SCTCMG 2022
International Scientific Conference «Social and Cultural Transformations in the Context of
Modern Globalism»

NEW CHALLENGES AND THREATS TO THE FOREIGN POLICY OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Inna Nikolaevna Burganova (a)*
*Corresponding author

(a) Orenburg State Pedagogical University, 19, Sovetskaya str., Orenburg, Russia, burganovain@yandex.ru

Abstract

The article shows new challenges and threats to the foreign policy of the Russian Federation and proposes a mechanism for leveling these risks in the context of the globalization of the international community. Transparency of national borders leads to greater interdependence of states and the emergence of non-military threats that threaten the security of the entire international community. The author concludes that the analysis of threats to the foreign policy of the Russian Federation shows a clear correlation between the levels of international and national security. The transformation of the levels of national and international security shows that they are becoming non-classical, expressed by indirect military clashes, the problems of increasing illegal migration, corruption, and poverty. The main instruments of foreign policy activity of the Russian Federation are the mechanism of multi-vector diplomacy and "soft power." The following measures should become the mechanisms for neutralizing global challenges. In the political sphere, state institutions should work both at the national (on their territory) and international levels (within the framework of world politics). In the socio-economic sphere of society, measures must be developed to combat the phenomena of poverty, to address the issue of the egalitarianism of social groups in society. In the cultural sphere, the problem of leveling global threats is on the spectrum. Creating a common system of spiritual education and patriotic values is important.

Corresponding Author: Inna Nikolaevna Burganova

1. Introduction

Any state's foreign policy is in the face of growing global challenges and threats. These risks are due to the transparency of state borders. The Russian Federation, like other state actors, is in the context of the globalization of world politics and the economy. The states must consider the adverse effects of modern challenges, as they threaten the security of society, human rights, and freedoms, the national sovereignty of the state, and territorial integrity. Therefore, it is necessary to study the problematic field of risks to national and international security, and the foreign policy of the Russian Federation. It is important to study their content characteristics of risks and challenges but also, they're further leveling and neutralization.

2. Problem Statement

At the present stage, the differences are being erased by the challenges of the foreign policy activities of the state in the international arena. In these circumstances, foreign policy is becoming a key tool for the progressive development of the state in leveling the threats to the global community. As part of this study, we need to answer the following problematic questions:

 i. What are the threats to Russia's national security, considering modern global threats?

 ii. What are the national security priorities of the Russian Federation and are they identical to the challenges of international security?

 iii. What is the content of the foreign policy instruments of the Russian Federation to neutralize risks in the international arena?

 iv. What is the mechanism for reducing the risks to national and international security of the Russian Federation?

3. Research Questions

 i. Threats to national and international security.

 ii. The content of the foreign policy instruments of the Russian Federation to neutralize risks in the international arena; the mechanism for reducing the risks of national and international security

4. Purpose of the Study

The study aims to conduct a systematic analysis of the challenges and threats of the foreign policy of the Russian Federation in the context of globalization. To achieve this goal, the following tasks were set:

 i. to determine the impact of global challenges and threats on national and international security (on the example of the Russian Federation);

 ii. to analyze classical and non-classical threats to national and international security;

 iii. to identify the tools of the foreign policy of the Russian Federation to level global risks;

 iv. to develop a mechanism to reduce the challenges to national and international security.

5. Research Methods

The author used the tools of systemic, structural-functional, and comparative analysis in this research. These methods allowed us to investigate the phenomenon of national and international security and foreign policy of the Russian Federation in the system of global challenges and threats. Also, the methodological basis of the research was general scientific methods, such as analysis, synthesis, and concretization. For the validity of the study, normative documents were applied: "The Concept of Foreign Policy" (editions 2000, 2008, 2013, 2016); Messages on National Security of the President of the Russian Federation to the Federal Assembly; "On the Approval of the Concept of National Security of the Russian Federation"; "On the National Security Strategy of the Russian Federation until 2020". Thus, we based on various techniques and methods that allow objectively investigating the challenges and threats to the foreign policy of the Russian Federation.

