

US, Chinese, and Russian Perspectives on the Global Order

Paul Bolt

United States Air Force Academy

The views in this paper are the author's alone and in no way represent the opinions, standards, or policy of the United States Air Force Academy, or the United States government.

US, Chinese, and Russian Perspectives on the Global Order

Since the end of the cold war and the unexpected collapse of the bipolar world order, scholars and policymakers have attempted to understand the contours of an emerging order. As early as 1989, Francis Fukuyama predicted the end of history, a world where liberal democracy reigned supreme without serious ideological challengers. US president George H. W. Bush proclaimed a “new world order” in 1991, “where diverse nations are drawn together in common cause to achieve the universal aspirations of mankind—peace and security, freedom, and the rule of law.” However, Fukuyama’s onetime mentor Samuel Huntington foresaw a very different structure, a clash of civilizations where frequent wars would be fought along civilizational fault lines. By the mid-1990s many observers noted a unipolar world structure dominated by the United States, although debate revolved around how long this unipolar structure would last.¹ For instance, French Foreign Minister Hubert Vedrine described the United States as a “hyperpower,” meaning “a country that is dominant or predominant in all categories,” and thus a country whose unilateral tendencies in his view needed to be balanced.²

Today the unipolar moment has passed, at least in the thinking of most policymakers and scholars. The rise of China, US setbacks in Iraq and Afghanistan, greater Russian activism in Ukraine and elsewhere, the emergence of the BRICS, the power of terrorist organizations such as al Qaeda and ISIS, and questions raised by the 2008 financial crisis have all brought new

¹ See, for example, Charles Krauthammer, “The Unipolar Moment,” *Foreign Affairs* 70, no. 1 (America and the World 1990/1991): 23-33, <http://users.metu.edu.tr/utuba/Krauthammer.pdf>; and Thomas S. Mowle and David H. Sacko, *The Unipolar World: An Unbalanced Future* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007).

² “To Paris, US Looks Like a ‘Hyperpower,’” *New York Times*, Feb 5, 1999, http://www.nytimes.com/1999/02/05/news/05iht-france.t_0.html.

challenges to the American view of world order.³ For example, in Henry Kissinger's 2014 *World Order* he states "Our age is insistently, at times almost desperately, in pursuit of a concept of world order," noting that world order consists of both legitimacy, or rules that are widely considered just, and power relationships between states.⁴ After examining various regional orders throughout history, Kissinger calls for a world order that is some modified version of the Westphalian system. Regional orders must come together to form a global order. However, this book makes it clear that the road to a true global order is filled with dangers. Nuclear proliferation, cyber technology, the loss of historical perspective due in part to the rise of the internet, and the pressures brought on political leaders by digital media make the framing of a global order more difficult.

Views of world order are inevitably tied to one's theoretical perspectives. Realists see order as the prevailing power distribution among states. Because the world is anarchic, "order" always has a conflictual element. Liberals emphasize the importance of international institutions in shaping world order. They also focus on the domestic characteristics of states, particularly the extent that states embrace values such as democracy and human rights. Constructivists note that conceptions of order evolve in line with state identities, conceptions of interest, and norms. The English School views international order as "a pattern or arrangement that sustains the primary goals of a society of states. It must involve limits on behaviour, the management of conflict, and the accommodation of change without undermining the common goals and values of society."⁵

³ However, for the argument that the United States is still the hegemonic power in Asia, see Evelyn Goh, *The Struggle for Order: Hegemony, Hierarchy, and Transition in Post-Cold War East Asia* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013); and Tim Summers, "China's Global Personality," Chatham House, June 2014.

⁴ Kissinger, *World Order*, 2.

⁵ Goh, *The Struggle for Order*, 7. There is a vast literature linking ideology and world order. See, for example, Joseph E. Nye, Jr and David A. Welch, *Understanding Global Conflict and Cooperation*, 9th ed (Boston: Pearson, 2013), 337; John Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics* (New York: WW Norton, 2003); G. John

However, and more importantly, states too have differing views of world order. The United States helped create the current global order after World War II. China and Russia, and their relationship with each other, shape the contemporary world order. Both countries have demonstrated at least some dissatisfaction with an American led order. China and Russia both publicly call for a more multipolar world where the interests of all major powers are taken into account. Both countries call for major international issues be worked out in the United Nations Security Council, where they have a veto. Russia and China both call for stronger state sovereignty, where human rights are not issues of international concern. Russia and China both reject the notion that democracy is necessary for legitimacy. Russia insists on a sphere of influence in the former Soviet states, while China wants the US to stop intervening in its territorial disputes in the South China Sea and East China Sea.

The way that China and Russia will shape the world order, and the influence each will have, is still unfolding. Clearly China has more resources to influence the world order than Russia, although Russia takes more provocative stands. This paper will provide an overview of how the United States, Russia and China view world order issues.

The United States and World Order

The United States, at its birth, saw itself as exceptional and above the squabbles and frequent warfare that defined the European order. However, early in its history the US manipulated the European balance of power to maintain its own security and eventually expand to the Pacific Ocean. By 1898 and the Spanish-American War, the US had begun to assert itself

abroad and become involved in the world order in a much deeper way. America's role further expanded under presidents Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, and Franklin Roosevelt.⁶

After the conclusion of World War II, the United States played a major part in shaping the world order through the formation of institutions. The United Nations was founded in 1945, with the hope that the coalition that won the war would be able to hold together to maintain a form of collective security through cooperation in the UN Security Council. However, as it became obvious that a Cold War was developing, the US created additional institutions that were security-oriented. NATO was created in 1949, the Security Treaty Between the United States and Japan was signed in 1951, and other alliances were created as well. Since the end of the Cold War, the United States has continued to support both NATO and the US-Japan Treaty, in spite of calls by China and Russia for new security architectures in Europe and Asia that they view as more inclusive and less dependent on the United States.

The United States also played a key role in creating the post-war economic pillars of the Bretton Woods system. The World Bank was created in order to provide loans, credits, policy advice, and technical assistance in order to aid developing countries. The International Monetary Fund is designed to maintain stability in the international monetary system. While the fixed exchange rates and the tying of the US dollar to gold that were part of the original Bretton Woods system are no longer in place, the US still strongly supports both the IMF and World Bank. Traditionally the World Bank is headed by an American and the IMF is headed by a European, leading to complaints from rising economies that they are not given enough influence in these institutions. Later economic institutions advocated by the United States include the WTO, NAFTA, and the Trans-Pacific Partnership, currently being negotiated. Moreover, the

⁶ Kissinger, *World Order*, chapter 7.

