

RUSSIA: PROSPECTS FOR A NEW LEGACY IN THE GLOBAL POWER GAME

NIHAL SHIMY ABDEL FATTAH EL-SHIMY

Research Scholar, International Relations Modern Sciences and Arts University, Egypt (MSA)

ABSTRACT

As the new global order is going through great changes, new political and strategic policies have been adopted by many countries of the international community to comply with the transformation taking place. A very small number of states seem to be playing the leading roles in the game, while the majority basically perceives what's going on, but have no significant role to play. Some basic questions arise: Who sets the rules of the game? Who are the major competitors, and challengers in the world of politics of today? Is a new Cold War era emerging between the United States and Russia? What kind of predictions can be made for the new world order? How can underdeveloped and developing states protect themselves in the new world order and guarantee peace and security?

The researcher believes that the race and competition that has once characterized the world during the Cold War era still exist. Studying the positions of both the United States and Russia in current world events is a strong evidence of the hostile feelings that has mostly prevailed between them. Russia, on the one hand, is aspiring to regain its international status and world power, while the United States feels the emerging threat to its hegemonic power.

Therefore, this study discusses a topic of great interest and importance to the world of politics and International Relations. It focuses on Russia and its presence in the Middle East as part of its aspiration to consolidate its strategic power and presence in the region. In other words, Moscow is attempting to regain the Soviet Union Legacy and to reestablish and consolidate the Russian presence in the Middle East. Special focus is made to the Libyan and Syrian crisis. Thus, the data and analysis carried out in this study will briefly explain the role of the Russian Federation in the Middle East by shedding lights on the sequence of its actions in the region since its first interference during the Former Soviet Union and during the Arab Spring. The article will also contain specific information about Russia's historical ties with the Middle East Region, but only to the extent of understanding current events. Finally, the researcher makes a number of predictions and recommendations about the future of the world order.

KEYWORDS: New Legacy, Global Power

INTRODUCTION

Power has been a difficult concept to identify through time; for centuries, politicians, social scientists, and philosophers, have explored and commented on the nature of power. Pittacus, a statesman from Ancient Greece, suggested that "The measure of a man is what he does with power," while Lord Acton, an English politician and writer, believed that "Power tends to corrupt; absolute power corrupts absolutely. Great men are almost always bad men". In fact, the concept of power can have various negative implications, and the term itself is difficult to define. However, many scholars adopt the definition developed by Max Weber, German sociologist, who said that "power is the ability to exercise one's will over others" (Rabuogi, J, 2009).

To predict the type of expected polar system in the near future, it's important to know what polarity signifies. Polarity is viewed as the distribution of power during a given period. Basically, polarity is the degree of concentration of military, economic and culture capabilities within an international system. According to this concentration of capabilities, the number of centers of power or 'poles' is determined. When these poles appear in the international system, there is usually formation of competing blocs as the countries within the system start to align with one of the major competing poles or centers of power; this is called polarization. (Rabuogi, J. 2009).

As major powers try to maintain their status and ensure their supremacy, the notion of individual interests versus collective interests are difficult to settle, especially that no central authority exists. In the new world order, great powers wish to preserve their international position against all possible threats. Therefore, it's no wonder that they seek both domestic and international recognition for their power and status in the international community. It's no doubt that Russia, after the dissolution of the ex Soviet Union had to deal with many internal problems, which delayed its strong appearance and presence on the international arena. Its power during the era of the Cold War had mostly been a counter power to that of the United States, especially in the Security Council and the use of the veto power. Even the WARSAW PACT was formed in 1955 to counter balance the power of the NATO.

Currently, Russia appears to be regaining its image as a major participant in world affairs. Therefore, because of the strong re emergence of Russia on the global scene, this paper is primarily concerned with the leading role of Russia and its reappearance in the region of the Middle East, especially Egypt and Syria. The year 2011 was a turning point as it marked the year of the beginning of Arab revolutions in the Middle East region. This was the beginning of the so called "Arab Spring". During this period, all the leading power countries had been forced to change their strategies and reorganize them to match the current political situations at that time. Many strategic countries in the region had ousted their rulers and toppled the existing regimes. These countries included Egypt, Libya, and Tunisia. Syria, however, was a different case, as will be discussed later in the paper. (Malashenko, Alexey, 2013).

Since the end of the Cold War era, the basic player in international politics has been the United States, as it has acted to a large extent as the police of all nations and appeared as the number one democratic country. Thus, it tried to impose its guardianship on the Arab countries where revolutions had taken place. For more than a decade, Russia has been trying to regain the legacy of the Soviet Union as well as the influence and dominance that was once enjoyed by the Russian Federation in the Middle East. In other words, Russia, under Putin's rule has attempted to re establish the Soviet Union's influence again in the Middle East Region by making Moscow the key regional player that represents the Russian Federation, and also by showing the Muslim population in Russia that the Islamic affairs matter to the Kremlin. In fact, Putin's main strategy has one vital objective which revolves around attempts to emphasize Russia's position as a strong and leading power that could successfully act as a connecting bridge between the West and the Muslim World. In other words, the changes that had taken place in the Middle East had forced the Kremlin to take it into consideration. Moscow focused on emphasizing the Russian prospects in the Arab World and the rebuilding of the Russian relations with the new elites who came into power in the region. Also Moscow indirectly preserved what it had inherited from the Soviet Union and integrated the unions' beliefs to come up with a developing and appropriate strategy, and effective tactics to make Russia maintain a strong position with influencing affairs in the Arab Spring in the region of the Middle East. (Malashenko, Alexey, 2013).

RUSSIA AND THE UNITED STATES

- **The Post Cold War Era**

For almost fifty years after the Second World War, global politics revolved around the rivalry of the East that characterized the era of the Cold war. “this bipolar standoff created stability and avoided great power wars, including nuclear war, but turned states in the global South into proxy battlegrounds.” (Goldstein, Joshua, 2014).

With the disintegration of the Soviet Union in 1990, a power vacuum was left in the region. Kuwait was occupied by Iraq in an aggressive action for the control of oil. This action rang the alarm...an aggression that goes unpunished and direct threats to supplies of energy for the global economy. Therefore, a coalition was formed of the major countries of the world and worked through the United Nations. It was led by the U.S. and applied sanctions were applied against Iraq. Since Iraq didn't meet the U.N. deadline to draw from Kuwait, the U.S. and its allies smashed the army of Iraq and evacuated them from Kuwait in the Gulf war. However, Iraq wasn't occupied by the coalition nor was its government overthrown. The costs of the war, on the other hand were shared between the coalition participants. While France and England made military commitments, Germany and Japan made great financial contributions. (Goldstein, Joshua, 2014).