6. Findings

The Foreign Policy Concept of the Russian Federation is the main document that captures the views of politicians and elites "on the basic principles, priority areas of the foreign policy activities of the Russian Federation" (The concept of foreign policy of the Russian Federation). Therefore, to understand the content of the challenges and threats, we need to understand how the revisions of these documents and the actions of the Russian Federation in the international arena have changed. With the adoption of the 2000 Foreign Policy Concept, the Kremlin outlined two key tasks: identifying new threat challenges in the context of the system of international relations and "rethinking the general situation around the Russian Federation (On the Approval of the Concept of the …). The concept of foreign policy demonstrates the change in the vectors of the Russian Federation's activities in the international arena (RFFA, 1996). After 1991, within the framework of post-reform Russia, the Kremlin sought to resolve issues of domestic politics. As for the foreign policy of the Russian Federation, it did not go beyond the scope of ensuring order along the perimeter of the borders. The Russian Federation has become interested in the security of the whole world (MID RF, 2020). One indicative moment is Moscow's position that the key challenge is "the creation of a universal structure of the world under the dominance of the United States." That is, the system of double standards leads to the establishment of Western-oriented approaches in the formal institutions of collective security.

The content of the 2000 Concept concerns two major processes. On the one hand, it is not possible to solve the challenges that threaten the entire international community by the forces of one state. Therefore, a subsidiary mechanism for all participants in world politics is needed. On the other hand, the existence of unresolved conflicts on a regional basis contributes to the desire of countries to form a belt of "good neighborliness along the perimeter" of their borders. In 2013, a new edition of the Foreign Policy Concept (CWR) appeared. It has become clear that the content of foreign policy threats has undergone a certain transformation.

First, due to the state of reducing the opportunities of the West to dominate in world politics and economics of Russia, to maintain international security, has taken the path of expanding the partners' dialogue platform. For example, the partners' dialogue platforms are BRICS, and SCO.

Secondly, the challenges to national and international security of Russia and the world in this document were called "the trend of increasing the importance of the factor of civilizational identity." That is, the events in the Middle East have become an indicator that it is impossible to impose the values of democratic ideology and liberal postulates on countries with a different confessional codes. Because this strategy leads to a "clash of civilizations."

A comparative analysis of the CWR 2000 and 2013 shows that the trends of parallel levels of national and international security persist. Risks are becoming more and more global. The Foreign Policy Concept of 2000 fixed such challenges as the problem of international terrorism and the creation of a belt of good neighborliness along the perimeter of the post-Soviet space, as well as the existence of threats of transnational organized crime and an increase in drug trafficking, the proliferation of WMD (weapons of mass destruction). Then the 2013 edition of the Concept fixed more moments of non-classical threats associated with an increase in the number of illegal immigrants, problems of maritime piracy, corruption phenomena, a general shortage of vital resources, as well as the radicalization of relations in society; poverty; the presence of environmental risks; changing climatic conditions; challenges of information and food security.

In addition, in this document, the emphasis on external risks concerns the re-ideologization of the IR (international relations). That is, the Russian Federation considers the issue of threats on the platform of international security rather than national. This issue is quite logical because of the processes of the interdependence of the participants in the international community when the leveling of global challenges is impossible by the efforts of one actor. Since the global processes taking place in the world are characterized more and more by "uncontrollability. The Russian Federation also defines the danger of risks on the world stage in the spectrum of the use of unilateral forceful instruments by state participants outside the legal mechanisms of the UN Charter and the UN Security Council.

The methodological basis of the external steps of national actors on the world stage has changed both in terms of their arsenal and in terms of their effect. The notorious "hard power" system has worked well in the realist and neorealist paradigms. Even within the framework of the departure from the forceful vision of international relations to the course of "intimidation," the common truth becomes clear: "If you want peace, prepare for war." The advent of atomic and then thermonuclear weapons put the world in the situation of a "time bomb". For states to be safe, many countries are working on new types of weapons. States are talking more and more about the importance of improving weapons, strategic exercises, and diversifying military-political cooperation, but at the same time, they are holding the idea of raising the level of international security, etc. The same NPT (Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty) failed to close Pandora's box. Many countries have been added to the five of the UN Security Council, which have become owners of WMD (weapons of mass destruction) without a positive resolution from other members of the international community and the IAEA.

A dilemma arose between the levels of national and international security, which resulted in global threats for all members of the international community. Therefore, the countries increasingly converge on the communitarian idea of creating a clear supranational mechanism for leveling the global challenges of our time. Communiqués, summits, forums, and high-level meetings are the very "soft power" platforms.

The foreign policy activity of states in the context of globalization is being transformed into the format of "network diplomacy." The dialogue between the actors takes place in the form of "changeable geometry," when states do not seek to delegate their powers to the communitarian level. Countries act in foreign policy for their benefit. Such flexibility contributes to deepening cooperation in areas that are fraught with risks for all participants in the dialogue.