United States now advocates that international economic agreements move beyond trade and cover investments and labor rights as well.

Nevertheless, in spite of these efforts to build international institutions, the United States has also held ambivalent attitudes toward international organizations and regimes, especially the United Nations. In the view of some Americans, the United Nations has been unwilling to act vigorously enough to deal with international conflict, particularly due to the veto power of permanent members of the Security Council. In the 1991 Gulf War, a US-led coalition pushed Iraq out of Kuwait with support from a United Nations Security Council resolution. However, the war against Kosovo was fought with only NATO authorization. The 2003 war against Iraq did not receive UN or NATO backing, but was instead a “coalition of the willing.” Moreover, the US was unwilling to join the Kyoto Protocol, International Criminal Court, or the Ottawa Treaty banning landmines.

However, it would be a mistake to suggest that there is a unified American view on world order issues. Walter Russel Mead suggests that there are four schools of thought regarding American foreign policy and, by implication, world order. The Hamiltonian school sees the US government’s first obligation as supporting American business. Thus Hamiltonians advocate a world order that is based on free markets, trade, international investment, and opportunities for American enterprises, with strengthened international economic institutions such as the WTO. The Wilsonian school holds that it is both morally imperative and in America’s interests to spread American values abroad. How to spread those values has often been a matter of debate. However, Wilsonians advocate strong international institutions, and call on the American government to promote the spread of democracy and international adherence to human rights standards. Specific goals of the Wilsonians have included democratization of the former Soviet

Union, international relations based on law, strengthened civil society around the globe, and greater protection for the rights of women.

The third approach, the Jeffersonian school, calls on the US to give first priority to defending American democracy in a world that threatens to overwhelm it. This school has sought to keep foreign policy costs low, while warning against efforts to force American values on others. The fourth approach, the Jacksonian school, represents populism, independence, nationalism, and military pride, reflected in the fact that ten former generals have become president of the United States. Both the Jeffersonians and Jacksonians have sought a reduced US role in the world with the end of the Cold War, warning that the US should not seek to build a comprehensive world order. Both have also been skeptical of globalism. However, the Jacksonians have advocated a more vigorous defense of US interests abroad.⁷

Henry Kissinger suggests that while the US has fundamentally shaped world order, it has also been ambivalent about it. The geographic position of the United States has meant that the US at certain points in history could choose to leave world order issues to others. Kissinger states that the American view of world order sees democratic principles as universal, necessary to legitimize a state's government. Seeing itself as unique and having a mission, the American view, according to Kissinger, is rooted most strongly in Wilsonianism. Kissinger claims "Whenever America has been tested by crisis or conflict...it has returned in one way or another to Woodrow Wilson's vision of a world order that secures peace through democracy, open diplomacy, and the cultivation of shared rules and standards." Unfortunately, according to Kissinger, this Wilsonian impulse takes neither history nor geopolitics adequately into account.⁸

⁷ Walter Russel Mead, *Special Providence: American Foreign Policy and How it Changed the World* (New York: Routledge, 2002).

⁸ Henry Kissinger, *World Order* (New York: Penguin Press, 2014), 268-269; more broadly, see chapter 7.

Liberal Wilsonian values continue to affect the American worldview. As described by the 2015 National Security Strategy, the American vision consists of “a rules-based international order that works best through empowered citizens, responsible states, and effective regional and international organizations.”⁹ It self-consciously strives to promote American values abroad, defining democracy, human rights, and the equality of minority groups around the world as fundamental American interests.¹⁰ While critics point to instances of US hypocrisy in applying Wilsonian principles, the Wilsonian principles themselves are not universally accepted by other states.

However, questions regarding world order continue to be contested in the United States. For example, the best way to ensure the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, a key plank of the American vision of world order, was hotly debated in the context of an international nuclear accord with Iran. Americans debate the amount of resources that are appropriate to devote to defeating ISIS and preventing a resurgence of the Taliban in Afghanistan. Appropriate policies toward Russia and China are major political issues. From an American perspective the world order is changing and becoming more dangerous, but solutions are not obvious.

China and World Order

China had great difficulty adapting to the Westphalian world order in the 19th century. Beginning with the First Opium War (1839-1842), China struggled to adjust to the rules of international (western) diplomacy where all states were theoretically equal, diplomats resided in foreign capitals, diplomatic representatives to the Qing did not kowtow to the emperor, and

⁹ The White House, “National Security Strategy,” Feb 2015, 1.

¹⁰ “National Security Strategy,” 19-22.

imperialism was a mark of great powers. Thus the Qing not only struggled with states who wanted territorial concessions, but also with the necessity to change a worldview where China was the center of the universe.

The victory of the CCP in 1949 resulted in an effort by Mao to fundamentally change the world order. Inspired by an ideology that predicted a proletarian revolution that would sweep aside existing political and economic structures, China saw itself as a champion of the Third World. While Chinese foreign policy was not always revolutionary, it was during time periods such as the Cultural Revolution. After Mao died and China began its reform period in the late 1970s, China experienced rapid economic growth, along with commensurate political influence. Probably no country had ever experience such rapid change over so short a time period. This growth was enabled by the contemporary international order, although an order in which China had little to no say in creating. How much does China now want to change the existing order?¹¹

One area of debate is how to define China's traditional view of world order, and what that view means for how China sees world order today. The "Chinese World Order" is a phrase first used by John King Fairbank. More recently, writers have referred to the Chinese system as *tianxia*, meaning all under heaven. The traditional Chinese world order or *tianxia* refers to a hierarchical Asian order in which the Chinese emperor stood at the top due to China's cultural superiority. Other states brought tribute to China in recognition of their subservience, and in return were given valuable gifts by the emperor. Enthusiasts of the Chinese world order claim that it was benevolent and a better model of world order than the Westphalian system, with all states benefiting. For example, David Kang states "East Asian regional relations have

¹¹ For a detailed analysis of this question, see David Scott, "The Chinese Century?" *The Challenge to Global Order* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008).