The final disintegration of the Soviet Union followed just a few months after the Gulf War. (Fukuyama, Francis, 1992). The Soviet Union fifteen republics began taking power from a central fragile government and declared themselves sovereign states. Those republics, in addition to Russia, struggled all through the 1990s against financial and economic collapse, corruption, military weakness, war and inflation. Shortly, both democracy and capitalism were adopted as the foundation of the political and economic systems of the former Soviet states. Since the 1990s, relations of western countries have been mixed with Russia and the other republics. Due to their economic problems and a feeling that Russia needed more internal reform rather than external aid, western states provided very limited aid for the harsh economic conditions of the region. This had greatly decreased the living standards. Also, in 1995 and 1999, Russia brutally suppressed the province of Chechnya, which caused western fears of an aggressive, expansionist Russian nationalism. (Ikenberry, G. John, 2000). Despite all that, the great powers of the world decided to increase their cooperation after the era of the cold War. Moreover, Russia was perceived as the successor state to the ex Soviet Union and regained its seat on the U.N. Security Council. In the meantime, both the U.S. and Russia agreed to reduce their nuclear weapons. (Goldstein, Joshua, 2014).

Economically, the post Cold War era is perceived as one of globalization. New hubs of financial and economic development are emerging in some Asian regions. In the meantime, disparities are growing between the rich and the poor both on the global and individual levels. “Globalization has created backlashes among people who are adversely affected or who believe their identities are threatened by foreign influences.” (Goldstein, Joshua, 2014). Also, China is becoming more and more central to global politics in the 21st century. Its rapid growth and size make it a rising power, although it's the only major power that is not democratic. In the meantime, China's poor records in regards to human rights have made it a clear target of Western attacks and criticism from both the NGOs and world governments. China has a great nuclear arsenal, and holds veto power in the Security Council. It's the only major power from the global South and is a great element in the future trends of the global environment.

- **A New Era of Cold War?**

As previously mentioned, the Cold War era formally ended between 1989 and 1991 with the disintegration of the ex Soviet Union. At that time, the international community hoped for an age of Russian-American cooperation. Actually, many signs indicated the birth of a good relationship between the two powers; they cooperated together for stabilizing the Russian economy, reached an agreement to permit the expansion of NATO to some former members of the Warsaw Pact, and worked together for securing the Russian nuclear weapons. (Goldstein, J. 2014).

It wasn't very long, however, that relations started to deteriorate, especially that NATO has enlarged and Russia opposed further expansion. Moreover, Moscow threatened to veto the Security Council resolutions which concerned Iraq in the 1990s and 2000s. The withdrawal of the U.S. in 2001 from the Ballistic missile Treaty erupted fears on the part of Russia that the U.S. might engage in a new arms race. Also, the Kremlin always opposed the U.S. efforts to get the approval of the Security Council in the 2003 Iraq war. Russia threatened to veto any resolution made or proposed by the U.S. In the year 2008, Russia went to war against Georgia, which was an American ally. "While relations remain civil, the friendship has cooled considerably." (Goldstein, J.2014).

Therefore, many wonder if a new cold war era will break out between these two countries. One group of scholars, including the researcher, emphasizes the emergence of a new cold war between Russia and the U.S. This can primarily be attributed to the great differences in major policy areas. The U.S. and Russia do not perceive events in the same way. While the U.S. is committed to the expansion of NATO, Russia believes that this poses a great threat to its security. Furthermore, while Russia opposes deploying antiballistic missiles in Europe, the U.S. is committed to this issue. (Goldstein, J.2014).

Another area of dispute is democracy. Russian democracy is imperfect and weak, which creates more tensions with the U.S. corruption is widespread, the press is threatened and corruption is extensive. The U.S. has also hinted that aid is based on Moscow's improvement of the weak democratic institutions. This made Russian leaders very angry.

Also, Russia confronts America's allies and reaches out to the enemies of the U.S. for example; Moscow and Venezuela have conducted joint military exercise and has relationship with Iran. Not only that, but Russia threatens Ukraine over prices of natural gas, and has gone to war with Georgia. Both of these countries are strong allies of the U.S. The researcher tends to concur with this school of thought.

The other group of scholars believes that no new cold war era can occur between Russia and the U.S. This argument is basically founded on the idea that Russia is dependent on Western acceptance and aid. That is, Moscow highly appreciates its membership in major IGOs like the IMF and the World Bank. Therefore, this approach argues that Russia will not seek policies that might threaten such relationships. Furthermore, no major ideological differences exist today between Russia and the U.S., as the former has abandoned Communism. Although Russian democracy might be weak and imperfect, it is not likely to discard its capitalist experiment or to re embrace communism. Europe can also assist to keep tensions low. Europe was divided during the era of the Cold War into an Eastern block and a Western Bloc. Today, all Europe is united and may serve as a mediator between the two countries. Moreover, European countries have strong political and economic interests in a continued cooperation between both Russia and the U.S. (Goldstein, J. 2014)

- **Can the United States and Russia Peacefully Co Exist?**

Realists often explain and define international relations in terms of power. Power is often defined as 'the ability to

get another actor to do what it would not otherwise have done” (Barnett, Michael, 2005). In other words, power is the potential or ability to influence...but is not influence in itself. Power is conceptualized as capabilities that may create influence. Such ability is basically based on tangible as well as intangible traits of states, such as income levels, armed force, sizes etc. According to the realists view, the international system co exists in an anarchic state. International anarchy implies the absence or non existence of a world government. This doesn't imply complete chaos or the absence of rules and structure, but the non existence of a central government that can enforce rules. In such a system, each state is an autonomous and sovereign actor that pursues its own national interests. In such a system of anarchy, the most reliable constraint on the power of a state is that of other states. “The term balance of power refers to the general concept of one or more states' power being used to balance that of another state or group of states. (Goldstein, J. 2014). The notion “Balance of Power' can be used to imply any ratio or percentage of capabilities of power between alliances or states, or it can refer only to a somewhat equal ratio.

The balance of power theory argues that counterbalancing occur often and pertain the international system stability. This stability means that the principles and rules of the international system remain the same. This means that sovereignty of state does not collapse or fall into a universal empire. However, this stability doesn't mean peace, but is only a stability maintained through recurring wars that may adjust relations of power.

(Gulick, Edward V. 1955) Also, according to the theory of power transition, wars often occur in the international system from” shifts in relative power distribution”. (Goldstein, J. 2014).

It's clear, that a bi polar world order exists as power is basically shared between the United States and Russia. The world will live with new rules in the next coming millennium. As no rules or law is enforceable, a major issue exists. The problem is how to guarantee a safe and secure world order, where all states are equal and sovereign? According to Joshua S. Goldstein, international affairs may be viewed as “a series of bargaining interactions in which states use their power capabilities as leverage to influence the outcomes. But bargaining outcomes also depend on strategies and luck.” (Goldstein, J. 2014).

Many countries, especially under developed ones in Asia and Africa aren't active players in the new political game and don't have the means to participate in global affairs. Moreover, under developed states don't have the means to protect their sovereignty against the greed of powerful states.

Based on such an idea, the question as to a peaceful coexistence between the United States and Russia poses itself. With the emphasis on the notion of the balance of power, states can ally with each other to stop or deter another state from becoming too dominant. Currently, the U.S. status is already being challenged, mainly by Russia in military power and China in economic power. Such changes are viewed as power transitions. Sometimes such transitions can occur peacefully like when Great Britain was replaced by the U.S. At other times, however, such transitions might not be, for example when Germany attempted to take over Great Britain in the first and second World Wars. Should Russia grow to challenge the U.S., what does the future hold for these two great powers? Will their relationship be one of hostility or peace? Actually, some scholars believe the United States and Russia may coexist peacefully. This argument is based on the idea that both countries agree on many important issues, for example, issues of terrorism and nuclear proliferation. As with the Soviet Union and the United States, during the Cold War era, there is a room for negotiations and agreements on issues of strategic importance that may allow for future cooperation between the two major powers.