Therefore, at the present stage of development, the Russian Federation conducts its foreign policy using "network diplomacy" as a platform for neutralizing threats to international and national security. The transformation of foreign policy instruments (in the example of the Russian Federation) can be associated with the following factors: First, the general alignment of forces in the international arena after 1945 assumed a bloc format of participants in world politics. In this sense, one can speak of an unfavorable set of circumstances for the actors, when their actions were limited by the rigid framework of the blocs (NATO and the Warsaw Pact). There is a "narrowing" of the format of the country's foreign policy due to the limited number of participants in the bloc. At the same time, the countries are in a position of constant aggravation of relations with the opposite bloc. Therefore, the intensification of the arms race and the growth of rivalry led to the understanding that the bloc's format must be reviewed as an instrument of foreign policy.

The emergence of "network diplomacy" can be associated with the transparency of state threats and the processes of globalization. In the context of increasing points of contact between states, the spectrum of their communication focuses more on leveling global threats. In these circumstances, a supranational mechanism for resolving issues at the level of international organizations plays into the hands.

In addition, the emergence of "network diplomacy" can be explained by the decrease in the importance of US dominance in the world. Since September 11, 2001, multipolarity has played an increasingly important role in international relations. Not only Washington but also other actors of the international community are becoming responsible for resolving issues on the international agenda.

The growth in the number of actors in the international arena includes multi-level goals in world politics, and the desire of states to express their steps in foreign policy through the mechanism of "changeable" geometry.

In general, the foreign policy of the Russian Federation took place at the angle of two trends:

1) the presence of global threats makes it desirable for actors to cooperate at the supranational level and with various international communities;

2) the possibility of potential risks in the perimeter zone of the post-Soviet space directs Russia towards the creation of a belt of good neighborliness along the perimeter of its borders.

The Russian foreign policy course is carried out following the principles of "network diplomacy." Therefore, the Kremlin is building a dialogue with the rest of the world community through the mechanism of multilateral communication with the simultaneous non-recognition of the unipolar vision of international relations on the part of the White House. The stabilization of the situation in domestic politics has allowed Russia intensifying cooperation with the BRICS, SCO, members of the CU, APEC, and other associations. The Russian Federation, using a flexible format of interstate relations, maneuvers between various players and does not limit its steps to a bloc format of diplomacy.

One of the tools of the foreign policy of the Russian Federation is the diversification of areas of interaction in the face of sanctions measures by the side of Western countries. Unfortunately, we can say that after 2014 the situation in the Russian Federation has not changed for the better. In particular, it was excluded from the G8. In addition, the presence of sanctions affects the economic potential of Russia. The stumbling blocks for Russia's foreign policy are problems in the domestic socio-economic sphere and the determinism of the national currency exchange rate from the prices of oil resources.

Threats to international and national security are leveled by the Russian Federation and other participants also with the help of tools of "network diplomacy." However, risks at the level of non-systemic actors are added to global challenges. Among them, a special place is occupied by terrorist organizations that destabilize the environment of international relations. Therefore, state actors are in a state of need to neutralize these risks. After the terrorist attack in Sinai, the Russian Federation took the path of leveling ISIS, for example, the Kremlin took part in military operations in Syria to eliminate the terrorist groups' ISIS, al-Qaeda, and Jabhat al-Nusra (Ivanova et al., 2020).

In the conditions of the interdependence of countries, such institutional means as the negotiation process between the participants in world politics, the mediation mechanism, sessions of international communities, meetings, summits, congresses, and conferences become levers for solving global threats.

In many respects, this form of cooperation between actors is not determined by a rigid framework. The flexibility of communication when establishing contacts allows making effective decisions. The key tool of the "network" mechanism is "soft power" (Nye, 2004).

In the problem of implementing the idea of a collective mechanism of state actors in the fight against global challenges, one can argue about contradictions:

1) why, in a situation of increasing the level of cooperation and communication between countries, international organizational structures, there is no decrease in risks in world politics;

2) why states cannot counter international security challenges on their territory;

3) why do international supranational structures and countries at the supranational level come to a compromise for a uniform vision of solving global challenges?

Therefore, it is so important to explore these dichotomies at the present stage.

The first dichotomy is determined by the very system of international relations. The openness and transparency of state borders cause the problem of the growth of global challenges and threats.

The second contradiction lies in the dilemma of the very possibilities of state players neutralizing challenges and threats (Fedorchenko & Krylov, 2015). Countries have control levers in the form of the creation of regulatory documents, rigid measures to toughen penalties for criminal articles, and blocking pages on the Internet that promote radical ideas. At the same time, the state's citizens often evaluate such actions by state bodies as interference in their personal lives, violating the rights and freedoms of citizens.

The third dichotomy is determined by the possibilities of the state's national interests in foreign policy. That is, the desire to level the global challenges of one state collides with the position of other countries, which may perceive such actions as increasing their position in the world.