historically been hierarchic, more peaceful, and more stable than those in the West.”¹² Others disagree, noting that there was much warfare in imperial China, the empire was maintained by force, or the tributary system did not define all of China’s foreign relations. For example, June Teufel Dreyer claims “Supporters of the revival of *tianxia* as a model for today’s world are essentially misrepresenting the past to talk about the present, distorting it in order to advance an equally distorted political agenda.”¹³

One supporter of using *tianxia* as a framework for the contemporary order is Zhao Tingyang. Zhao argues that we live in a global society where the entire world, not the nation-state, is primary. The concept of *tianxia* is a world theory that entails a benevolent empire that engages in world governance. While *tianxia* is a Chinese concept of order, Zhao holds that any nation could rule under this concept.¹⁴

While imperial China defined the Asian order and Mao advocated a radical transformation of the world order, Deng Xiaoping adopted a much more modest position. Deng’s primarily goal was to rapidly build China’s economy while maintaining the power of the CCP. Such a strategy required a peaceful international environment and a concentration of China’s resources on economic development. As a result, Deng laid down the principle of “hide your strength, bide your time, never take the lead,” understanding that over time China would become much more powerful and be able to exercise greater influence. However, Deng’s dictum

¹² David C. Kang, “Getting Asia Wrong: The Need for New Analytical Frameworks,” *International Security* 27, no. 4 (Spring 2003): 66.

¹³ June Teufel Dreyer, “The ‘Tianxia Trope’: Will China Change the International System?” *Journal of Contemporary China* (2015), 17, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10670564.2015.1030951>. For details of the debate on the historical Chinese world order, see Suisheng Zhao, “Rethinking the Chinese World Order: The Imperial Cycle and the Rise of China,” *Journal of Contemporary China* (2015), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10670564.2015.1030913>.

¹⁴ Zhao Tingyang, “Rethinking Empire from the Chinese Concept ‘All-Under-Heaven (Tianxia),” in *China Orders the World: Normative Soft Power and Foreign Policy*, ed. William A. Callahan and Elena Barabantseva (Washington, D.C.: Woodrow Wilson Center, 2011), 21-36; see also William A. Callahan, *China Dreams: 20 Visions of the Future* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 52-58.

left open the question of when China would be strong enough to change its strategy. While the strategy was designed to minimize anxiety over what China's rise means for the international community, concerns were inevitable.¹⁵

There have been a variety of official pronouncements designed to reassure the world about China's rise and offer clues on China's vision of world order. For example, the Information Office of the State Council published a white paper entitled "China's Peaceful Development" in 2011.¹⁶ This document asserts that China "takes a path of peaceful development and is committed to upholding world peace and promoting common development and prosperity for all countries." China's development is scientific, independent, open, peaceful, cooperative, and serves the interests of not only China, but also the world. In seeking peaceful development, Chinese foreign policy works to "promote democracy in international relations." China promotes the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence and rejects alliances in order to promote "new thinking on security featuring mutual trust, mutual benefit, equality and coordination." The white paper makes the claim that this model of peaceful development is consistent with China's history and culture.¹⁷

Similarly, China's 2013 Defense White Paper, "The Diversified Employment of China's Armed Forces," tries to make the point that China's military will only be used in a defensive capacity. In uncompromising language, the document asserts:

¹⁵ On China's strategy under Deng, see David M. Lampton, *The Three Faces of Chinese Power: Might, Money, and Minds* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2008), 27-36.

¹⁶ The English version of this document can be found at http://www.gov.cn/english/official/2011-09/06content_1941354.htm.

¹⁷ For an application of the concept of China's "New Diplomacy," see Gao Fei, "The Shanghai Cooperation Organization and China's New Diplomacy," Netherlands Institute of International Relations Discussion Papers in Diplomacy, July 2010.

It is China's unshakable national commitment and strategic choice to take the road of peaceful development. China unswervingly pursues an independent foreign policy of peace and a national defense policy that is defensive in nature. China opposes any form of hegemonism or power politics, and does not interfere in the internal affairs of other countries. China will never seek hegemony or behave in a hegemonic manner, nor will it engage in military expansion. China advocates a new security concept featuring mutual trust, mutual benefit, equality and coordination, and pursues comprehensive security, common security and cooperative security.

China's rise thus contributes to a peaceful international order.¹⁸

Official documents as well as scholars emphasize further aspects of Chinese diplomacy that have world order implications. Xi Jinping has proposed that relations with the US and other major powers be based on what he calls "A New Type of Great Power Relations," an item on the agenda in the summit at Sunnylands in 2013. The essence of this model is defined as "1) neither a confrontation nor a conflict; 2) mutual respect; and 3) win-win cooperation." This can be seen as a response to the US call for China to become a responsible stakeholder. China does not want to just join an order in which it had no say in creating, but wants to shape that order.¹⁹ The call for A New Type of Great Power Relations can also be seen as an effort to urge the United States to respect China's core interests in order to avoid a war caused by a power transition. However,

¹⁸ The English version of this document can be found at http://www.china.org.cn/government/whitepaper/node_7181425.htm.

¹⁹ For an analysis of this model, see Ren Xiao, "Modeling a 'New Type of Great Power Relations': A Chinese Viewpoint," The Asian Forum, October 14, 2013, <http://www.theasianforum.org/modeling-a-new-type-of-great-power-relations-a-chinese-viewpoint/>. See also Yang Jiechi, "Innovations in China's Diplomatic Theory and Practice Under New Conditions," August 16, 2013, Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs, <http://www.fmprc.gov.cn/eng/zxxx/t1066869.shtml> and Christopher K. Johnson et al, "Decoding China's Emerging 'Great Power' Strategy in Asia," Center for Strategic and International Studies, June 2014, 19-21.

from the perspective of the United States, both China's core interests and A New Type of Great Power Relations are too vaguely defined.