The researcher as well as other scholars, however, adopts the approach that the United States and Russia will find it difficult to coexist peacefully. They base their argument on the idea that the allies of both Russia and the U.S. may create conflicts between them. Today, the United States has lost its credibility in many Arab countries, while Russia is trying to get many Middle East states to ally with it and attempts to regain its legacy in the region. Not only that, but Russia is already attempting to compete with the United States as a global super power.

ATTEMPTS TO REGAIN THE SOVIET UNION LEGACY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

- **Historical Ties with the Middle East Region**

The Nature of the Russian relationships in the Arab World has passed through a number of different phases. Before the era of the Soviet Union, the Russian Empire had no tangible aims or ambitions in the region of the Middle East. Russia was only concerned to protect the Orthodox Church's interests in Palestine. (Alexey Malashenko in 2013) Therefore, Russia's interests were basically focused on a number of areas upon which its strategy has been built; basically the Mediterranean Straits, Persia, Central Asia, China and the Caucasus.

Also, as the region of the Middle East was dominated by the Ottoman and European powers, it did not occupy any position in the Russian Empire Strategic Hierarchy of Political needs. Even after the 1917 revolution that had taken place in Russia and ended up by toppling the Czarist regime and introducing the birth of the Soviet Union, Russia still had very minor interests in the Middle East region. That is, the ruling Bolsheviks had no strategic interest in the region. As Marxism spread, however, it had advocates in the Arab world, and this marked the beginning of the emergence of some, even minor, Russian influence in the Middle East. (Malashenko, Alexey, 2013).

The Periods of the First World War and the Second World War again marked new turning points in the Soviet Union's history of power. It started to become one of the major power actors in the world in terms of enhanced military performance and strict Soviet Leaders. Moreover, the Soviet Union's global ambitions began to appear and were reflected in the policy that supported the fight against the west. In this fight, Moscow's approach primarily aimed to reduce the impacts of the Cold War through attracting alliances from the Middle East countries under the condition of having mutual political objectives with the system of the Soviet Union, and its main allies were: Egypt, Libya, and Iraq.

In the meantime, the Kremlin had shown wide acceptance for the Union's allies and wanted to spread its interference and presence in the region. As Marxist thought began to spread in Egypt, Libya, Syria, Iraq and Algeria, there was a great appreciation to the Soviet Union Model. During the 1950s and 1960s, for example, the Soviet Union started spread its ideology and aimed to develop the concepts of socialist orientation and discourage the capitalist ideology by advocating and developing the non capitalist model. That is, the Soviet Model was the promising model that had attracted the Third world countries at the time. As a result of this alliance, the countries that favored the Soviet Union were closely attached to it and depending on Russia to maintain their military equipments in terms of weapons and planes. In the year 1956, huge political actions had been witnessed. For example, "The Triple Aggression" against Egypt occurred in 1954. The ex- Soviet Union had provided Egypt with military aid in terms of planes and the Russian Pilots were fighting with the Egyptian military forces against the British, French and Israeli. It also supported Egypt and Syria's side after the 1967 setback. Also the Soviet Union had supported Libya's Military parade in 1979 and tanks were driven by Soviet Sergeants. (Malashenko, Alexey, 2013).

It's clear, therefore, that by that period, the Soviet Union did not only gain political approach in the Middle East Region, but it had strengthened its position in the region by creating economic integration with the allied Arab countries such as constructing the Aswan Dam in Egypt and the Nag- Hammadi Steelworks in Algeria; supplied them with cheap and quite effective weapons. (Malashenko, Alexey, 2013).

Unfortunately, however, the Soviet military and political support failed to turn the Middle East conflict in the Arab's favor. Also, when it came to financial and economic cooperation, the Soviet Union could not compete economically or technologically with the more developed Western countries. As Alexey Malashenko believed, the Soviet Union suffered from an internal economic crisis that made it harder to expand support for its Arab allies. Some Middle Eastern countries expressed dissatisfaction with Soviet military supplies. Local media, especially in Egypt, for example, complained that Moscow was supplying the country with defensive weapons when offensive arms were needed. Therefore, as a response to the deterioration of the Soviet Union's performance and interactions with Egypt, in 1972, Egyptian President Anwar Sadat expelled Soviet military advisers and specialists from his country. This was the beginning of the end for the Arab-Soviet friendship. At the same time, together with the United States and Israel, Sadat initiated the Camp David peace process, in which Moscow was given no role.

After the disintegration of the Soviet Union in 1991, the whole decade was considered an unclear period for the Russian policies in the Middle East. This uncertainty has been facing Russia's international relations with the Arab World until Vladimir Putin had taken office. He was able to successfully enhance his country's performance in many fields and helped Moscow to regain its active role in the Middle East as well as in the international arena once again.

- **Russia and the Arab Spring**

With the emergence of the Arab Spring, Russia's influence in the Middle East diminished even further. At first, Moscow interpreted the Arab Spring's events as the result of planned Western intervention specifically designed to decrease Russia's hold on the region. Many scholars in Russia saw in the protests an echo of the "color revolutions" against the governments in former Soviet countries that were believed to have been encouraged by Western powers. As response to the political stabilities that had been witnessed in the Arab World, Moscow thought that these revolutions were just another vital challenge for Russia whether it would gain its position or move away from the region of the Middle East. Therefore, Russia's Foreign Policy adopted in early 2013, describes the revolts that had aroused in the Middle East Region as evidence that Arabs "desire to return to their civilizational roots" and says that "political and social-economic renewal of society is often taking place under the slogan of affirming Islamic values" (Malashenko, Alexey, 2013).

According to Putin and his government, Russia's economic and political relations with countries in the Middle East have been negatively affected. He said that "in the countries that have gone through the Arab Spring, Russian companies are losing the positions they built up over the decades on local markets; taking into consideration that Political cooperation with many post Arab Spring regimes is symbolic and limited to the statements issued after official visits. For example, political relations with Tunisia, which never were a priority, have not improved with the ascension of the country's new Islamist government. In November 2012, Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov said that Moscow was ready to cooperate with the Muslim Brotherhood, which had come to power in Egypt.

He delivered to Mohamed Morsi, winner of the Egyptian presidential election, Putin's invitation to visit Moscow. In the meantime, the Russian viewed the Muslim Brotherhood as a terrorist organization and a threat to Russia's security as declared by the Russian Supreme Court in 2003.