Thus, global challenges and threats are a consequence of the diffusion of the international community (Gutorov & Shirinyants, 2017). There is an increase in players, including illegitimate ones (terrorist organizations, extremist organizations), which leads to a destabilization of the general situation

in world politics. Unfortunately, the communitarian foundations for dealing with these risks are not unified. Due to the fear of the countries sharing their sovereignty to neutralize threats. Since the national interests of the state actors themselves can be limited due to the rules of international communities, which include countries at the level of member-participants. In these circumstances, the problem of the lack of egalitarianism of states in dealing with global risks appears. Ultimately, tensions among national actors increase (Roberts, 2018). For example, states have different scenarios for dealing with the spread of COVID-19, international terrorism, and piracy. Against the general background of increasing risks at the global level, this contributes to even more problems. For example, terrorism causes problems of increasing migration flows, organized crime, and arms trafficking.

Thus, these global call propagation processes make it possible to single out the following scenarios for the development of events:

1. Optimistic scenario. The possibilities of such a scenario relate to the desire of states to solve the issues of neutralizing global risks in a communitarian way, where it is important to consider all the approaches of the countries participating in the international community.

2. Pessimistic scenario. Its implementation will be obvious in the absence of unified approaches to leveling the challenges of our time.

A cause-and-effect analysis of global challenges and threats to foreign policy, and international and national security involves not only their substantive characteristics but also the identification of the very mechanism for their neutralization. To do this, it is necessary to highlight the "tree of problems" due to the increase in threats, as well as consider possible ways to solve them.

The problem of spreading risks affects the levels of international and national security. Therefore, it is important to study them in all spheres of society.

These challenges affect all state actors, including the Russian Federation. Therefore, it is necessary to develop a mechanism that will allow the players of the international community to neutralize global threats. The author of this work has identified measures that allow leveling challenges in all four areas of society.

In the political sphere, the state institution plays the main role in erasing threats to national and international security. In this sense, we can talk about the introduction of an effective regulatory framework that can both identify global risks and introduce legislative solutions to neutralize them. That is, there is an expression of understanding on the agenda for the citizens of the country that state institutions are doing everything possible to level the challenges. Thus, the idea of increasing the legitimization of power is being implemented and a tough stance on the part of political leaders and elites is demonstrated to combat challenges. In addition, within the framework of a specific threat (for example, a terrorist threat), the state levels the risks of involvement of potential members of terrorist structural associations. Thus, rigid measures on the part of state players stop the possibilities and real steps of terrorists, terrorist organizations, recruiters, and representatives of radical ideologies.

In these circumstances, state institutions should work at all levels (for example, family, school, technical school, university, media, army) to slow down the processes of leveling threats both nationally (on their territory) and internationally (within the framework of world politics).

In the socio-economic sphere of society, measures must be developed to combat the phenomena of poverty and to address the issue of the egalitarianism of social groups of society against the background of today's sharp differentiation of the population.

In the cultural sphere, the problem of leveling global threats is on the spectrum, it is important to build a common system of spiritual education, and patriotic values. States must work with the neutralization of threats at the level of limiting the propaganda of spheres of violence, as well as the romanticization of ideas of racial superiority, images of a terrorist and an extremist, xenophobia, and fascist ideas.

In the spiritual sphere, state players are presented with the idea of spreading radical ideologies. This aspect concerns the negative perception of migrants among the youth. It is important to strive in the context of globalization for the peaceful coexistence of different national and ethnic groups. Also, state actors need to develop rules of uniformity for the cultural majority, as well as for representatives of the newcomer population (migrants). At the same time, refugees must be loyal to the values of the citizens of the country where they arrived. Only such a mechanism can contribute to the overall harmonization of the dialogue between most of the civilian population and migrants.

It is important to develop the links of a common system for leveling threats across the entire spectrum of society's activities at the level of the political, socio-economic, and spiritual spheres of society. Tightening control over groups of people representing views of Islamic fundamentalism and radicalism. At the same time, a common readiness for dialogue can become a bridge that will connect state actors along the path of neutralizing global challenges and threats.