Liselotte Odgaard describes China's version of international order as "coexistence," at least through the time of Hu Jintao's leadership. This vision of order embodies often-proclaimed concepts such as mutual respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity, non-interference, mutual non-aggression, and peaceful co-existence. However, there are inconsistencies between China's stated doctrines and actions. Thus, there are contradictions between China's desire for a peaceful rise and other goals that must be accomplished through hard power. For example, China seemingly desires regional primacy and raises tensions in regional disputes while calling for a peaceful environment and swearing off hegemony. China seeks a stable international and economic environment, while seeking to undermine the United States in important ways. China seeks soft power at the same time the CCP cracks down on perceived political opponents and encourages Chinese nationalism. Odgaard believes this is because the strategy of co-existence is not principled but only a means to achieve great power status.²⁰

Xi Jinping's unique stamp on Chinese ideology and foreign policy has been the concept of the "Chinese dream," summarized as "the rejuvenation of the Chinese nation." While it officially encapsulates previous elements of Chinese foreign policy doctrine, such as a peaceful environment, peaceful development, assisting other countries develop, and win-win cooperation between states, there is more of a nationalistic edge to the concept. The dream is also linked to two upcoming centenaries, the 2021 anniversary of the founding of the Chinese CPC and the 2049 anniversary of the founding of the PRC. Xi asserts that the Chinese dream links

²⁰ Liselotte Odgaard, "Between Integration and Coexistence: US-Chinese Strategies of International Order," *Strategic Studies Quarterly* (Spring 2013): 15-39; for contradictions in China's stated doctrines and policies, see Barry Buzan, "The Logic and Contradictions of 'Peaceful Rise/Development' as China's Grand Strategy," *The Chinese Journal of International Politics* (2014): 14-21.

individuals to the state. He emphasizes the central role of the CCP in achieving the dream, the necessity of hard work across generations, the importance of innovation to achieving the dream, and even the participation in the dream of ethnic Chinese living abroad.²¹

There are critics to Xi Jinping's conception of the China Dream. For example, William Callahan documents many different dreams in China. Looking at twenty different views of China's future from officials, dissidents, and public intellectuals, Callahan asserts that there are many influential views about China's future, not just the official view.²² Victoria Hui argues that Xi's China Dream assumes a 5000 year history of a powerful and peaceful China that is in fact a myth. China was often divided, emperors sought military expansion, and people were exploited. Instead of looking to the past, China needs to look to the future.²³

Xi has also expressed dissatisfaction with the current security architecture in Asia. The current security structure is dominated by the US hub-and-spokes system, where the US participates in key alliances in the region. Speaking at the Conference on Interaction and Confidence-building Measures in Asia in May 2014, Xi proposed that members, who do not include the US, play a bigger role in maintaining Asian security. According to Xi, Asian countries should provide for Asian security. A month later Xi reiterated his point, indirectly criticizing the US for seeking to dominate Asia.²⁴ This new proposed security structure, while unlikely to materialize, points to Chinese dissatisfaction with the current regional order.

²¹ For Xi's speeches on the Chinese dream, see Xi Jinping, *The Governance of China* (Beijing: Foreign Languages Press, 2014), 37-70; see also Yang Jiechi, "Innovations"; and Christopher K. Johnson, "Decoding," 18-19.

²² Callahan, *China Dreams*.

²³ Victoria Tin-bor Hui, "The China Dream: Revival of What Historical Greatness?" in *China Dreams: China's New Leadership and Future Impacts*, ed. Chih-Shian Liou and Arthur S. Ding (Singapore: World Scientific, 2015), 3-32.

²⁴ "China's Xi Calls for Asia Security Framework at Summit," Bloomberg, May 21, 2014, <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2014-05-21/china-s-xi-calls-for-asia-security-framework-at-summit>; and

China has taken several recent initiatives with implications for world order and international institutions. One is participation in BRICS, a grouping of Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa. The BRICS is an important avenue for China to play an international leadership role in a low-threat environment. China uses it to enhance its role both as a representative of developing countries and its identity as a rising power. At a summit in July 2014, the BRICS leaders announced they were establishing the New Development Bank (NDB) with a \$50 billion initial capitalization, as well as a \$100 billion currency reserve fund that members could draw on if they suffered from a balance of payments crisis. The bank was launched one year later, headquartered in Shanghai. Bank president Kundapur Varman Karmath stated “Our objective is not to challenge the existing system as it is but to improve and complement the system in our own way.”²⁵ Nevertheless, the BRICS countries were clearly unhappy with what they see as their subservient role in the World Bank and International Monetary Fund, and view current international institutions as inadequate to deal with world problems. While weaknesses in the West revealed by the 2008 financial crisis gave impetus to the BRICS, by 2015 the BRICS economies themselves had slowed considerably and the future influence of the BRICS was less certain.²⁶

The creation of the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank (AIIB) is another Beijing initiative with world order implications. First proposed by Beijing in 2013, the multilateral bank is designed to fund infrastructure projects in Asia. The US initially opposed the new institution,

Henry Sanderson, “China’s Xi Urges Asian Security Framework to Counter US,” Bloomberg, June 28, 2014, <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2014-06-28/china-s-xi-urges-asian-security-framework-to-counter-u-s->.

²⁵ “Brics Countries Launch New Development Bank in Shanghai,” BBC, July 21, 2015, <http://www.bbc.com/news/33605230>.

²⁶ For China’s perspective on the BRICS, see Joseph Y.S. Cheng, “China’s Approach to BRICS,” *Journal of Contemporary China* 24, no. 92 (2014): 357-375.

arguing that by lowering lending standards it will undermine the World Bank and Asian Development Bank. In addition, the US feared that the new bank would give China added political leverage in the region. However, China responded that there is a need for greater financing of projects in Asia. Moreover, China makes a strong case that it is not given power commensurate with its economic influence in the World Bank, IMF, or Asian Development Bank. The Asian Development Bank, for example, has always been led by a Japanese national. In the end, the US could not prevent many of its allies from becoming founding members of the new bank. The UK, France, Germany, Italy, Australia, and South Korea all signed on to become founding members, although Japan declined.²⁷ Interestingly, Russia was one of the last states to sign on as a founding member of the AIIB. Some Russian bureaucrats feared that Russia lacked the resources to fund the bank. Perhaps Russian officials also worried that the AIIB will compete with the Russian-led Eurasian Union. Reportedly Putin himself was required to make the decision to join the AIIB.²⁸

Another Chinese initiative with potential to shape world order is a plan to alter Asia's political and economic landscape called "One Belt, One Road," with a goal of integrating Eurasia under Chinese leadership.²⁹ The plan was first proposed in 2013, and in March 2015 MOFA, NDRC, and MOC publicly released an action plan. One Belt, One Road has two components. The first is the land-based Silk Road Economic Belt, while the second is the 21st

²⁷ See Jane Perlez, "US Opposing China's Answer to World Bank," *New York Times*, October 9, 2014, http://www.nytimes.com/2014/10/10/world/asia/chinas-plan-for-regional-development-bank-runs-into-us-opposition.html?_r=0; and the AIIB website at <http://www.aiibank.org/>.