As for its relations with the Gulf Countries, Russia's relations seemed unchanged. Russia's relations with Saudi Arabia, for example, have been practically nonexistent since the Soviet period, when the two countries had virtually no contact. Neither country has made any serious effort to improve the situation, which suggests that neither side is particularly interested. Russia's relations with the other Gulf countries including Bahrain, Kuwait, the United Arab Emirates, and Qatar remain low overall. Media reports that members of Bahrain's Shia opposition had visited Moscow did nothing to improve Russia's relations with these largely Sunni Gulf countries, most of which support the Bahraini government against this opposition. However the Russian relations with countries as Morocco, Algeria and Jordan remained unchanged. Russia does not have particularly strong relations with Morocco or Jordan, although it does enjoy some economic and political ties to Algeria that have not been significantly damaged by the regional revolutions. Russia's relations with Yemen look to be doing quite well in the wake of the Arab Spring. Popular protests overthrew Yemeni President Ali Abdullah Saleh, who stepped down in February 2012. But Yemen's regime change model suits Moscow, which likes the fact that the protests ousting Saleh did not take place under the banner of the fight for democracy and appreciates that the events bore no resemblance to any of the color revolutions. Unlike Libya, the Yemenis got by without outside help and avoided humanitarian intervention. When they did reach out to foreign powers, they included Russia in the conversation as Yemen's ambassador to Russia, Mohammed Saleh al-Hilali, suggested that the then Russian president Dmitry Medvedev could send a special envoy to Yemen to persuade the opposing parties to resolve the conflict through peaceful means. Ultimately, however, Moscow took no part in the country's peace process, leaving it instead to the United States and Saudi Arabia. The Kremlin perhaps took the view that it was risky to intervene in Yemen's affairs because the situation there was so complicated and extremists had a lot of influence; as one Russian newspaper put it, "it would be easy to get involved in Yemen, but the consequences would be serious." (Malashenko, 2013).

According to Malashenko, Putin's strategy to gain a more influential role in the region of the Middle East has entailed emphasizing Russia's special position and its distinct civilization entity that combines both west and east. It also attempted to remind the Arab world that Russia's population includes around 20 million Muslims. Therefore, the goal of this foreign policy is to present Russia as a bridge between the West and the Muslim world. Unfortunately Putin's attempts had failed to increase the Kremlin's influence in the region. It also failed to act as an intermediate between the West and Iran, between the Arabs and Israel, and between the United States and Saddam Hussein's Iraq before Washington launched military operations against Baghdad in 2003. Moreover, the Muslim World did not accept Russia as one of its own; as a result, the West took advantage from the Muslim reaction and refused Russia's interference as an intermediate party between them. Putin's meetings with Arab heads of state and governments in 2005–2007 also failed to produce the desired results. He was also unable to conclude a number of proposed economic contracts, including an agreement with Saudi Arabia, on a joint railway construction project although Russia signed a similar contract with Libya in 2008. Putin's proposal to create a regional security system was also rejected by Arab governments.

In other words, the draw backs of Putin's policy and the weakness of Russia's position in the region became very obvious when Moscow proved its inability to prevent the invasion of Iraq by the U.S. Moscow spoke out repeatedly against an American invasion of Iraq. Also, some well-known Russian politicians such as Vladimir Zhirinovskiy, the Liberal

Democratic Party's leader and Gennady Zyuganov, the Communist Party leader publicly expressed their support for Saddam Hussein. Saddam Hussein was one of the few remaining "friends" who hoped to see in Russia the Soviet Union's successor in the Middle East. After his departure from the political stage, Russia's only remaining partners of any importance in the region were Qaddafi of Libya and Assad of Syria. (Bellamy, Alex J. and Paul D. Williams, 2011).

The influence of Russia in the Middle East continued to fade between 2007 and 2012. The Kremlin's influence decreased further with the outbreak of antigovernment uprisings in 2011 that came to be known as the Arab Spring. The attempts and strategies made by Putin to regain the influence of the Soviet Union in the region were relying on specific combination that shed lights on the past Soviet Legacy and strategic national interests. In other words, it's through this past power that Moscow conducts a policy that serves the main target in this process. It seeks to restructure the strength of Russia in the region and regain its power status. As the Kremlin did not easily differentiate between the Former Soviet Union and the Russian Federation, Moscow still had hopes to regain the image of the Soviet Union in the Arab World through holding what remained from the Former Soviet base for instance, Syria where the sole Russian military base located in the Syrian port of Tartus. (Malashenko, 2013).

Also, Putin's conducted policy in the Middle East is greatly motivated by one important factor reflected in Military Technical Cooperation. This form of cooperation as interpreted in military weapons agreements have attracted Arab countries. In the meantime, they benefit the Russian Defense and Weapons Industry and also, gets the economy to exhibit continuous liquid cash transactions. It should be clear, however, that Russia mostly targets the countries that have comparative advantage in producing oil and gas in the region as: Iraq, Libya, and Algeria as the oil markets of these countries were considered competitors to the Russian oil markets.

- **Russia's Middle East Policy and Islam**

One of the vital factors that had deeply encouraged the Russian Federation to deepen its presence in the Middle East is its interest to show the Muslim citizens in Russia that their country is willing to cooperate with their fellow Muslims abroad. Russia has a significant Muslim population, especially in the North Caucasus and the Volga Region, and Moscow is anxious to show how it is involved in the Islamic world's affairs and ready to defend the interests of Muslims if need be. Since the Kremlin didn't have specific historical interactions with Islamic regimes; Russian Politicians had declared their willingness to deal with the Islamic governments to serve the persistence of Russia in the region. For example, Moscow had been engaged in dialogue with Iran's leadership and has tried to build relations with the Hamas Islamic resistance movement. After Hamas won Palestinian parliamentary elections in 2006, Russia even offered its services to help settle the differences between the movement and the president of the Palestinian Authority Mahmoud Abbas. (Malashenko, 2013).

After the 25th of January Revolution 2011 that had taken place in Egypt and led to toppling Mubarak's Regime, Russia's politicians had been trying to maintain tolerable relation with Muslim Brotherhood as they won power and authority in the country.

Thus, it can be said that Kremlin's attitude presented through Moscow towards the Islamists had depended on their classification of their main causes according to their importance. For instance, the Kremlin had shown respect to the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt but considered its Syrian counterpart which is currently participating in a civil war to oust

Syrian President Bashar al-Assad a Russian ally, a terrorist organization. Moscow was strongly against the Islamist Extremists movements linked to al-Qaeda which has contributed to violent insurgencies in Russia's restive North Caucasus region.

Despite the huge differences between the Islamists' and the Russian Federation doctrine, yet there is something in common. Both have craved channels between these parties. These channels are found to be the linked ideology that is based on discouraging Western democracy, and building an identity built on a base of anti-Western Sentiment. This triggers the common phenomenon between the Islamist and the Russian Orthodox Church as each party focuses on the principle of having different understandings for democracy and human rights from the Western interpretation for democracy and well being. For instance, the Salafis who represent one of the Islamists radicals, reject the interpretation of democracy by Western countries. In the meantime, the Russian Federation refused to join forces with them although many members of this movement form the leading power in Caucasus. This indicates that the Salafis are so strict to their ideology as they show no tendency or tolerance to accept other ideologies assuming that they are always the right ones. (Malashenko, 2013).

- **Libya and the Russian Involvement**

In the year 2011 which was characterized by witnessing remarkable protesting movements, Moscow found itself caught between the desire to keep Qaddafi, a Russian ally, in power and Western pressure to allow international support to the rebels. The Kremlin fell between two traps: 1. The pressure made by western powers to permit global support to the rebels, and 2. The desire to keep Qaddafi in power, especially that he was considered a Russian ally.

