Journal of Contemporary China*, Vol.10.No. 26.