²⁸ Yu Bin, "All Still Quiet in the East," *CSIS Comparative Connections* 15, no. 1 (May 2015), http://csis.org/files/publication/1501qchina_russia.pdf.

²⁹ For details, see François Godement and Agatha Kratz, eds., "'One Belt, One Road': China's Great Leap Outward," European Council on Foreign Relations, June 2015; and Jacob Stokes, "China's Road Rules," *Foreign Affairs*, April 19, 2015, <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/asia/2015-04-19/chinas-road-rules>.

century Maritime Silk Road. There are very few publicly available details on the plan, although its general outline involves Chinese-funded infrastructure development throughout Eurasia, lower tariffs throughout the region, streamlined customs procedures, greater financial integration based on the renminbi, and stronger diplomatic coordination. In addition, Beijing has committed large sums of money to the initiative. This includes \$50 billion to the AIIB, \$10 billion to the NDB, and \$40 billion to a New Silk Road Fund. Implementation of the plan could stretch out to 35 years.

Chinese officials claim the initiative demonstrates that China is a benevolent power that does not threaten its neighbors. It is portrayed publicly as win-win economic development for all parties, unrelated to the US pivot to Asia. It can also be seen as a tangible manifestation of China moving from being what President Obama once called a “free rider” to a leader that provides public goods.³⁰ However, in a speech to the Chinese Defense University, General Qiao Liang calls One Belt, One Road a hedge strategy. As the US moves east, China moves west to alleviate the pressure applied by the US. Because China’s land power is greater than its sea power, the Silk Road Economic Belt will be primary.³¹

Although One Belt, One Road has the highest level political support, Chinese scholars point out various potential pitfalls. For example, global and regional powers, including Russia and India, will have reservations. Russia in particular fears it will threaten the viability of the Eurasian Union... Moreover, analysts are concerned about political risk in the region, too much state involvement, misallocation of resources, too many Chinese provinces attempting to tap into

³⁰ In this regard, see Zheng Wang, “China’s Alternative Diplomacy,” *The Diplomat*, January 30, 2015, <http://thediplomat.com/2015/01/chinas-alternative-diplomacy/>.

³¹ Qiao Liang, “One Belt, One Road,” *Heartland: Eurasian Review of Politics*, July 17, 2015, http://temi.repubblica.it/limes-heartland/one-belt-one-road/2070?refresh_ce.

the money China has allocated, and what One Belt, One Road might mean for China's much vaunted non-interference policy.³² It is also unclear what effect China's economic slowdown might have on the future of this initiative.

Another area where China's views on world order differ from the West is in the cyber arena. Certainly China and the United States both want to strengthen cyber security to prevent crime. Both states also want to secure their governments and corporations from cyberattack, although they are unwilling to limit their own government's use of cyber operations.

Nonetheless, China takes a broader view of internet threats. Chinese writers talk about "cyber sovereignty" or cyber "virtual territory" and the risks that the internet poses to China's social and political system. In 2015, China's legislature passed a security law that claimed China's sovereignty includes cyberspace. Moreover, the Chinese government is concerned that the internet is dominated by western-designed protocols and hardware. In order to mitigate what it sees as cyber threats, the Chinese government takes a much more active role in regulating the internet and censoring content than western states, leading toward a system where what is available on the internet varies across countries. China wants to see norms and rules established by the United Nations that would legitimize restrictions on the internet. The *Wall Street Journal* comments that "China's determination to promote an alternative to the borderless Internet embraced by Americans marks yet another way the country is challenging a US-led world order under President Xi."³³

³² For the concerns of Chinese scholars, see Godement and Kratz, "One Belt, One Road."

³³ James T. Areddy, "China Aims to Rewrite Rules of Global Web," *Wall Street Journal*, July 29, 2015, A1, A10, quote on A10; see also Michael Swaine, "Chinese Views on Cybersecurity in Foreign Relations," *China Leadership Monitor*, no. 42 (Fall 2013), http://carnegieendowment.org/files/CLM42MS_092013Carnegie.pdf.

China has also sought to reshape the Asian order through more aggressive means of asserting its territorial claims over disputed islands in the South China Sea and East China Sea. In the East China Sea, Japan and China both claim the Diaoyu or Senkaku Islands. While Japan administratively controls the islands, China is seeking to force Japan to recognize that sovereignty is disputed. In the South China Sea, China has overlapping claims with Vietnam, the Philippines, Malaysia, Taiwan, and Brunei. China's newly assertive strategy is demonstrated by the establishment of an Air Defense Identification Zone in the East China Sea that overlaps territory claimed by Japan and South Korea, increased military patrols, and the creation of islands in the South China Sea. China has also refused to participate in a case brought against it by the Philippines at the Permanent Court of Arbitration in the Hague.³⁴

While China is trying to reshape the world order through institutions such as the SCO, BRICS and the AIIB; initiatives such as One Belt, One Road; moves to regulate the cyber order; and more aggressive steps to change the Asian order in the South China Sea and East China Sea, it is ironically most satisfied with the United Nations, in spite of the fact that the UN was created without input from the PRC. There are several reasons China prefers the institutional design of the UN. First, the UN acts as a concert system, acting in a multipolar fashion, where states have legal equality. Moreover, the Security Council gives recognition to China as a great power, while the General Assembly enables China to identify with developing countries. There are also common norms and preferences shared by China and the UN in regard to peacekeeping. As a

³⁴See International Crisis Group, "Old Scores and New Grudges: Evolving Sino-Japanese Tensions," July 24, 2014, [http://www.crisisgroup.org/~media/Files/asia/north-east-asia/258-old-scores-and-grudges-evolving-sino-japanese-tensions.pdf](http://www.crisisgroup.org/~/media/Files/asia/north-east-asia/258-old-scores-and-grudges-evolving-sino-japanese-tensions.pdf); and Jeffrey Bader, Kenneth Lieberthal, and Michael McDevitt, "Keeping the South China Sea in Perspective," Brookings, August 2014, <http://www.brookings.edu/~media/research/files/papers/2014/08/south-china-sea-perspective-bader-lieberthal-mcdevitt/south-china-sea-perspective-bader-lieberthal-mcdevitt.pdf>.

result, of the five permanent members of the UN Security Council, China is the largest contributor to UN peacekeeping operations.³⁵

These initiatives of China lead to two questions. The first is whether China's actions so far already challenge the global order. The second question is what order China ultimately wants for the future, and what this goal means for world politics. Ellen Frosts suggests that China's actions so far already challenge the world order. China's use of force for regional claims; institutional frameworks such as the NDB, the AIIB, the SCO, and the China-ASEAN Free Trade Agreement; the proposed One Belt, One Road; Xi's call for a "New Asian security architecture"; and the Russian-led Eurasian Union are all challenges. Frost says "Rival regionalisms' – new or re-energized regional groupings initiated or heavily supported by China and Russia – are on the rise. Their goals include providing alternatives to U.S.-led institutions, thereby avoiding Western-backed conditionality and reducing U.S. influence. As a result, a slow crisis both of regional and global order and of institutional legitimacy is emerging."³⁶ However, others suggests that China's initiatives mainly complement rather than challenge the existing order.