The Kremlin tried to prevent European intervention in the Libyan internal conflict, blocking a number of United Nations (UN) Security Council resolutions that would have permitted intervention by using its veto power. Eventually, however, Moscow gave in to growing international pressure to support the forces opposing Qaddafi. On February 26, 2011, Russia joined the embargo on arms exports to Libya, and it abstained in a March 2011 UN Security Council vote that imposed a no-fly zone over Libya, giving other countries the right to take necessary measures to protect the civilian population. This allowed the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to carry out a military operation at the end of March.

In June 2011, Moscow attempted to persuade Qaddafi to step down, but it was already too late. Qaddafi's opponents no longer needed any compromise or voluntary resignation on the part of the Libyan leader. (Bellamy, Alex J. 2011).

According to Bellamy and Williams, the Politics of protection (R2P) has been used in Libya as a cover for NATO's desire for intervention. Although, they appeared to be intervening for humanitarian rescue mission, they were protecting their oil interests. This was obvious as the nationalized oil companies in Libya became open to foreign investors after the Qaddafi regime fell. In other words, the R2P was just the new means of the west to cover their intervention in other sovereign states to accomplish their own interests.

This means that some countries use the logo of protection to justify and legitimize their intervention in other states, stepping over the notion of sovereignty. (Bellamy, Alex J. 2011).

Security as a term has been changed. Traditionally, it emphasized the state since its basic

Purpose was the protection of its citizens. Outrun by globalization and economic diversity and having bad

governance, the ability of some states to protect its civilians are coming into question. This incapability is especially clear in societies that are war torn.

Thus, some states have come to greatly threaten the welfare and rights of their own citizens instead of protecting them. This has probably resulted in broadening the emphasis of security toward individual human rights rather than the state level. Also, it has resulted in considering suitable roles for the international community so as to compensate for the failure of the state. “Everyone agrees that the world would be better off without atrocities, which degrade humanity and undermine norms of peaceful politics.” These ideals, however, are a collective good, enjoyed by all countries regardless of which ones put money and lives on the line.” (Goldstein, Joshua, 2014).

Therefore, advocates of human rights proposed a concept known as the Responsibility to Protect. The international community must try diplomacy and prevention first, but must resort to military intervention as a last means if necessary in order to stop mass atrocities.

The basic idea was to protect citizens from war crimes, crimes against humanity, genocide and ethnic cleansing. As suggested by the UN, the duty of emancipating citizens from political violence may include the state, but also goes beyond it, especially when the suffering of citizens is the result of state neglect. “In such cases, the duties of human protection may fall on the ‘international community’ – encompassing preventative measures to holt conflict before it arises, through the use of force to holt mass atrocities, right through to international involvement in post- conflict reconstruction” (Glover, Nicolas, 2011).

Thus, the Responsibility to Protect was officially adopted when the United Nations member states unanimously agreed in the 2005 summit to implement it. R2P declares that nation states have a responsibility to protect other nations from genocide, ethnic cleansing, war crimes, and all crimes against humanity. In other words, the claim was if a functioning government fails to protect its citizens, then it’s the duty of other nations to do so. The timely and decisive actions would be taken in accordance with the provisions in the charter 3 of the UN to protect innocent civilians in such conditions. (Bellamy, Alex J. 2011). In the meantime, it’s the responsibility of the United Nations to help states in discharging this responsibility to use either peaceful means or to enforce action. This declaration clearly marks a vital highlight in the relations between human rights and sovereignty. (Bellamy, Alex J. 2005).

The Obama administration attempted to use the Libyan case as a way to re plan its foreign policy. The U.S. invoked the Responsibility to Protect so as to defend decisions made concerning the intervention in Libya and later defined the prevention of potential massacres as “a core national security interest and a core moral responsibility of the United States.” (Keeler, Chris. 2011).

Diplomatically, however, the intervention in the case of Libya and the NATO expansion of its activities outside United Nations mandate were highly controversial. Not only that, but the states that were supportive of the intervention became greatly antagonized by the decision of the NATO to under go regime change. Thus, Russian officials believed that the alliance was going beyond its authority as it pursued change in the Libyan regime. (Keeler, Chris, 2011).

- **Syria and the Russian Involvement**

Until 2013, with Qaddafi gone, Russia had only one friend in the region of the Middle East, Assad of Syria.

However, the Kremlin's policy of supporting and advocating the Syrian president has caused great international criticism which further eroded Russian's influence in the Arab world. The Kremlin wished to prevent the fall of the Syrian president for a number of reasons; these include economic and geopolitical causes, as well as strategic purposes. (Malashenko, 2013).

In the Syrian crisis, Russia has been blamed for vetoing a resolution that threatened to impose sanctions to allow time for al Assad to crush the opposition. Moreover, Moscow was accused for ignoring humanitarian considerations. Russian strategies can be interpreted as a desire for maximizing its political power and trade advantages and to be able to serve its legitimate foreign policy. (Russia, humanitarian intervention and the Responsibility to Protect, 2015)

The Syrian crisis has grasped a global attention by 2011. A protest was made by the people against Bashar al Assad's authoritarian regime. A civil war erupted; one that tore Syria into pieces. As a result, a crisis of humanity caused a great response of the global community. (Menkiszak, Marek, 2013). In all of this, Russia attempted to appear as a somewhat neutral force as it supported Bashar of Syria both politically and militarily. The main aim of Russia was to protect the regime against all forms of pressure to surrender power to the rebels. Also, it aspired to prevent any attempts from the Arabs or the West to advocate military intervention in Syria. (Menkiszak, Marek, 2013).

The Russian strategy and policy towards the Syrian crisis, as believed, were influenced by a number of factors. Primarily, there has been a great worry over the economic and strategic interests in the country and also a fear of the results of any form of imbalance in the area, including Islamic radicalism. Thus, the policy adopted by Russia in regards to the Syrian crisis is basically based on a strong belief that the U.S. is undergoing a conspiracy aiming to spread its interests by means of regime change through the use of military power and technologies of soft power, and Syria is a clear goal for this. All through the crisis, Russia has kept its direct links with the regime of Bashar, and gave the blame to the opposition for the use of chemical weapons. (Menkiszak, Marek, 2013).

Furthermore, Moscow resisted all forms of steps made by the Western and Arab states to adopt U.N. resolutions that condemned state forces and even made suggestions for non military sanctions against the Syrian regime. The draft of the Security Council was even vetoed three times by Russia. It also criticized all requests made to make the Syrian president step down and it believed that it would hinder solution to the conflict. (Menkiszak, Marek, 2013). When the Russian warships reached Tartus, the Syrian port, it was clear that Russia strongly supported the regime. "there were two basic reasons for these visits: first, obviously it was a military and political demonstration to deter the United states as well as its allies from any kind of military engagement in the conflict. Second, it was a way to send heavy armaments from Russia for the forces of the Syrian regime." (Menkiszak, Marek, 2013). President Putin has accused the United States for defining its military actions in terms of humanitarianism. It was obvious, therefore, that although Russia did not formally reject the Responsibility to Protect doctrine, it criticized what it thought was an attempt by the Arab and Western states to over use the R2P as a reason and excuse for military intervention. In other words, President Putin was very strict in regards to the Responsibility to Protect as he signed the following: "It is unacceptable that military interventions and other forms of interference from without, which undermine the foundations of international law based on the principle of sovereign equality of states, be carried out on the pretext of implementing the concept of responsibility to protect." (Menkiszak, Marek, 2013). Moscow also attempted in 2013, to make an agreement with the Arab League regarding the case of Syria. According to this deal, Bashar would hand in the chemical weapon pile. This deal was made after President Obama

declared that the U.S. was considering a military strike against Assad's regime as he had used chemical weapons against his own people. The aim of Russia, therefore, was to prevent all forms of armed intervention by the west in the Syrian crisis. (Menkiszak, Marek. 2013).