7. Conclusion

1. The adoption of the regulatory framework of the Russian Federation in the form of various editions of the Foreign Policy Concept is associated with an increase in global challenges and threats. Moreover, the content of national and international security risks has been constantly transformed. However, more and more we can talk about the symmetry of the levels of national and international security. That is, these risks are becoming more and more global. The Foreign Policy Concept of 2000 fixed such challenges as the problem of international terrorism and the creation of a belt of good neighborliness along the perimeter of the post-Soviet space, as well as the existence of threats of transnational organized crime and an increase in drug trafficking, the proliferation of WMD (weapons of mass destruction). Then later in the 2008 Concept, the problem of rejection of the universal vision of the system of international relations on the part of the administration of the White House (USA) is indicated. The 2013 and 2016 editions of the Concept fixed the moments of non-classical threats associated with the growing number of illegal immigrants, the problems of maritime piracy, corruption phenomena, the general shortage of vital resources, as well as the radicalization of relations in society; poverty; the presence of environmental risks; changing climatic conditions; challenges of information and food security, the increasing importance of the factor of civilizational identity, and, as a result, the problem of clash of civilizations along the fault line (Garnett, 1970).

2. The Russian Federation in the international arena adheres to a clear position on the rejection of the tools of "hard power" in the foreign policy of any state actors. The reason is that "hard power" leads

to chaos and uncontrollability in international affairs. The Kremlin believes that the use of force is contrary to the provisions of the UN Charter and the UN Security Council and is accompanied by the phenomenon of an arms race and the growth of conflicts between countries and interstate contradictions. A dilemma arose between the levels of national and international security, which resulted in global threats for all members of the international community. Therefore, countries increasingly converge on the communitarian idea of creating a clear supranational mechanism for leveling the global challenges of our time. Communiqués, summits, forums, and high-level meetings are the very "soft power" platforms (Pierpaoli, 2015).

3. The foreign policy activity of states in the context of globalization is being transformed into the format of "network diplomacy." The dialogue between the actors takes place in the form of "changeable geometry," when states do not seek to delegate their powers to the communitarian level but act in foreign policy following their benefit. Such flexibility contributes to deepening cooperation in areas that are fraught with risks for all participants in the dialogue. The instrumental base of "soft power" makes it possible to neutralize threats to national and international security.

4. The following measures should become the mechanisms for neutralizing global challenges and threats:

    i.   in the political sphere, state institutions should work at all levels (family, school, college, university, media, army, etc.) to slow down the processes of leveling threats both at the national (on their territory) and international levels (within the framework of world politics);

    ii.   in the socio-economic sphere of society, measures should be developed to combat the phenomena of poverty, to address the issue of the egalitarianism of social groups of society against the background of today's sharp differentiation of the population;

    iii.   in the cultural sphere, the problem of leveling global threats is on the spectrum of building a common system of spiritual education and patriotic values.

States must work with the neutralization of threats at the level of limiting the propaganda of spheres of violence, as well as the romanticization of ideas of racial superiority, images of a terrorist and an extremist, xenophobia, and fascist ideas.

It is important to develop the links of a common system for leveling threats across the entire spectrum of society's activities at the level of the political, socio-economic, and spiritual spheres of society. At the same time, a common readiness for dialogue can become the bridge that will connect state actors along the path of neutralizing global challenges and threats.

References

Fedorchenko, A. V., & Krylov, A. V. (2015). The phenomenon of the Islamic State. *Bulletin of MGIMO-University, 2*(41), 174–183. Charter of the United Nations. https://doi.org/10.24833/2071-8160-2015-2-41-211-220

Garnett, J. (1970). *Theories of Peace and Security: A Reader in Contemporary Strategic Thought*. St. Martin's Press.

Gutorov, V., & Shirinyants, A. (2017). Modern terrorism as political and psychological phenomenon: The actual problems of interpretation. *Przeglad Strategiczny, 10*, 277–293. https://doi.org/10.14746/ps.2017.1.15

Ivanova, A. G., Burganova, I. N., & Sheshukova, G. V. (2020). Perspectivies on Terrorism, Culture, and Globalization: A Comprehensive Review of the Contemporary Scholarship. *Tarih Kültür ve Sanat Araştirmalari* [History, Culture and Art Studies], *9*(1), 182–194.

MID RF. (2020). *On the National Security Strategy of the Russian Federation until 2020.* http://www.mid.ru.

Nye, J. S. (2004). *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics*. Public Affairs.

Pierpaoli, Jr. P. G. (2015). Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant. *U.S. Conflicts in the 21st Century: Afghanistan War, Iraq War, and the War on Terror (3 volumes): Afghanistan War, Iraq War, and the War on Terror* / Ed. Spencer C. Tucker (English) Russian.

RFFA. (1996). *Address on National Security of the President of the Russian Federation to the Federal Assembly of August 7, 1996*. http://kremlin.ru

Roberts, M. J. (2018). Radical Origins: Why We Are Losing the Battle Against Islamic Extremism-and How to Turn the Tide. *Journal of Strategic Security 11*(2), 93–95. Pegasus Books. https://doi.org/10.5038/1944-0472.11.2.1683