In terms of China's ultimate interests, analysts are divided on the direction China will take in the future. However, few would disagree with Eric Li, who states quite simply "China has its own long-term strategic objective: to reclaim a pre-eminent position in Asia."³⁷ As early as 1997 Brzezinski saw China as striving for regional dominance and then great global influence. Brzezinski noted that China's central objective is "*to dilute American regional power to the point*

³⁵ Rosemary Foot, "‘Doing Some Things’ in the Xi Jinping Era: The United Nations as China's Venue of Choice," *International Affairs* 90, no. 5 (2015): 1085-1100.

³⁶ Ellen L. Frost, "Rival Regionalisms and Regional Order: A Slow Crisis of Legitimacy," National Bureau of Asian Research Special Report #48, December 2014, quote on pg 3.

³⁷ Eric X. Li, "China and the World," *Survival* 57, no. 2 (April-May 2015): 237.

*that a diminished America will come to need a regionally dominant China as its ally and eventually even a globally powerful China as its partner*³⁸ (emphasis in original). For Martin Jacques, China will rise to immense power and shape world order more than the United States ever did. In the not-too-distant future China will be the most influential power in history. Jacques predicts world order will be hierarchical, with Beijing as the world capital. Asia will return to the tributary system, the international financial system will be dominated by the RMB, and Chinese culture will be a major source of soft power.³⁹

Another school of thought sees China's rise as dangerous and conflictual. For example, John Mearsheimer views the rise of China through the lens of offensive realism. If China's economic growth continues, Mearsheimer foresees China attempting to dominate Asia and projecting its power outside the region as well. The US, along with most of China's neighbors, will resist China's efforts. In the ensuing conflict, there is a serious risk of war.⁴⁰ Similarly, Edward Luttwak asserts that China's efforts to grow economically, militarily, and in global influence is already generating resistance. Because China is unlikely to change its policies to better accommodate its neighbors, resistance to China from the US and regional powers will increase and China will be left with reduced relative power.⁴¹ Fei-Ling Wang also sees an aggressive China that attempts to dominate Asia and challenge American power wherever

³⁸ Zbigniew Brzezinski, *The Grand Chessboard: American Primacy and Its Geostrategic Imperatives* (New York: Basic Books, 1997), 172.

³⁹ Martin Jacques, *When China Rules the World* (New York: Penguin Press, 2009). See especially chapter 11.

⁴⁰ John J. Mearsheimer, "Can China Rise Peacefully," April 2014, <http://nationalinterest.org/commentary/can-china-rise-peacefully-10204>. (This is also the new concluding chapter of *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*).

⁴¹ Edward N. Luttwak, *The Rise of China vs the Logic of Strategy* (Cambridge: The Belknap Press, 2012).

possible to reshape the world order in a manner that is supportive of preserving Chinese autocracy.⁴²

A third school of thought asserts that within China itself there is debate and uncertainty on China's vision for the future. For example, Henry Kissinger contrasts China's peaceful rise narrative with the triumphalist narrative of Liu Mingfu's *The China Dream* and Song Xiaojun's *China is Unhappy*.⁴³ In two different volumes, William Callahan looks at a variety of views within China on world order issues.⁴⁴ David Shambaugh and Ren Xiao identify seven schools of thought that differ on their views of China's identity, foreign policy, and world order questions.⁴⁵ In a recent Chatham House paper, Tim Summers makes the case that "China's global personality is complex and dynamic. It is currently in a period of flux, driven by debates within China that are magnified by a global context that is also characterized by a period of shifts in traditional economic balance and political power. The main debates are around the implications of China's rise for its traditional identity as a developing country, whether it should become more 'revisionist' in seeking to change the international and regional orders, and how assertive its foreign and security policy should be."⁴⁶

Russia and World Order

⁴² Fei-Ling Wang, "China Faces the United States: A Strategy of Four Rs," Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Aug 28-Sept 1, 2013. For an additional argument that China is a self-conscious challenger of the United States, see Michael Pillsbury, *The Hundred-Year Marathon: China's Secret Strategy to Replace America as the Global Superpower* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 2015).

⁴³ *On China*, 504-513.

⁴⁴ William A. Callahan and Elena Barabantseva, eds., *China Orders the World: Normative Soft Power and Foreign Policy* (Washington, D.C.: Woodrow Wilson Center, 2011); and Callahan, *China Dreams*.

⁴⁵ David Shambaugh and Ren Xiao, "China: The Conflicted Rising Power," in *Worldviews of Aspiring Powers*, ed. Henry R. Nau and Deepa M. Ollapally (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 36-72.

⁴⁶ Summers, "China's Global Personality."

Russia's view of world order has both similarities and differences from the Chinese and American perspectives. The primary factor uniting China and Russia's views of world order is a belief that the United States has been the dominant factor in shaping the order for too long, and their own countries' interests have not been given adequate consideration. What separates them is psychology of loss and power trajectories. China sees its "century of humiliation" as having ended in 1949. After various ups and downs since the Maoist period, since 1978 China has been on a trajectory to recover past greatness and reshape the world order. Russia's humiliation is much more recent with the dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991. While Russia has regained some of its swagger under President Putin, the Russian economy relies too heavily on the export of hydrocarbons and it realistically cannot expect to shape the world order to the extent that China can. As Ivan Timofeev suggests, Russia "does not even have a project to propose to other countries."⁴⁷

Russia's long history has shaped its view of world order. At least since the time of the Mongol invasions, Russia has often suffered from a strong sense of insecurity due to its demographics and underdeveloped economy, with a belief that the country was surrounded by potential enemies. The result for most of Russia's history has been imperial expansion to protect against unending outside threats, autocratic rule at home, and a realist worldview that sees international relations primarily as a struggle for power, coupled with a need for development to catch up with rivals. Thus a strong state has been linked to economic development, national security, Russian civilization, and Russian identity.⁴⁸

⁴⁷ Ivan Timofeev, "Why Russia Wants a Change to the Contemporary World Order," *Russia Direct*, October 30, 2014, <http://www.russia-direct.org/analysis/why-russia-wants-change-contemporary-world-order>.