From the Syrian activists' point of view, Syrian opposition forces and their allies abroad have perceived Russia's continued mediation as support for Assad's regime. Russia's position on Syria has made its relations with the Arab world even cooler. The Arab Middle East is firmly allied against the ruling Syrian regime. When the Arab League voted in 2012 to expel Damascus from its ranks, only Algeria and Syria itself voted against the decision, and Arab leaders vocally criticized Russia's support of the Syrian regime.

In the meantime, the Arab World believes that the Syrian conflict is not only a purely internal Syrian affair but also a confrontation between external actors, above all the United States and its allies versus Russia and China. (Malashenko, 2013).

It should be clear that in the Syrian case, the United Nations didn't authorize the use of international sanctions but only condemned the violence. In other words, the Responsibility to Protect doctrine wasn't implemented in this case as it was in the case of Libya. In the meantime, the U.N. didn't rule out forms of foreign military act. Ma Zhaouxu, the spokesman of the Chinese foreign ministry believed that the resolution wasn't going to make the situation any easier. Vitaly Churkin, the Russian envoy to the United Nations said the resolution was a way of legitimizing already taken unilateral sanctions and said that it was a way to overthrow regimes by force. (Keeler, Chris, 2011). The Russian foreign ministry was very explicit when he made the following statement "Our wording proposals on the inadmissibility of external military intervention are not taken into account. And that, in view of the well known events in North Africa, cannot but make us wary...The situation in Syria cannot be considered in the Security Council in isolation from the Libyan experience. The international community is wary of the statements being heard that the implementation of the Security Council resolution in Libya as interpreted by NATO is a model for its future actions to exercise the "responsibility to protect." (Keeler, Chris, 2011).

The United States was annoyed as it believed that the Security Council was not very successful in addressing an urgent and vital moral challenge and threat to the security and peace of the region. Moreover, Hillary Clinton, the Secretary of State of the U.S. said that both Russia and China had to give their explanation to the Syrians. In addition to that, Great Britain's foreign secretary believed that the vetoes were greatly mistaken. (Keeler, Chris, 2011).

This shows that both China and Russia were blamed by western countries for wielding their vetoes. Some scholars believe that the clear disagreements between members of the Security Council may have a great and direct influence on the future of the Responsibility to Protect. (Keeler, Chris, 2011). In other words, in the case of Syria, the incapability of the U.S. as well as its allies to pass the resolution is a clear reflection that the norm of humanitarian intervention made by the administration of President Obama is not global in scope. (Keeler, Chris, 2011).

- **Egyptian Russian Relations**

As both Russia and Egypt have undergone great political and social changes, the atmosphere of mutual respect and trust has greatly played a major role in the relationship between the two countries.

They've had several major mutually benefitting relations, which included the Iron and Steel Works in Helwan, the Aswan hydroelectric power station, the Nag Hammadi aluminium plant and an Egyptian Russian University...etc. (Mikhin, Victor, 2015).

After toppling Mohamed Morsi's regime in Egypt in 2013, the International arena's structure had changed, shedding lights on the Russian Federation. Putin had exploited this opportunity and provided many facilities to Egypt in several fields such as military and financial aids. This was basically done to ensure that Egypt becomes one of his country's allies; in addition to Egypt's leading role in the region. It's also considered the gate for exporting the Russian ideologies and thoughts.

It's no doubt, therefore, that one of the most important relations Russia seeks to develop is the relations with Egypt. Russia and Egypt are seeking to establish commercial and diplomatic bonds to serve both states economically and politically. Both countries have had a long history and strong relations, the peak of which was during the Cold War. During President Gamal Abdel Nasser, Egypt was a strong ally of the Soviet Union, and was backed by them during the Yemen war in the 1960s. After the death of Nasser, however, both the Soviet Union and Egypt felt burdened with this diplomatic attachment. More than 15,000 Soviet experts were expelled from Egypt because of a conflict over military machinery spare parts. In 1976, Sadat annulled their friendship treaty. (Deghetto, Torie R. 2015).

Putin has been cultivating ties with Egypt, a Soviet ally for much of the Cold War and traditional export market for Russian arms. "Egyptian exporters successfully use the opportunities offered by our market which have additionally opened after certain restrictive measures have been adopted in response to EU sanctions," Putin said. <http://www.aljazeera.com/news/2015/08/putin-sisi-pledge-boost-russia-egypt-ties-150826201113441.html>

Currently, Egypt and Russia have been preoccupied by trying to restore their relations that suffered to some extent as a result of regime change in Egypt after the Jan. 2011 revolution. President Putin stated: "We are restoring our relations to the fullest extent. And the development of the economy goes along with intensification of political contacts. It is growing, in spite of the problems in the global economy," (Mikhin, Victor, 2015). In other words, while Russia seeks political influence, Egypt is a very strategically important state and the most populous country in the region. Therefore, it's an ideal ally and has one of the strongest military powers in the area. In other words, Egypt's role as a key political player in the region probably fits Putin's interests and desires in the Middle East, especially in terms of security and counterterrorism. Russian investment, on the other hand, can be a very important factor in stabilizing the economy. In the meantime, the Russian, Egyptian relations reflect a growing cooperation on security. Russia has furnished Egypt with arms that included surface to air missile launchers, fighter jets and surface to air missile systems. In June, 2015, the two states conducted joint naval drills. This was called "Bridge of Friendship 2015" and took place in the Mediterranean. Russia and Egypt signed the first Egyptian nuclear plant agreement in November, 2015. The new power plant is to consist of four third generation reactors. The Egyptian president El Sisi announced that this project is peaceful and intends to produce electricity. The head of Russia's nuclear firm Rosatom along, signed the Dabaa nuclear plant agreement with the Egyptian state. This project is considered the largest project between Egypt and Russia since the High dam project built in the 1960s. It's considered one of the greatest projects based on Russian technologies to be constructed in Egypt. This project is to mark a new phase in the history of Egyptian-Russian bilateral relations. It's believed that as a result of this project, Egypt will be the leader of the region in the nuclear technologies field, and the only state with a generation 3+ plant. In the

meantime, al Sisi said that his country is committed to the international conventions that prohibit the proliferation of nuclear plants and nuclear weapons. (Ahram Online, 19 Nov. 2015)

Furthermore, the main issue of the relationship between Russia and Egypt is the military technical cooperation. Both countries signed arms contracts which included deliveries of aircraft, air defense systems, helicopters and anti craft missile systems. Also, military cooperation is not only limited to trade of weapons, but also include exchange of information and training of personnel. Furthermore, the arms supply takes place without delay and with no conditions of political nature. That is, it's believed that Russia has great investment opportunities in the economy of Egypt, from infrastructure to high technology. In the meantime, the leadership in Egypt are striving to develop a suitable environment for foreign investments, and also have a great desire to have close business ties with Russian. According to Victor Mikhin, "Today we are in a phase of history when a part of our planet is aggressively, actively trying to block us, to not allow us strengthening our sovereignty. So I would like to emphasize that Egypt, on the contrary, invites us to be active, long-standing partners, not just in politics, but also in business" (Mikhin, Victor, 2015).

Mohamed el-Badr, the Egyptian ambassador to Russia believes that recent relations between Egypt and Russia were on the rise. He stated: " This is a very important step for us, as speaking metaphorically, the most difficult flight stage for an aircraft is the take off. Today our relations develop very harmoniously, and they are promising," (Mikhin, Victor, 2015).

Thus, cooperation in political, business, and technical areas for these two states is very important. Hisham Zazou, the Egyptian Minister of Tourism believes that in order to keep flow of tourists from Russian, both countries might decide to use Rouble as the main currency in the sectors of commerce and tourism.

It can be concluded that both countries, Egypt and Russia have passed through great political and social changes. However, the atmosphere of mutual respect and trust has always played an important role in the relations between the two countries. Both states are mutually benefitting from the partnership and have very similar, if not identical perceptions on many global issues. Therefore, It's quiet easy to restore relations because Egypt and Russia have had a strong foundation on which they can build future relations. They aren't alien to one another. also, there seems to be some kind of friendly relations between both al-Sisi and Putin, and this makes cooperation much easier as more respect and trust seem to develop. (Mikhin, Victor, 2015).

CONCLUSIONS

As previously mentioned, the Russian Federation is one of the major powers that exist in the modern era. Its huge attempts to regain the Soviet Legacy are very clear as it moves forward to re gain its global status. Under Putin's governance, there have been several attempts to reemerge the Soviet Union again by showing the Russian Muslims that their matters and causes are important to Russia. This is especially clear as the Kremlin considers to restore the Russian affairs in the Middle East to act as an intermediate between the Muslims and the West. This is considered a camouflage to the country's main objective of minimizing the Western influence especially United States of America in the Region. Moscow had exerted great efforts in trying to be a neutral party as it attempts to carry out peaceful solutions in the region.

Today, Russia's global role reflects its own priorities and validates its status and position in the world system. Moscow's political elite attempt to shape its evolution, especially in regards to security developments, but far from the

security society of the liberal democracies of the west. Therefore, Russia's position to strengthen its regional and international influence and its attempts to affirm its legitimacy is greatly accompanied by values that basically challenge the liberalism of the west. That's basically why the Russian strategy towards the Responsibility to Protect and humanitarian intervention are viewed by many western scholars as greatly counter to international norms inspired by the west.

Also, international anarchy is balanced by global order--institutions and rules through which countries cooperate for mutual benefits. The transition from the Cold war era has been a time of turbulence, full of transformations and changes as well as new possibilities, both good and bad. "It is likely, however, that the basic rules and principles of IR- those that scholars have long struggled to understand – will continue to apply, though their contexts and outcomes may change. Most central to those rules and principles is the concept of power," (Goldstein, J.2014).

Throughout history, the world has seen different political structures and power distributions as power transition has been a frequent phenomenon in international politics; those transitions were always companioned with episodes of uncertainty and high risk as power transitions have great effect on the international stability. (Rabuoqi, J, 2009). In other words, the distribution of power in the world doesn't only affect countries but it also affects international organizations and their performance. Since its foundation in 1945, the United Nations has handed over the global peacemaking to the Security Council. Given the council's powers, its members have played a vital role in some of the most significant world events of the past sixty years. Nevertheless, critics often argue that the Security Council is not functioning effectively as it fails to resolve many important issues because of the distribution of power within the council. In addition, they believe that this distribution of power is one of the results of the Second World War and the power distribution that resulted after it. (Rabuoqi, J. 2009).

Since the Cold War era, the globe has been witnessing a unipolar system where the distribution of power has been allocated in one state which exercised most of the cultural, economic and military influence. It's been the hegemonic power of the United States that had basically dominated the world system. The military, economic and culture capabilities had been concentrated in the United States which had played the role of the police of the world in the last years.

The distribution of political power is continuously changing in the world and there are different opinions when it comes to the distribution of power. The balance-of-power school argues that an even distribution of power is more stable while the preponderance-of-power school argues that dominance of power is more stable. Although the two schools have different theories, they both agree that distribution of power has a huge effect on the stability of the world.

Today, there is no doubt that a bi polar system has re emerged (the U.S. and Russia). The United States has definitely lost a great deal of its dominance. Since the Cold war, the United States was trying to inflict its ideology of democracy as a form of soft power on many areas of the world. The U.S. has emphasized the power of democracy as the ideal ideology and tried to spread it throughout the globe. It has been trying to maximize its influence of capabilities through a psychological process. Thus, the United States wanted its own values to become widely shared among other nations as a way to easily influence other states. This has caused a great loss of its credibility as many states came to realize that its calls for democracy and human rights were basically a camouflage to hide its intentions of greed and love of power.

Today, unipolarity does not dominate the world any more. A number of great powers have emerged and put an end to a unipolar global system. The world is witnessing the consolidation of a bipolar system with Russia and the United

States as the main contesters. This case is similar to the 1960s when the capabilities and power of the US and the USSR illustrated the concept of a power bipolar system since they had equal powers at that time.

However, this can turn into multipolarity if other players decide to take part in the political and military game. Currently, the U.S. and Russia are the major players, but this doesn't seclude other powers like China. The Chinese government is focusing more towards economic rather than military or political capabilities. However, if China chooses to take part in the distribution of power and get a piece of the cake, then the global system will shift to multi polarity. That is, if China decides to engage itself, not just economically, but militarily and culturally in world affairs, then the world will witness a multipolar system where a distribution of power in which more than two states have nearly equal amounts of military, cultural and economic influence exist. The political power will be more evenly distributed among the three states, the United States, Russia and China with high chances for intermediaries to moderate disputes. If that happens, the researcher believes that the international system will be more stable. In both bilateral and multilateral systems, there is likely to be greater stability because each of the dominant states can exercise a great influence on the others. According to Rabuogi, "as the system moves away from bipolarity towards multipolarity, the frequency of war should be expected to diminish." (Rabuogi, J. 2009).

RECOMMENDATION

- **Modification of UN Structures:** The United Nations should modify its own structures and re plan new mechanisms to satisfy the new world order.
- The UN has to upgrade itself internally to set the rules of the game and protect the sovereignty and equality of member states so as to ensure a safe global order.
- The International Court of Justice (ICJ) must be empowered and given the means to settle conflicts and disputes peacefully. It should claim jurisdiction over all states of the globe, and its decisions have to be binding on all countries.
- **Decrease the North South Gap:** The International Community, basically the UN and major powers, must attempt to decrease the North South gap. The great difference in income levels between those in the North and those in the South have to be narrowed down. Rich countries must be encouraged to help poor states to reach a level that allows its population to survive and have the basic needs of food, clothing, shelter and clean water and sanitation system.
- **Provision of Assistance:** The United Nations should provide assistance to remote areas, especially in Africa and Asia and send its experts to help such places to overcome basic problems.
- Poverty should be eradicated, better education must be provided and health care should spread to all regions of the globe.
- The United Nations millennium goal has to be strictly followed and strongly implemented.