⁴⁸ For discussions of the impact of history on the Russian worldview, see Kissinger, *World Order*, 52-58; Stephen J. Blank, "The Sacred Monster: Russia as a Foreign Policy Actor," in *Perspectives on Russian Foreign Policy*, ed. Stephen J. Blank (Carlisle, Penn: Strategic Studies Institute, Army War College, 2012): 25-194; and Allen C. Lynch, *How Russia is Not Ruled* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 7-10.

One element of Russia's view of world order is the insistence that it be treated as a great power by other world powers. Russia's imperial history, its defeat of Napoleon, and its cold war struggle with the US play a role in this insistence. Russia's great power status now relies on its size and location in the heart of Eurasia, its hydrocarbon exports, its nuclear weapons and military capabilities, its power relative to its immediate neighbors that were also once part of the Soviet Union, its veto power in the United Nations Security Council, and an increasingly active diplomacy, especially in the Middle East. While there were hopes after the fall of the Soviet Union that Russia would integrate with the West, Russian elites believed that such integration would diminish Russia's international role, making it an appendage of the West rather than a great power of its own making. Moreover, Russia has been disappointed that Washington has not given it the status it feels it deserves. From the Russian perspective, poor post-cold War relations between the US and Russia are largely due to the United States ignoring Russia's fundamental interests.⁴⁹

Similar to China, Russia also advocates for a multipolar world. By definition, in a world with a hegemonic power, Russia is not given equal great power status. A multipolar world is one where great powers form a condominium in which the interests of all powers are taken into consideration. Thus the United Nations Security Council is an important venue for resolving international issues from Russia's perspective. In Russia's case, a multipolar world is particularly important because it needs resources from a variety of states for its own economic development. Russia does not want to be in a position where one power can deny it access to the

⁴⁹ For Russia's desire to be a great power, see Jeffrey Mankoff, *Russian Foreign Policy: The Return of Great Power Politics*, 2nd ed (Lanham, Md.: Roman and Littlefield, 2012). On US-Russian relations, see Angela E. Stent, *The Limits of Partnership: US-Russian Relations in the Twenty-First Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2014).

resources it needs.⁵⁰ Moreover, like China, Russia seeks a multipolar world that respects state sovereignty and the internal affairs of states, especially human rights issues, are not on the international agenda.

A multipolar order is also important to protect Russia's internal institutions. While the Russian Constitution provides for a framework of democratic governance, the fairness of recent elections has been questioned. In the economic realm, Russia has what some call a type of "crony capitalism," a mixture of business and politics where informal links determine the success or failure of Russian businesses.⁵¹ In fact Allen Lynch suggests that the harsh Russian climate, the tremendous size of Russia, and the lack of water transportation means that Russia will never be able to operate under free market conditions because costs in Russia are so high. This further contributes to the need for a strong central state.⁵²

Another element of the Russian view of world order is the belief that it has a sphere of influence in Eurasia, particularly the former Soviet states. This is due to history, Russia's security requirements, and Russia's role as a great power. Some would also argue that Russia is bound to Eurasia by similar values that separate it from the West. For example, Lukin argues that Eurasians value religion, rejecting liberal secularism, permissiveness, moral relativeness, and arrogance that looks down on others.⁵³ Whatever the cause, Russia does not see the post-Soviet states as truly sovereign in that Russia believes it has the right to set conditions on their policy choices. Mette Skak calls this Russia's new Monroe Doctrine. In fact, Russian officials

⁵⁰ See Timofeev, "Why Russia."

⁵¹ Stent, *Limits*, 180-181.

⁵² Lynch, *How Russia is Not Ruled*, 195-234.

⁵³ Alexander Lukin, "What the Kremlin is Thinking: Putins's Vision for Eurasia," *Foreign Affairs* (July/August 2014): 91-93.

have explicitly referred to a Monroe Doctrine, while in 2008 Medvedev suggested that “There are regions in which Russia has ‘privileged interests.’”⁵⁴ Russian troops in South Ossetia and Abkhazia, Russian troops in Moldova’s breakaway republic of Transnistria, Russia’s invasion Georgia in 2008, its invasion of Crimea, continued military and political efforts in eastern Ukraine, and efforts to intimidate the Balkan states provide evidence.

Russia’s interest in greater economic integration between Russia and Eurasia is illustrated by the Eurasian Union. Modeled after the European Union, the Eurasian Union links its members through free trade and endeavors to coordinate financial systems, industrial policies, agricultural policies, labor markets, and transportation systems. It is designed to bring economic integration to former Soviet states, followed by tighter political integration, thus enhancing Russian leadership in the region. The Union, built on the foundations of the Eurasian Customs Union, was established on Jan 1, 2015. Its members include Armenia, Belarus, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, and Russia. However, so far the EEU has not produced greater economic growth for members. While Russia greatly hoped that Ukraine would join in order to give much greater clout to the organization, the political crisis between Russia and Ukraine prevented that from happening. The devaluation of the Russian ruble has led to economic difficulties for the other members of the EEU too. Belarus and Russia have had numerous trade disputes, and sanctions on Russia have hurt Kazakhstan as well. Kazakhstan also plans to sign an enhanced Partnership and Cooperation Agreement with the EU. Moreover, the non-Russian members worry about

⁵⁴ Mette Skak, “Russia’s New ‘Monroe Doctrine,’” in *Russian Foreign Policy in the 21st Century*, ed. Roger E. Kanet (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 138-154, quote on 147; see also Blank, “Sacred Monster,” 75-96; and Mankoff, *Russian Foreign Policy*, 8.

losing sovereignty if they are too closely linked to Russia, especially after Russia's invasion of Crimea.⁵⁵

Although Russia is attempting to strengthen its links with Eurasia and the former Soviet states, it still struggles with an identity issue that has long bedeviled it. Russia's huge landmass connects east and west. Russia is part of Europe and Asia, leaving Russia with an unresolved question of identity. Clearly Russia has been influenced by the Mongols and Siberian native cultures that were absorbed into Russia. However, Russia has had a sense of ambivalence regarding the east, mixing colonial attitudes with great interest.⁵⁶ Europe has also had a strong pull on Russia, exemplified by Peter the Great's building of St Petersburg on Russia's western border. Nevertheless, there are also religious, cultural, and economic divides between Europe and Russia, and the West has never fully accepted Russia as a member in Russia's eyes.