- **A Global Awareness of the Culture of Peace:** more effort has to be made for the culture of peace. People, especially children should be cultured to appreciate peace and reject all types of violent settlement to disputes and conflicts.
- **Development of human potentials:** Large populations should not be an obstacle to development, on the contrary, they can be a great asset and a major input in the wealth of a nations. Therefore, every state has to make its own strategy and learn from the positive experience and outcomes of other countries to turn the overpopulation to a major element of power.

Finally, in the age of globalization and the call of human rights and equality, measures should be taken to ensure a safe and peaceful globe for all states. The researcher believes this is only possible if the international community agrees to cooperate together for the sake of global progress and prosperity. The super powers as well as the great powers have to cooperate, not just with each other, but with the less advantageous countries in order to reach a suitable level of development and to provide them with the necessary assistance and decrease the economic gap between and among them. In the meantime, the United Nations has a very great role to play in the coming era. Although the United Nations is not a world government, it's the closest thing to being so. Therefore, if the international community gets obsessed by its greed for power and wealth, ignoring under privileged states, then it's the ethical duty of the UN to promote higher standards of living, full employment and conditions of economic and social progress and development. It must provide solutions of international economic, social, health and related problems, international cultural and educational cooperation and universal respect for humanity.

REFERENCES

1. Abrams, Elliott. 1995. Security and Sacrifice: Isolation, Intervention, and American Foreign Policy, Huston Institution, Indiana, USA.
2. Barnett, Michael, Power in International Politics. *International Organization* 59 (1), 2005: 1-37)
3. Bellamy, Alex J. "Responsibility to Protect or Trojan Horse? The Crisis in Darfur and Humanitarian Intervention after Iraq 2005," *Ethics & International Affairs* 19, no. 2 (2005)
4. Bellamy, Alex J. "Whither the Responsibility to Protect? Humanitarian Intervention and the 2005 World Summit." 2006. <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1747-7093.2006.00012.x/abstract>
5. Bellamy, Alex J. The Responsibility to Protect and the Problem of military intervention. *International Affairs*, **Volume 84, Issue 4, pages 615–639, July 2008**
6. Bellamy, Alex J. 2010. The Responsibility to Protect-Five years. *Ethics & International Affairs*. V. 24.
7. Bellamy, Alex J. and Paul D. Williams. 2011. "The new politics of protection? Cote d'Ivoire, Libya and the Responsibility to Protect". Published in: *The Royal Institute of International Affairs*.
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1468-2346.2011.01006.x/abstract>
8. Chesterman, Simon. 2003. *Just War or Just Peace? Humanitarian Intervention and International Law* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003).

9. Deghetto, Torie R. 2015. "While Russia Makes War in Syria, It Makes Love in Egypt"
<https://news.vice.com/article/while-russia-makes-war-in-syria-it-makes-love-in-egypt>
10. El-Shimy, Nihal. 2015. The Responsibility to Protect... Care or Greed? *Best Journal*, vol. 3, Issue 11, Nov. 2015.
11. Evans, Gareth and Sahnoun, Mohamed. 2002. "The Responsibility to Protect," *Foreign Affairs* 81, no. 6 (2002), pp. 99–110
12. Fukuyama, Francis. *The End of History and the Last Man*. Free Press, 1992.
13. Goldstein, Joshua S. 2014. *International Relations* (10th edition), Pearson, England.
14. Glover, Nicolas. 2011. "A critique of the Theory and Practice of the R2P." <http://www.e-ir.info/2011/09/27/a-critique-of-the-theory-and-practice-of-r2p/>
15. Gulick, Edward V. *Europe's Classical Balance of Power*. Cornell, 1955.
16. Ikenberry, G. John. *After Victory*. Princeton, 2000)
17. Keeler, Chris. 2011. "The End of the Responsibility to Protect?" 2011. *Foreign policy journal*
<http://www.foreignpolicyjournal.com/author/chris-keeler/>
18. Kofi Annan, "Two Concepts of Sovereignty," *Economist*, September 18, 1999.
<http://www.economist.com/node/324795>
19. Lindberg, Todd. 2005. "Protect the People," *Washington Times*, September 27, 2005; available at washingtontimes.com/op-ed/20050926-092335-2083r.htm.
20. Malashenko, A. 2013, *Russia and the Arab Spring*, Carnegie Moscow Centre..
http://carnegieendowment.org/files/russia_arab_spring2013.pdf
21. Marek Menkiszak. "Responsibility to Protect...Itself? Russia's strategy Towards the Crisis in Syria". 2013 The Finnish Institute of International Affairs. http://www.fiaa.fi/en/publication/341/responsibility_to_protect..._itself/
22. Mikhin, Victor, 2015. **Russia and Egypt: Relations are on the Rise**
23. Nicholas J. Wheeler. 2001. "Legitimizing Humanitarian Intervention: Principles and Procedures" *Melbourne Journal of International Law* 2, no. 2 (2001).
24. Nicholas J. Wheeler, "A Victory for Common Humanity? The Responsibility to Protect after the 2005 World Summit" 2005. (paper presented to a conference on "The UN at Sixty: Celebration or Wake?" Faculty of Law, University of Toronto, http://www.jilir.org/docs/issues/volume_2-1/2-1_7_WHEELER_FINAL.pdf
25. Rabuogi, J (2009). "Does Unipolarity Foster Global Stability? A Critical Analysis, OF NAIROBI Institute of Diplomacy and International Studies. Retrieved from:
http://www.academia.edu/1194125/Does_Unipolarity_Foster_Global_Stability_A_Critical_Analysis
26. Wohlforth, C (nd). "The Stability of a Unipolar World", *The MIT press journals*. Retrieved from:
<http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/files/wohlforthvol24no1.pdf>

27. Statement by Ban Ki-moon, Minister of Foreign Affairs and Trade of the Republic of Korea, at the General Debate of the 60th Session of the United Nations General Assembly, September 18, 2005; available
28. <http://www.mofa.go.kr/webmodule/htsboard/template/read/engreadboard.jsp?typeID=12&boardid=304&seqno=298363>
29. (ICISS, The Responsibility to Protect, 2001: 15) As a response to that, an international Commission on Intervention and Sovereignty <http://responsibilitytoprotect.org/ICISS%20Report.pdf>
30. International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty, *The Responsibility to Protect* (Ottawa: ICISS, 2001).
31. **Egypt, Russia sign Dabaa nuclear plant deal Ahram Online, Thursday 19 Nov. 2015**
32. Russia, humanitarian intervention and the Responsibility to Protect: the case of Syria Derek Averre and Lance Davies Article first published online: 15 Jul 2015 @The Royal Institute of International Affairs. Volume, 91, Issue 4 pp. iii-xii, 687-931
33. <http://journal-neo.org/2015/02/07/rus-rossiya-egipet-otnosheniya-razvivayutsya-po-voshodyashhej/>