Within Russia there are different schools of thought on Russian identity, corresponding to different visions of world order. Kuchins and Zevelev identify three such schools. Liberals support collective security, globalization, and international organizations, calling for integration into Europe. Influential in the Yeltsin administration, their influence has faded. Great power balancers are realists. They advocate an independent foreign policy for a Russia that is a great power and balances other powers. They also stress the concept of Russian civilization and the importance of the Orthodox Church. Nationalists are neo-imperialists, many of whom want to restore the old borders of the Soviet Union and dominate the Near Abroad, while ethno-

⁵⁵ For details on the EEU, see Nikolas K Gvosdev and Christopher Marsh, *Russian Foreign Policy: Interests, Vectors, and Sectors* (Los Angeles: CQ Press, 2014), 188-193; Marcel H. Van Herpen, *Putin's Wars: The Rise of Russia's New Imperialism* (Lanham, Md: Rowman & Littlefield, 2014), 75-87; and Reid Standish, "Putin's Eurasian Dream is Over Before it Began," *Foreign Policy*, January 6, 2015, <http://foreignpolicy.com/2015/01/06/putins-eurasian-dream-is-over-before-it-began/>.

⁵⁶ In this regard, see Orlando Figes, *Natasha's Dance: A Cultural History of Russia* (New York: Picador, 2002), 355-429.

nationalists want to embrace what is Russian rather than build an empire. Mankoff divides Russian approaches in a similar fashion. He identifies Atlanticism that looks to Europe and the US, Eurasianism that sees Russian identity in Eurasia, centralism that sees Russia as playing an independent role between Asia and the West, and Russian nationalism that is anti-immigrant and advocates for the interests of ethnic Russians. Gvosdev and Marsh add Sinophiles to the list of Russian perspectives on identity.⁵⁷

Immediately after the fall of the Soviet Union, Russia turned sharply to the West. However, this began to change quite quickly as both sides became disillusioned. In fact Mankoff's central argument in his book on Russian foreign policy is that already during Yeltsin's presidency "the bulk of the Russian elite came to recognize that integration with the West and its institutions was neither possible nor desirable, at least in the short-to-medium term."⁵⁸ NATO expansion particularly angered the Russians, as they believed that the West was taking advantage of Russian weakness and violating its core interests by threatening its western border. In fact, Russia's 2015 military doctrine identifies NATO as Russia's most serious military threat. The debate intensified with the Ukraine crisis and subsequent western sanctions on Russia. Russia's turn toward China in particular raised questions anew about Russian identity and policy directions.

Nevertheless, Russia has strong cultural ties with the West, and there is evidence to suggest that Putin sees Russia as having a European cultural orientation.⁵⁹ Moreover, for purposes of economic development the West arguably has more to contribute to Russia than

⁵⁷ Andrew C. Kuchins and Igor Zevelev, "Russia's Contested National Identity and Foreign Policy," in *Worldviews of Aspiring Powers*, ed. Henry R. Nau and Deepa M. Ollapally (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 184-198; and Mankoff, *Russian Foreign Policy*, 62-77. See also Gvosdev and Marsh, 57-59.

⁵⁸ *Russian Foreign Policy*, 5.

⁵⁹ Allen C. Lynch, *Vladimir Putin and Russian Statecraft* (Washington, DC: Potomac Books, 2011), 105-106.

Eurasia or China.⁶⁰ But even during a time of strained relations with the West, some Russians still assert that Russia is a part of Europe. For instance, retired Lt Gen Evgeny Buzhinsky is head of the PIR Centre, a highly regarded military think tank in Moscow. In a 2015 interview Buzhinsky asserts “It is my strong belief that though we occupy part of Asia and part of Europe, Russia is a European country – in our way of thinking and everything. We are much closer to the US and Europe than to China, India, and Korea.”⁶¹

Russia’s vision of world order is clouded somewhat by a fractious foreign policy making process. Under Vladimir Putin, foreign policy making is focused on the president. Putin is clearly the central player in Russian politics, including foreign policy.⁶² Nevertheless, there is no single common vision of foreign policy, and beneath the Kremlin are many institutions with foreign policy interests that the Kremlin has difficulty coordinating. These include the prime minister, Foreign Ministry, Defense Ministry, Security Council, economic ministries, security services, military industries, energy firms, and regional governments. There are also those who advocate for Russia to prioritize particular regions of the world, a difficult task when Russia has far-flung global interests.⁶³

Conclusion

⁶⁰ In this regard see Viacheslav B. Amirov, “Russia’s Posture in and Policy Towards Northeast Asia,” in *Russia’s Prospects in Asia*, ed. Stephen J. Blank (Carlisle, Penn: Strategic Studies Institute, Army War College, 2010): 5.

⁶¹ Bridget Kendall, “How Does Russia View the West?” BBC, August 10, 2015, <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-33821589>.

⁶² For an argument that Putin has tried to concentrate all power in the Kremlin but is in fact quite vulnerable, see Ben Judah, *Fragile Empire: How Russia Fell In and Out of Love with Vladimir Putin* (Newhaven: Yale University Press, 2013).

⁶³ For treatments of foreign policy making in Russia, see Lynch, *Vladimir Putin*, 95-118; Mankoff, *Russian Foreign Policy*, 53-96; and Gvosdev and Marsh, *Russian Foreign Policy*.

In conclusion, the interactions between states are on the surface about particular policy issues. However, at a deeper level states negotiate and struggle to create a world order that is in line with their interests and domestic form of governance. The United States, China, and Russia cooperate on some issues and compete on others. Similarly, these three states have overlapping views of world order, but also sometimes strongly diverging views of how the framework of international relations should be constructed. Prospects for peace depend in large measure on how these three states, as well as other international actors, can resolve their various normative claims on what constitutes a legitimate order.